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Executive Summary

In January of 2001, Historical Architect, Mark Mortier and project Exhibit Specialist, Glenn Simpson from the Architectural Conservation Projects Program of the Intermountain Support Office - Santa Fe (NPS-IMSF-CAC), were invited by the Acting Superintendent of Manzanar National Historic Site, Debbie Bird, to visit the Site to prioritize preservation tasks for various historic structures throughout the Site. In attendance at the planning meeting were also Robbyn Jackson, the regional Historical Architect from the Pacific Great Basin Support Office (NPS-PGSO), Michael Crowe, the regional (NPS-PGSO) National Historic Landmark Coordinator, as well as a representative from the State of California. The prioritization of preservation tasks was guided by the Condition Assessment and Preservation Plan prepared the NPS-IMSF-CAC Historical Architect (2000) as well as by available funding through a Save Americas Treasures grant and matching National Park Service Foundation grant. The outcome of the meeting was the creation of a prioritized preservation task list and schedule of work for the preservation crew from IMSF-CAC to execute the tasks under the direction of the NPS-IMSF-CAC project Exhibit Specialist, with the assistance of the NPS-IMSF-CAC Historical Architect. The window for project execution was scheduled for the spring of 2001, with majority of tasks being accomplished prior to the annual pilgrimage to the Site by former internees, their families, and friends. The following tasks were identified during the planning meeting:

- Replace the roofs of the Military and Internal Police Posts;
- Reconstruct the windows and doors of the Military and Internal Police Posts;
- Document graffiti and inscriptions on the exterior stonework and extant window and doorframes of the Sentry Post prior to cleaning the stonework and installation of reconstructed windows and doors;
- Reconstruct the historic fence around the internee cemetery;
- Conserve the simulated wood-grain finishes extant throughout the Site, including the Police Posts, Cemetery, Administration Area, Hospital, and Chicken Ranch;
- Remove vegetation from the Administration Area, Chicken Ranch, Hospital, and Camp Director’s Residence;
- Repair deteriorated stonework and concrete at various locations within the Administration Area.
- Hang the reconstructed entrance sign;
- Move the California Historical Landmark plaque away from the Military Police Post;
- Stabilize masonry on both North Barbeques.

Additional tasks were to be developed as the project progressed based on funding and crew availability.

Manzanar National Historic Site was created in 1992 and is still in the process of becoming interpreted for and accessible to visitors by the National Park Service. Large-scale implementation of the General Management Plan is still underway and the park infrastructure continues to grow. The park holds numerous types of cultural resources including archeological features, cultural landscapes features, historic structures, as well as some natural resources. The cultural resources range from...
prehistoric to historic, dating to the mid-20th century. The primary resources of the Site are those relating to the War Relocation Center Period (WRC). During this time nearly all of the extant structural features were constructed either by the Department of the Army or by the internees themselves. The two Police Posts were constructed by a Japanese-American mason and were among the main features of the entrance to the Center. The stonework of the Police Posts displays exceptional craftsmanship as they were constructed with medium dark igneous rocks, cut smoothly on their exposed faces, and placed in an uncoursed mosaic pattern. The roofs of the Police Posts also display the characteristic pagoda-style transitional slopes found in traditional Japanese architecture.

During the period from when the Center closed at the end of World War II to the date when ownership was transferred to the National Park Service, the remaining structures received very little maintenance. The doors and windows of the Police Posts were removed and were later replaced with fixed plywood or plexi-glass panels to prevent further vandalism to the interiors. Investigation of the roofs revealed that the cedar shingles of were original, as were the cornice molding of the Military Police Post, and soffits of both posts. The soffit of The Military Police Post has been painted several different colors since the WRC period. The soffit of the Internal Police Posts appears never to have been painted. Beginning about 1980, graffiti and inscriptions began to appear on the interior and exterior of the structure. Much of the markings are Japanese or Japanese-American surnames and may relate to the annual pilgrimages. When the Center was declared a California Historical Landmark in 1973, a large bronze plaque was set in a stone monument and placed against the east elevation of the Military Police Post where it remained for nearly three decades briefly telling the wartime story of thousands of Japanese Americans.

The internee cemetery and associated monument located in the northwestern section of the Site continue to serve as a place of remembrance for surviving internees and family members and are the center of activities during the annual pilgrimage. Built in August of 1943, the monument in the center of the cemetery appears to be constructed of stone and concrete and is painted with white paint. Written on the east side of the monument in Japanese characters is the phrase, “Monument to console the souls of the dead.” Around the monument are nine masonry stanchions in the form of faux tree stumps. The stanchions have been finished over time with three different coatings in the following order: an organic simulated wood grain, an organic orange, and a latex brown paint. Prior to this project, the latex paint was peeling away revealing the orange and wood grain finishes beneath. Historic photos by Ansel Adams and other documentation indicate that there was a low ornamental wood post and-rail fence around the cemetery. The fence is no longer in existence but archeological investigation by the National Park Service Western Archeological and Conservation Center (NPS-WACC) has located the exact position of the corners, gate, and fence line.

Other features of the Site that were included within the NPS IMSF-CAC scope of project work were the Administration Area, Hospital, Chicken Ranch, Director’s Residence, and North Barbeques. The Administration Area suffered from an overgrowth of vegetation, which has impacted visitor understanding of the Site as
well as the remaining structural features. In some instances, weathering was causing physical deterioration of masonry features. Similarly, the Hospital and Chicken Ranch were very overgrown with vegetation growing in the cracks of foundations causing further cracking. In addition, the simulated wood grain finish on the incinerator at the Chicken Ranch, which is similar to those found elsewhere at the Site, was beginning to deteriorate. At the Director’s Residence, the fall of a lifeless medium-sized locust tree during one of the Owens Valley’s many wind events, displaced a major section of the structure’s remaining foundation. And lastly, the stone North Barbeques were beginning to show signs of masonry deterioration and trash accumulation.

The decisions to reconstruct the cemetery fence, the perimeter fence, the entrance sign, and numerous other features including several barracks buildings, a mess hall and a guard tower were made at during the development of the Manzanar General Manage Plan. It was determined that reconstruction these features is essential for public understanding of the site, and that there is sufficient information to allow for accurate replication.
Project Narrative

This project involved a several different types of tasks and was subsequently divided into three major tasks. The first task included the documentation and reporting of the Graffiti and Inscription on the Military and Internal Police Posts. The second task group included general historic preservation maintenance on the Police Posts, cemetery, Hospital, Chicken Ranch and Administration Area, etc. The third task included the specialized conservation treatment and reporting on the simulated wood finishes found at the Hospital, Chicken Ranch, Police Posts and Administration Area.

On April 7, 2001, an NPS-IMSF-CAC Documentation Specialist was dispatched to Manzanar National Historic Site (NHS) to document the graffiti and inscriptions found on the interior and exterior of the existing window and doorframes and exterior of the Police Posts in preparation for rehabilitation of the Posts, and the foundations of the Chicken Ranch if time permitted. It was determined by the NPS-IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist that the approved rehabilitation work would result in a loss of potentially historic information indirectly related to the WRC period. Therefore, documentation of the graffiti and inscriptions was selected as mitigation of the potential loss. See Volume II for a full justification, description, and report of the graffiti and inscription documentation. The task of documentation was started prior to the arrival of the IMSF-CAC preservation crew in order to have enough documentation completed to enable to preservation crew to begin work on at least one of the Police Posts.

The NPS-IMSF-CAC preservation crew departed Santa Fe, New Mexico on April 9, 2001 and reported for duty at Manzanar NHS on April 11, 2001. The preservation crew brought with them nearly all the tools required for completing the preservation tasks. The IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist procured the remaining tools and materials prior to and during the project. Upon arrival at Manzanar HNS the crew was divided into two groups, one group was to focus efforts on the reconstruction of the Cemetery Fence and the vegetation removal from the Administration Area, Chicken Ranch and Hospital, and the other group was to focus on the Police Posts.

Work began on the Internal Police Post as the majority of documentation had been completed by the time of the preservation crew’s arrival. Scaffolding was erected on the north and south elevations of the structure. The old cedar shingles were examined and measurements were taken of the existing exposures, spacing, and general layout. After those details were recorded the shingles were removed revealing the topsides of the skip sheathing boards. It was clearly evident that the shingles had never been replaced, as there were only nail holes in the sheathing from the shingles that were removed and the sheathing itself still retained the chimney hole cut through it during the WRC period. There was no flashing at the drip edges, hip or ridges; however, along the ridge and hips, narrow strips of 30lb. Roofing felt had been applied in lieu of flashing. Before applying the new shingles, the soffits were cleaned of the dirt and debris accumulated over the last half-century and selected roof sheathing boards were re-nailed using 8d galvanized nails. A course of 30lb. roofing felt was applied on the last three feet of each roof slope. New shingles were installed to replace the severely deteriorated existing shingles using the same 3-inch exposure and 1/8 to 3/8-inch spacing as the original shingles using galvanized 4d nails. The
triple starter course was also replicated. Aluminum flashing 6” wide was procured from the local hardware store and was used as flashing between the hip finish shingles and ridge finish shingles.

The re-roofing of the Internal Police Post was finished at the same time the documentation of the Military Police Post was completed. Scaffolding was erected on the north and south elevations of the Military Police Post. The old cedar shingles were also examined and measurements were taken of the existing exposures, spacing, and general layout. Those details were recorded and the shingles were removed revealing the topsides of the skip sheathing boards. It was clearly evident that like the Internal Police Post, the shingles had also never been replaced, as there were only nail holes in the sheathing from the shingles that were removed. There was no flashing at the drip edges, hip or ridges; however, along the ridge and hips, narrow strips of 30lb. roofing felt had been applied in lieu of flashing. Before applying the new shingles, the soffits were also cleaned of the dirt and debris and selected roof sheathing boards were re-nailed using 8d galvanized nails. One sheathing board on the east slope was deteriorated enough to warrant replacement. It was replaced with a piece of Douglas fir of the same dimensions and approximately the same grade (WWPA No. 2 Standard and Better). The new sheathing board was date-stamped and stamped with the division stamp (“NPS-IMSF-CAC”). No roofing felt was applied on the last three feet of each roof slope as was done on the Internal Police Post because it was not present historically and it was not needed in accordance with the product specifications for that application. New shingles were installed using the same 3½ -inch exposure and 1/8 to 3/8-inch spacing as the original shingles using galvanized 4d nails. The triple starter course was also replicated. Aluminum flashing 6” wide was added between the hip finish shingles and ridge finish shingles to prevent water penetration at these areas. The aluminum flashing replaced the roofing felt flashing used historically because the roofing felt had failed more rapidly than the shingles.

Concurrent with the re-roofing of the Police posts, the NPS-IMSF-CAC preservation crew began the reconstruction of the historic Cemetery Fence. Analysis of wood samples taken by the NPS-WACC Archeologist from various areas of the Cemetery as well as its abundance on the site suggested that the fence was originally constructed with black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia). Procurement of the wood necessary to complete the project was made possible by the staff at Manzanar NHS, which was able to acquire a permit to cut the necessary wood from a woodlot in Independence, California owned and managed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. With the permit, and the assistance of a State of California Department of Forestry (CDF), the Manzanar NHS/CDF team cut approximately 3500 linear feet of farmed black locust poles ranging from 2-6” in diameter. The dimensions of the poles were determined through a process of extrapolation using historic photos. The locust was cut in March/April of 2001 and was still green at the time of the Cemetery fence reconstruction. The unseasoned characteristics of the locust were intended to allow for easier cutting and fastening during the reconstruction process.

The first step in the actual assembly of the fence was to determine the exact location of the historic fence. This task was accomplished through archeological investigations led by NPS Archeologist, Jeffery F. Burton of NPS-WACC. During the
archaeological investigations, the historic corners and gate openings were identified and pin-flagged for the NPS-IMSF-CAC preservation crew. Once the corners and openings were established the preservation crew, with the assistance of the NPS-WACC Archeologist, determined the correct historic spacing between posts. The postholes were dug to a depth of approximately 30 inches using an 8-inch auger attachment for the Manzanar NHS John Deere skid-steer tractor. The NPS-WACC Archeologist also monitored the excavation of the postholes for disturbance of subsurface archaeological features, and no archeological material was encountered.

The posts were then set into the holes, which were backfilled with the soil removed during excavation. Larger diameter posts were selected for the corners and gate openings to provide greater strength at those points to prevent leaning after the loads of the top, bottom and cross rails were attached. No concrete was used to set the posts, and no wood preservatives were applied to the posts due to their unseasoned character. After the posts were set, the height the fence was determined by using copies of historic photographs. The height was determined to be approximately 34 inches above the ground level. All of the posts were cut off at the 34-inch height using a variance of 2 inches to re-establish the rustic character of the historic fence.

The top, bottom, and cross rails were attached to the fence posts using combinations of 3½, 4 and 5-inch square drive stainless steel screws depending on the diameter of the rail being fastened. The screws were counter-sunk to a depth of approximately ½-inch so that they would not be visible. These screws were selected due to their ease of use and longevity. The characteristics of the historic fasteners were not identified during pre-field research and the general conclusion was that they were probably nails. Nails were not chosen because they would have required much more maintenance and would not have as much strength. By April 20, 2001, the historic Cemetery Fence had been successfully reconstructed and by all accounts closely matched the original fence.

After the NPS-IMSF-CAC preservation crew completed reconstruction of the Cemetery Fence, they began vegetation removal around the foundation and features of the Administration Area. While the Cultural Landscape Report for Manzanar NHS was still in progress at the time of the project, the regional Landscape Architect, Kimball Koch and the NPS-IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist determined that the vegetation threatening the historic features was non-historic. Specifically, the crew was directed to target vegetation growing in the cracks of the foundations and features or within one foot of the perimeters. The crew also removed the dead tree which had fallen across one of the remaining stone walls of the Director’s Residence and reset the displaced foundation section back to its original location. All vegetation removed, with the exception of the dead tree removed from the Director’s Residence, was low fast-growing shrubbery. After the designated vegetation was removed from the Administration Area, the crew began removal of the vegetation from the foundations and features of the Chicken Ranch.

The reconstruction of the Entrance Sign was made possible through a contract administered by the Manzanar NHS staff and was delivered to Manzanar NHS while the NPS-IMSF-CAC was on site. On April 24, 2001 the NPS-IMSF-CAC crew
responsible for the removal of the vegetation at the Chicken Ranch was temporarily diverted from vegetation removal and joined the NPS-IMSF-CAC crew working on the Police Posts for the task of hanging the reconstructed entrance sign. The sign was prepared by fastening to the signboard the straps and “D” rings provided by the contractor. The original signposts used to hang the original entrance sign were determined by the NPS-IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist to be in sufficiently good condition upon which to hang the reconstructed sign. Plain-steel eyebolts, washers, chain and “S” hooks and zinc-plated hex nuts were procured from McMaster-Carr of Los Angeles, and were used to hang the new sign. Using historic photographs as a guide, the chain was cut to length and the sign was hung from the top two eyebolts. Shifting of the signposts over time and the variation of new fastening materials required that additional links of chain be removed in order to achieve the best and strongest placement of the sign. Like the Cemetery Fence, the reconstructed entrance sign was determined by all to be a very close match to the historic sign (captured in numerous historic photos), which has long since disappeared. The California Historical Landmark plaque was also moved away from the Military Police Post at this time and moved to a new location next to Blue Star Memorial Highway marker on the south side of the entrance area. The stonework on the east elevation of Military Police Post that the CHL plaque was resting against was then cleaned using a mild solution of muriatic acid, which removed much of the residual cement from the plaque monument.

After hanging the entrance sign, the preservation crew split again and returned to their respective tasks. Half of the crew continued vegetation removal at the Chicken Ranch while the other half returned to work on the Police Posts, which by then had already been re-roofed. However, much work had yet to be completed on the Police Posts. Due to the recalcitrance of the vendor selected to reconstruct the windows and doors for the Police Posts, the delivery of the windows and doors was significantly delayed. The preservation crew, therefore, began the exterior treatment of the wood finishes on both structures. All cornice moldings and soffit boards were examined for looseness. Loose boards were treated by resetting existing nails with a punch, and where necessary, additional nails were added to provide strength. One coat of Valspar Natural Clear Wood Stain was then applied to the soffits, window frames and doorframes of the Police Post using china bristle brushes in order to help preserve the bare wood. After the application of stain to the Internal Police Post the crew began application of Valspar Flat Exterior Oil-base Wood Primer to the soffits, dormer lattice, and window and doorframes of the Military Police Post. Analysis of the historic paint on the Military Police Post revealed multiple layers of non lead-based paint. The NPS-IMSF-CAC Historical Architect was able to select the most appropriate color for the finish coat. With the windows and doors still undelivered the finish coat of Valspar Exterior Latex paint tinted to the manufacturer’s color of Tea Biscuit. Two coats of finish paint were applied using China bristle brushes. Also at this time, the replacement hinges and strike plates were installed for the doors and windows for both Police Posts.

The doors and windows for the Police Posts were finally delivered on April 30, 2001 and were painted and installed during that week. Each door and window was sealed on all sides using the Valspar Oil-base Wood Primer and then received two coats of
the Valspar Latex exterior Flat Paint. The doors were bored for their locksets with a 2-3/8 inch backset. Basic round-style keyed entry locksets from the Best Access Company were installed using cores provided by the Manzanar NHS staff. It should be noted that the doors and windows were made from specifications developed by the NPS-IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist with the assistance of the NPS-IMSF-CAC Historical Architect (See Letter to Architectural Reproductions on Pg. 82). Laminated safety glass was elected as the most appropriate glazing for the doors and windows due to its high strength and safety features. These features would prevent or reduce the possibility of damage to the inside of the Police Posts and the possibility of injury occurring during acts of vandalism.

Additional tasks accomplished by the crew during the last week of the rehabilitation project and during the period of June 11-29, 2001 were the extension of the reconstructed barbed-wire historic perimeter fence along the north side of the main entrance, the stabilization of the stonework at the North Barbeques and the sign pedestal in the Administration Area, the continuation of vegetation removal at the Chicken Ranch, and hand pruning of some orchard trees.

Some of the more interesting architectural remains at Manzanar are the masonry structures and features built by Ryozo Kado, a mason interned at the Manzanar WRC. Mr. Kado was skilled at constructing features of concrete, sculpted and painted to resemble wooden timbers, stumps, and planks. These features include window and door lintels and sills in the Military Police Post and the Internal Police Post, concrete tree stump stanchions flanking the Military Police Post and surrounding the obelisk in the camp cemetery, an unidentified feature near the administration center, a bench near the Hospital Wards, and a stove/incinerator at the Chicken Ranch Complex. (The stove/incinerator is of doubtful Kado construction, but it is certainly influenced by his skilful techniques.)

Common to nearly all of the features built by Kado are simulated wood grain finishes. As these finishes are considered to be authentic, artistic, and decorative, it was decided that applied conservation was the most appropriate course of action. Therefore, two conservators from IMSF-CAC, Anne Oliver and Robert Hartzler participated in the condition assessment and treatment of the finishes under the direction of IMSF-CAC Supervisory Exhibit Specialist, Jake Barrow. The report on this specific conservation work is found in Volume III.

While in generally good condition, Mr. Kado’s constructions have suffered from more than 50 years of environmental exposure and lack of maintenance. They exhibited cracking and loss of surface veneer and substrate. Conservation treatments included edging and infilling loss with cementicious materials, re-adhering delaminating veneers with an acrylic adhesive, in-painting losses, filling open cracks, and removing graffiti. The Cemetery stanchions had been over-painted with a modern, oil- or alkyd-based paint. This layer had begun to crack and fail, and was removed, revealing the earlier finishes.

By September 2001, all preservation and conservation tasks had been successfully completed and all IMSF-CAC personnel and equipment returned to Santa Fe.
Photographic Narrative

Deteriorated shingles at apex of Internal Police Post before removal.

New 30lb. Roofing felt applied over soffits of Internal Police Post.
New cedar shingles being applied to North Slope of Internal Police. Note hole in roof sheathing where the historic stovepipe passed through the roof.

Detail of new shingles at apex of Internal Police Post.
Apex of Internal Police Post roof before application of hip and cap flashing.

Installation of hip flashing and finish shingles on Internal Police Post roof.
Finished cap flashing and hip shingles.

Completed apex of Internal Police Post roof.
Detail of completed intersection of apex and hip singles at Internal Police Post roof.

Internal Police Post after re-roofing.
Deteriorated cedar shingles on Military Police Post.

Military Police Post roof after removal of deteriorated shingles.
Left - Detail of northwest corner of Military Police Post roof.

Right - New flashing over ridge of Military Police Post roof.

Replacement of single sheathing member.
Division and date stamp used to differentiate new fabric from existing fabric (NPS-IMSF-CAC APRIL 2001).

Detail of finished shingles at intersection of roof slopes on Military Police Post roof.
Left - Corner detail of Military Police Post roof.

Right - Detail of finished ridge shingle on Military Police Post roof.

Military Police Post after removal of California Historical Landmark plaque and cleaning of stonework.
New location of California Historical Landmark plaque adjacent to Blue Star Highway plaque.

New entrance sign placed during Police Post re-roofing.
Flat steel “S” hooks used to secure reconstructed entrance sign.

Detail of strap hardware used to hang reconstructed entrance sign.
1940’s photograph of monument at the internee cemetery. The post-and-rail fence is visible beneath the trees in the background and close inspection of the photograph reveals some details of the fence construction.

View of reconstructed post-and-rail fence around the internee cemetery.
Left - Detail of post-and-rail fence at mid-section.

Right - Corner detail of post-and-rail fence.

Pathway to Administration Area after vegetation removal.
Pathway between historic locations of Administration Buildings after vegetation removal.
Stonewall and concrete slabs after removal of vegetation, fallen tree, and resetting of slab section displaced by fallen tree.

New door hardware for Internal Police Post.
New hinges used for Internal Police Post windows.

Military Police Post after application of oil-base wood primer to dormer, soffits, and window and doorframes.
Detail of Military Police Post soffit during wood priming.

New door hardware for Military Police Post.
New Best Access locksets installed in Internal and Military Police Posts.

Military Police Post after installation of reconstructed doors and window sashes, and painting of soffits.
Internal Police Post after installation of reconstructed doors and window sashes, and painting and staining.

Stabilization of stone sign pedestal in Administration Area.
Preservation Recommendations

PRESERVATION SCHEDULE

Yearly Inspections: Police Posts, Cemetery Stanchions and Fence, Entrance Sign, North Barbeques, Chicken Farm, Administration Area, Director's Residence, Hospital Area.

Yearly Maintenance: vegetation removal at all areas, cleaning of interior of Police Posts.

Five-Year Maintenance: Repaint and re-stain wood elements of the Police Posts, graffiti removal from Police Posts.

POLICE POSTS

The preservation work thus far on the Police Posts has brought them to a high state of stability. With proper and regular maintenance, these structures will require minimal preservation work for the next decade; however, if routine maintenance is not performed, these structures will quickly deteriorate. The buildings should be cleaned and closely inspected every year to identify any immediate maintenance needs such as rodent infestations, broken glass, roof leaks, vandalism, wood deterioration, stone or mortar deterioration, drainage problems, and failure of the wood finishes on the thresholds and lintels of both structures. Failure or pending failure of these finishes should be immediately corrected by a trained conservator familiar with these types of artistic finishes. Other conditions should be treated in the priority in which they threaten the overall integrities of the structures. Broken glass should be replaced with laminated safety glass. The stained and painted surfaces of both structures should be cleaned and repainted every five years. Specific recommendations for the preservation of the simulated wood grain finishes of the lintels and thresholds are found in the conservation report prepared by Robert Hartzler (Appendix B).

CEMETERY

The finishes on the stanchions surrounding the monument were treated as part of this project and preservation recommendations for them may be found in Appendix B. The cemetery perimeter fence, while not a historic structure or feature, should be treated as one only in so far as its appearance should be maintained so that it compliments or enhances the integrity of the historic structures and features in its proximity. The fence should be closely inspected every year for weak connections and wood deterioration. Broken rails or posts should be repaired using black locust material and similar counter-sunk stainless steel fasteners. No concrete shall be used to reset existing posts or in the placement of new posts. An additional recommendation is that a designated parking area be established for visitation to the cemetery and that the informal access road around the newly reconstructed cemetery fence should be closed. This would eliminate vehicles entering the interior of the cemetery and would keep the dust down for the visitors viewing the monument.
ENTRANCE SIGN

Like the cemetery fence, the entrance sign is a reconstruction, and like the fence it should be treated as if it were an historic feature. The sign should weather well, blending in with the rest of the site over time. Failure of the glue joints of the sign is possible as is failure of the fasteners for the letter panels. The signposts are original and will need future preservation. Initially, as much historic fabric as possible should be retained, but wind, sun, and potentially vandalism, will eventually necessitate replacement. If replacement of the posts is determined necessary, then they should be replaced in-kind. The wood appears to be redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*). Samples should be taken from the remaining posts or post fragments and analyzed to identify the genus, and if possible, the species of the wood. The sign should be inspected yearly for any of these conditions.

NORTH BARBEQUES

In the original scope of work, some re-grading around the barbeques was planned to divert water away from these features. This work was not completed due to concerns about disturbing subsurface archeological materials and features. This re-grading should be accomplished in the near future to prevent stone and mortar deterioration caused by capillary transfer of moisture from the surrounding soil into the stone and mortar. The barbeques should also be inspected periodically for loose stones and deteriorated mortar.

CHICKEN FARM

Recommendations for the incinerator at the Chicken Farm may be found in Volume III. The foundations of the Chicken Farm were heavily over-grown before the NPS-IMSF-CAC crew began vegetation removal and through their efforts many of the foundations were cleared. Clearing of vegetation included removal of shrubs from on top of the foundations as well as along the perimeters. Vegetation was removed if it was determined to be affecting or could affect the short- and long-term integrity of the foundations; however, the crew was not able to remove all of the vegetation from all of the foundations and features. The remaining foundations and features should be cleared within the next calendar year. The Chicken Farm should be inspected annually for vegetation-related problems and other problems such as poor drainage and deteriorating concrete. If these problems are identified, the services of a qualified Historical Architect should be sought and a treatment plan developed.

ADMINISTRATION AREA

The foundations and walkways of the Administration Area were also partially over-grown before the IMSF-CAC crew began vegetation removal and through their efforts all of the foundations and walkways were cleared. Clearing of vegetation included removal of shrubs from on top of the foundations and walkways as well as
along the perimeters. Vegetation was removed if it was determined to be affecting or potentially affect the short- and long-term integrity of the foundations and walkways. The sign holder in the center of the Administration Area is a prominent feature exhibiting the simulated wood grain finishes found elsewhere in the park. Specific preservation recommendations for this feature are also found in Volume III. The Administration Area should be inspected annually for vegetation-related problems and other problems such as poor drainage and deteriorating concrete. If these problems are identified, the services of a qualified Historical Architect should be sought and a treatment plan developed.

DIRECTOR’S RESIDENCE

The concrete slabs at the Director’s Residence are subject to undercutting and erosion and should be inspected yearly. Vegetation should be removed on a regular basis to prevent displacement and subsequent loss of integrity.

HOSPITAL BLOCK

The concrete slabs and steps at the Hospital Block should be inspected. The Director’s Residence should also be inspected annually. As with all masonry features, vegetation should be removed on a regular basis to prevent displacement and subsequent loss of integrity. Particular attention should be given to the bench at the Hospital Block because it also has the simulated wood grain finishes found elsewhere in the park. This bench was treated in 2001 and specific preservation recommendations for the bench are found in Volume III.
Composition of Costs

The budget for work described in all three volumes of this report was managed by Manzanar National Historic Site under one NPS account number (8760-7001-600). Manzanar NHS, NPS-IMSF-CAC, and NPS-WACC all charged expenses related to the project to this account number. The following is a summary of expenses for personnel services, travel, equipment, and materials and miscellaneous expenses incurred by all three programs.

- Personnel Services: $79,799.03
- Travel Expenses: $32,163.06
- Equipment: $76.37
- Materials and Miscellaneous Expenses: $37,970.61
- Total Project Cost: $150,009.07
Goals Accomplished

In accordance with the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA), the accomplishment of tasks described in all three volumes of this report assisted Manzanar NHS to achieve selected GPRA goals established at the beginning of fiscal year 2001. Specifically, this project facilitated full and/or partial achievement of the following GPRA Goals:

Ia5 – Historic Structures
Ia05 – Historic Structures
Ia7 – Cultural Landscapes
Ia8 – Archeological Sites
Ib2C – Historic Structures Baseline
Ib2F – Historical Research Baseline
PROJECT AGREEMENT

For the implementation of

Preservation Work on Structures and Features of
Manzanar National Historic Site
FY2001

By

Architectural Conservation Projects Program
Intermountain Support Office - Santa Fe
National Park Service

January 23, 2001

[Handwritten dates and signatures]

Date

Approved by

Superintendent, Manzanar National Historic Site

Date

Approved by

Program Manager, Architectural Conservation Projects Program,
Intermountain Support Office – Santa Fe
I. Executive Summary

This agreement is between the Manzanar National Historic Site and the Intermountain Support Office - Santa Fe, Architectural Conservation Projects Program (IMSF-CAC) for preservation services for the stabilization and restoration of various structures at Manzanar National Historic Site (MANZ). This agreement describes the preservation services and the terms and conditions under which the work will be completed.

II. Scope of the Project

The scope of work for this project includes implementation of the recommendations contained in the Draft Condition Assessment and Preservation Plan, prepared by IMSF-CAC, dated August 31, 2000.

Specific tasks to be completed under this project agreement are as follows:

Military Sentry Post:
- Replace cedar shingle roofing
- Repaint soffit and cornice molding
- Rehabilitate simulated wood stucco on concrete thresholds, lintels and tree stumps through testing and implementation by qualified a conservator(s)
- Reconstruct windows and doors
- Document inscriptions on lintels and window frames
- Move California State Historical Landmark plaque away from structure so as not to interfere with the Post's integrity of setting.

Police Post:
- Replace cedar shingle roofing
- Stabilize soffit and cornice molding
- Rehabilitate simulated wood stucco on concrete thresholds and lintels through testing and implementation by qualified a conservator(s)
- Reconstruct windows and doors

Administrative Area:
- Repair masonry at stone planters, storm drain, traffic circle, stone-lined sidewalk, Camp Director’s Residence Patio Walls and Caucasian Recreation Club Patio Walls
- Clear vegetation from stone planters, storm drain, traffic circle, stone-lined sidewalk, Camp Director’s Residence Patio Walls and Caucasian Recreation Club Patio Walls
- Rehabilitate simulated wood stucco on concrete Stone Masonry Object through testing and implementation by qualified a conservator(s)
- Document inscriptions on traffic circle, stone-lined sidewalk, Camp Director’s Residence Patio Walls and Caucasian Recreation Club Patio Walls

Cemetery:
- Reconstruct perimeter fence using material procured by MANZ Staff. If MANZ Staff is unable to procure material, IMSF-CAC will procure a substitute substitute material
- Rehabilitate simulated wood stucco on concrete tree stumps through testing and implementation by qualified a conservator(s)

Chicken Farm Complex:
- Rehabilitate simulated wood stucco on concrete incinerator flue and stove top through testing and implementation by qualified a conservator(s)
- Clear vegetation from the top and perimeter of foundations
III. Data Collection

IMSF-CAC has already performed data collection for this project, in order to produce the Condition Assessment and Preservation Plan. Additional data obtained by the park subsequent to data collection performed by IMSF-CAC shall be made available to IMSF-CAC. The following report provides historical and condition assessment background for the project.

Additional data collection throughout the field component of this project will be accomplished by crewmembers from IMSF-CAC, as part of a Completion Report, which will be produced after the project has been completed. This report will include, but not be limited to photo documentation before, during, and at the end of the project.

IV. Compliance

The park has already prepared compliance documents for the rehabilitation of the Posts. Compliance documentation for potential subsurface disturbance during site grading around Barbeques, and removal of vegetation from perimeter of Chicken Farm foundations, Hospital foundations and features in the Administrative Area, will be prepared by the park. The affected area will extend approximately 10 feet away from Barbeques on all sides and approximately 2-3 feet away from foundations of the other features.

V. Project Coordination

The successful execution of this project will depend upon the timely completion of any and all necessary actions as outlined for each of the following participants.

IMSF-CAC:

- Shall develop project agreement, scope of work, provide technical assistance, and prepare cost estimate for architectural and preservation services
- Review existing documentation, reports, and correspondence
- Provide project supervision, some tools and equipment to execute the scope of work.
• Schedule and conduct project related meetings and interviews.
• Prepare a completion report detailing the work completed under this project agreement.

MANZ:
• Provide written authorization to IMSF-CAC to transfer funds or cross-charge a MANZ account number to cover all costs as outlined including but not limited to salaries, travel, testing of materials, purchase of equipment related to the project, and overhead cost.
• Review draft documents, coordinate comments, and distribute coordinated comments to IMSF-CAC in a timely manner.
• Designate an onsite point of contact at each location.
• Provide access to the project site.
• MANZ Staff will procure quantities of Black Locust fence posts and rails for Cemetery perimeter fence. If MANZ Staff is unable to procure material, IMSF-CAC will procure a suitable substitute material.

VI. Deliverables/Products
• Preservation Work
• Project Completion Report (2 printed copies, plus electronic version on CD ROM).
• Reports on Stucco conservation and inscription documentation (May be included in Completion Report).

VII. Estimated Schedule
This project will be executed on the following schedule:

All preservation work is to be performed and completed during the period from April 9, 2001 to May 4, 2001, with the exception of the Stucco conservation work, which will be completed by the end of FY2001.

VIII. Cost Estimate
Reference attached cost data sheet:

Includes material costs, testing, services salary and travel costs, for IMSF-CAC Historical Architect, IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist, one IMSF-CAC Archeology Technician, two IMSF-CAC Conservators and seven IMSF-CAC Preservation Crew members for the project as outlined above.

IX. Project Team

MANZ Superintendent:
Port of contact for MANZ. Managerial responsibilities and coordination of IMSF-CAC work in Park. Provides account number for charging project costs. Reviews and approves documents provided by IMSF-CAC.

Acting Program Manager for IMSF-CAC:
Coordinates Intermountain Region – Santa Fe managerial responsibilities and supervision of IMSF-CAC staff.
IMSF-CAC Historical Architect:
Directs historic preservation work and coordinates work of IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist. Provides on-site supervision and management of preservation work and crew. Documents preservation work and prepares Completion Report with Exhibit Specialist.

IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist:
Directs historic preservation work and coordinates work of IMSF-CAC Historical Architect. Provides on-site supervision and management of preservation work and crew. Documents preservation work and prepares Completion Report with Historical Architect.

Preservation Crew:
Seven IMSF-CAC Preservation Crew members will perform the preservation work, and two IMSF CAC conservators will perform the conservation work on the stucco finishes. IMSF-CAC Archeology Technician will document inscription on structures treated within the Section II of the Project Agreement.
January 25, 2000

REPLY TO: NPS991117A

George Turnbull, Superintendent
Pacific Great Basin Support Office
National Park Service
600 Harrison Street, Suite 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107-1372

Re: Implementation of General Management Plan Actions at Manzanar Historic Site, Inyo County.

Dear Mr. Turnbull:

Thank you for submitting to our office your November 1999 letter and supporting documentation regarding the proposed implementation of the National Park Service’s (NPS) General Management Plan (GMP) activities at Manzanar National Historic Site in Inyo County. The Manzanar National Historic Site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and is also designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL). The proposed GMP activities at Manzanar National Historic Site will include the following:

- Restoration of the World War II-era 6-strand barbed wire fence (3.6 miles) placed by the Corps of Engineers around the perimeter of the 550-acre barracks area.

- Restoration of the Relocation Center entrance to its historic (1941-1944) appearance, including the replication of the Mazanar Relocation Center sign. This action will require the relocation of the National Historic Landmark Plaque; the State Historic Landmark Plaque, and the Blue Star Memorial Highway Plaque.

- Reconstruction of the rustic fence originally built by evacuees to delineate the boundaries of the cemetery.

- Reconstruction of Watchtower No. 8.

NPS is seeking our comments on its determination of the effects the proposed project will have on historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800, regulations effective June 17, 1999 implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Our review of the submitted documentation leads us to concur with the NPS’s determination that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on historic properties associated with the Manzanar National Historic Site. All of the work is reversible and will not significantly alter or change those elements that contribute to the Manzanar National Historic Site. In addition, the proposed project appears to adhere to the guidance provided by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Illustrated Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Cultural Landscapes (National Park Service, 1995).
Thank you again for seeking our comments on your project. If you have any questions, please contact staff historian Clarence Caesar at (516) 653-8902.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Daniel Abeyta, Acting
State Historic Preservation Officer
United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Pacific West Region
600 Harrison Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, California 94107-1372

Daniel Abeoya, Acting State Historic Preservation Officer
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Office of Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, California 94296-0001

Dear Mr. Abeoya:

In accordance with the regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, we request your review and comment on a proposed undertaking to implement General Management Plan actions at Manzanar National Historic Site, Inyo County, California. Specifically, these actions include restoration of the historic Manzanar War Relocation Center security fence; restoration of the Relocation Center main entrance; reconstruction of the cemetery fence; and reconstruction of one of the eight watchtowers.

Manzanar National Historic Site is an 813-acre unit of the U.S. National Park System and is of National Significance. The site was designated a California Registered Historic Landmark in January 1972 (8050). In 1977 the City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Board declared Manzanar a City Historic Landmark. On July 30, 1976, the “Manzanar Relocation Center” was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Designation of the site as a National Historic Landmark followed in February 1985. Manzanar National Historic Site was established by PL 102-248 in March 1992. The legislation states that the Historic Site is intended to “provide for the protection and interpretation of historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the relocation of Japanese Americans during World War II.” Manzanar is intended to preserve and interpret a representative War Relocation Center as an aspect of the nation’s Pacific Campaign of World War II. There were 10 such centers established in western states to confine persons of Japanese descent residing on the West Coast. These centers were established pursuant to Executive Order 9066, which authorized the Secretary of War to exclude citizens and aliens from certain designated areas as a security measure against sabotage and espionage. Over 120,000 persons were relocated to these centers. All ten centers were assessed by an NPS historian in the mid-1980s, and Manzanar was determined to be the best preserved and to have the greatest potential as a national park unit. The “Record of Decision, General Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement” (GMP) for Manzanar National Historic Site was signed on January 3, 1997 and states that:

“The site would be managed as a cultural landscape based on the World War II relocation center period. Management of such would require rehabilitation of the gridwork of the camp road system, thinning and clearing of some areas of dense tree growth, reconstruction of the camp’s perimeter fence, and rehabilitation of some of the rock gardens and ponds constructed by the internees...
Reconstruction of sample barracks and a watchtower would be undertaken to enhance interpretation and visitor understanding of the camp experience.”

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) reviewed and commented on the Manzanar Draft GMP in 1996. Comments specific to these proposed actions are:

“The OHP supports the establishment of a ‘Demonstration Block’ with relocated or reconstructed representative barracks and watchtowers to facilitate a visual and meaningful understanding of the camp experience.

The OHP appreciates the NPS’ proposal to preserve the two existing sentry buildings located adjacent to Highway 395 through rehabilitation and regular scheduled maintenance.

The OHP supports the relocation of all memorial plaques from the main entrance area to the visitor center area. The State Historical Landmark plaque should be removed with care to avoid damages to the sentry building. NPS must consult with the OHP prior to the proposed removal and relocation of the State plaque. The NPS should also consider the feasibility of installing a replica of the historic WRA sign at the main entrance to Manzanar.

The Manzanar cemetery area is an important feature associated with the camp experience. However, the management and interpretation of the cemetery area is not discussed in the Draft Plan. The isolated location of the cemetery area represents a possible threat to the integrity and safety of the cemetery features.”

A copy of the entire letter is enclosed, along with the NPS responses to the OHP comments.

The Manzanar National Historic Site is located in Inyo County in the Owens Valley, approximately 230 miles north of Los Angeles. The Owens Valley is a long, narrow, semi-arid valley bounded on the west by the towering Sierra Nevada Mountains and on the east by the Inyo Mountains. The boundaries of the site on this open landscape are largely undefined outside of the three remaining structures. The remaining features – foundations, landscaping fragments, the cemetery and remnants of fencing – blend almost seamlessly into the surrounding landscape.

The proposed undertaking includes four components of the GMP recommendations:

1. Restore the historic WWII (1942-1944) concertina barbed wire fence (3.6 miles) placed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers around the perimeter of the 550-acre barracks area where the 10,000 evacuees lived
2. Restore the Relocation Center entrance to its historic (1942-1944) appearance, including the replication of the Manzanar Relocation Center sign. This action will require the relocation of the National Historic Landmark Plaque, the State Historic Landmark Plaque and the Blue Star Memorial Highway Plaque.
3. Reconstructed the rusted fence originally built by evacuees to delineate the boundaries of the cemetery.
4. Reconstructed Watchtower No. 8.

Restoration of the World War II era security fence. The restored fence will provide present and future generations a unique opportunity to experience and understand the profound impact felt by the Japanese American evacuees as they struggled to adjust to their new circumstances, as well as the loss of the basic civil rights and personal freedoms they had assumed were theirs in common with all American citizens. This project was chosen to receive a 1999 “Save America’s Treasures” (SAT) Millennium Grant and the NPS is in the process of finding a private match to the grant funds. This restoration will be based on investigation and documentation of intact segments of the historic fence, historic photographs, and an archaeological survey.
completed in summer 1999, to document missing components and alignments. Please see the enclosed copy of the "Assessment of Actions Having an Effect on Cultural Resources" (XXX) form—"Historic Security Fence Restoration," for this project, which includes a copy of the SAT grant application form, copies of historic photographs, and archeological survey information.

Restoration of the Relocation Center entrance area. The restored entrance area, with the Manzanar sign, will allow for the interpretation of the no-man's land between the Sentry Post and Police Posts. It was here that evacuees said final good byes, from behind barbed wire, to sons, brothers, fathers and husbands leaving for Europe to fight for the country that had taken their liberty. Restoration of this area to its historic appearance is necessary in order to interpret this sad era of American history. Restoration to the historic period will be guided by historic photographs and the above-mentioned archeological survey. Please see the enclosed XXX "Restore Relocation Center Entrance Area and Cemetery," which includes copies of current and historical photographs, and archeological survey information.

Restoration of the cemetery fence. Funding for the reconstruction of the cemetery fence is included in the SAT Grant. The cemetery is the focal point of the annual Manzanar Pilgrimage when former evacuees, their families and friends visit Manzanar and hold a memorial service, followed by a picnic and cleanup project. As a memorial site, the cemetery is a place of special importance to the Japanese American evacuees, and their families. As the population of evacuees ages, fewer of them are able to attend the pilgrimage, giving urgency to the desire to rehabilitate the cemetery area. The cemetery is currently bounded by a modern wood post and barbed wire fence designed to keep cattle out, restoration of the cemetery fence will define the area as it was historically. Additional information on the cemetery fence reconstruction is included in the previously cited XXX: "Restore Relocation Center Entrance Area and Cemetery," which includes current and historical photographs, and archeological survey information. Additional archeological survey work to locate the historic fence alignment is scheduled for the fiscal year 2000.

Reconstruct Watchtower No. 8. Relocation Center residents tell of the indignity of being held behind barbed wire fences, watched over by guards in the watchtowers. This was particularly difficult at night when the tower searchlights would spot them and follow them through the camp, whether to the latrine or to a friend's barracks. Reconstruction of the watchtower is the most controversial component of the proposed undertaking. The NPS has strict guidelines regarding reconstruction of missing historic structures. There are four requirements for reconstruction that must be met:

1. Significant archeological resources will be preserved in situ or their research values will be realized through data recovery.
2. The structure can be built at full scale on the original site with minimal conjecture.
3. It is essential for public understanding of the cultural associations of a park established for that purpose.
4. Reconstruction will be undertaken only upon specific written approval of the director of the Park Service after policy review in the regional and Washington offices.

A copy of the correspondence sent from the Regional Director, Pacific West Region to the Director of the National Park Service requesting his written approval of the reconstruction is enclosed. It includes the NPS Pacific West Region justification that reconstruction of the watchtower meets requirements 1 through 3. Reconstruction of the watchtower is also controversial to a small number of citizens who believe Manzanar Relocation Center was more like a summer camp than a prison. These people dispute the existence of the watchtowers as guard towers, and insist that the Japanese Americans were not held against their will, the barbed wire fence was to keep cows out and the towers were to spot fires. Through the GMP process, however, it was learned that the value gained from reconstructing a tower to aid in the interpretation of the site far outweighed any negative connotations. This portion of the project was originally included in the SAT grant proposal, but as that
money is only for restoration projects, reconstruction of Watchtower No. 8 was deleted from the approved grant project. Private funding is being sought to undertake the reconstruction. Enclosed please find a copy of the XXX - "Reconstruct Watchtower No. 8" which includes copies of historical photographs, a copy of the Historic American Buildings Survey drawing of a typical tower, and archeological survey information.

NPS has determined that the proposed action is an undertaking as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(y) and is hereby initiating consultation in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. Further, NPS seeks your concurrence on our determination that the area of potential effects (APE) is the entire camp residential area, roughly 550 acres. A map is enclosed.

Applying the Criteria of Effect, we find that the proposed undertaking, to implement GMP actions at Manzanar National Historic Site, will have an effect. Applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect, we believe the effect will not be adverse. All of the proposed work has been determined, through the NPS GMP planning process, to be necessary for the protection and interpretation of the site and all restorations and reconstruction will be based on ample supporting documentation.

We appreciate you review and comment on the proposed undertaking. Should questions arise during the review process, please contact Historical Architect Robyn Jackson of this office at 415-427-1399.

Sincerely,

(Sgd) George J. Turnbull
Superintendent, Pacific Great Basin Support Office

Encl (6)

cc (with enclosures):
Superintendent, MANZ
Superintendent, DEVA
WACC Archeology
Ms. Rone Ochi, Chairperson, Manzanar Advisory Commission, 4000 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Apt. 824, Washington, DC 20016
Ms. Sue Kunitomi Embrey, Chairperson, The Manzanar Committee, c/o The Manzanar Committee, 1566 Curran Street, Los Angeles, CA 90026
Mr. William Michael, Museum Director, Eastern California Museum, c/o Eastern California Museum, P. O. Box 206, Independence, CA 93526

bcci: Stephanie Toothman, CCSO w/encls
David Look, PGSO w/encls
Robyn Jackson, PGSO w/encls

FNP: M:Scott:ocl.11/10/99:x.1400 (c:/data/dos/daniel aboyta letter)
February 26, 1996

George Turnbull, Superintendent
Pacific Great Basin
System Support Office
National Park Service
600 Harrison Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94107-1372

Dear Mr. Turnbull:

The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) has received your letter of January 30, 1996 transmitting the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Manzanar National Historic Park Site, Inyo County.

The Draft General Management Plan represents a sensitive understanding of a controversial period of American history by considering the full range of historical values and resources associated with the Manzanar area, inclusive of Native American concerns, pioneer agricultural enterprises, and the WWII camp experiences. The following comments are provided for consideration by the National Park Service (NPS):

1. The OHP concurs with the NPS' recommendation to adopt Alternative C: Enhanced Visitor Experience as the proposed action. Alternative C provides the optimum opportunity for resource management, protection, and interpretation.

2. The OHP supports the establishment of a "Demonstration Block" with relocated or reconstructed representative barracks and watchtowers to facilitate a visual and meaningful understanding of the camp experience.

3. The OHP supports the rehabilitation and maintenance of the original school auditorium for adaptive use as an interpretative/visitor center. The Draft Plan recognizes the importance of proper rehabilitation, maintenance, and pest control of the building. Nevertheless, the NPS must address contingencies to protect the structure against possible vandalism and other harm. All possible threats and danger to the vacant auditorium must be minimized, especially after the departure by the Inyo County Public Works Department.

4. The OHP appreciates the NPS' proposal to preserve the two existing sentry buildings located adjacent to Highway 395 through rehabilitation and regular scheduled maintenance. However, as with the auditorium, the sentry buildings must be protected against possible damages or vandalism.
5. The OHP supports the relocation of all memorial plaques from the main entrance area to the visitor center area. The State Historical Landmark plaque should be removed with care to avoid damages to the sentry building. NPS must consult with the OHP prior to the proposed removal and relocation of the State plaque. The NPS should also consider the feasibility of installing a replica of the historic NPS sign at the main entrance to Manzanar.

6. The Manzanar cemetery area is an important feature associated with the camp experience. However, the management and interpretation of the cemetery area is not discussed in the Draft Plan. The isolated location of the cemetery area represents a possible threat to the integrity and safety of the cemetery features.

7. The spelling of the term "Japanese American" should be written without a hyphen.

Should you have additional questions or wish to have the OHP participate in the forthcoming scheduled public hearings on the Draft Plan in Southern California, please do not hesitate to contact Eugene Itoh at (916) 631-8936.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine Widell
State Historic Preservation Officer
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY THE OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1. We are aware of the need to provide for protection of these structures and this is proposed to be achieved through augmented staffing, a sprinkler system in the auditorium, night exterior security lighting, and fire and intrusion alarms. Please note that the final plan provides increased protection to the historic entrance and the sentry posts by routing visitors into the site via the existing non-historic entrance to the auditorium.

2. We recognize the need to consult with OHP prior to relocation of the subject plaque and this requirement has been noted in the plan.

We agree that a replica sign would be a useful interpretive feature at the entrance area.

3. The cemetery will be maintained and protected as part of the overall operation. Protection will be substantially improved as a result of closing and rerouting the gravel road which presently passes immediately to the east. Interpretation will be further detailed when the interpretive prospectus for the site is completed.

4. The suggestion is noted and the document has been edited accordingly.
ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Mazama National Historic Site  Park district (optional):

2. Work/Project Description:
   a. Project name: Relocation Center entrance area and cemetery  date 11/1/99
   b. Describe project and area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.2(c)); explain why work/project is needed.

The Relocation Center entrance area is one of the few portions of the site that retain numerous extant structures: the Military Sentry Post; the stone entrance gate posts; the Police Post; the Entrance sign posts with rock beds; and a parking area delineated with stones. Two concrete bollards, made by Mazama residents and fashioned to look like wood stumps, were located next to the Sentry Post to protect it from being hit by cars. These had been removed off site after the relocation center closed but were recently returned to the park. Since the closing of the relocation center, three memorial plaques have been added to the entrance area. These plaques: a State of California Landmark plaque on a stone plinth attached to the east side of the Sentry Post; a National Historic Landmark plaque mounted on a boulder; and a Blue Star Highway Plaque on a post; will need to be relocated to a more appropriate area. The redwood post and barbed wire fence that surrounded the residential area is being restored through a Save America's Treasures Millennium Grant (see attached "Assessment of Actions Having an Effect on Cultural Resources" form dated 8/4/99. Under this proposed undertaking, the windows and doors of the Sentry Post and Police Post will be restored; the historic sign will be replicated; and displaced parking space marker stones will be relocated in their proper positions.

The cemetery fence, now gone, was a rusted wood fence, most likely of lOCUS branches, built by Mazama residents to delineate the boundary of the cemetery. It will be reconstructed in its original location, based on archaeological evidence and historic photographs, and the present, modern barbed wire fence will be removed. See attached justification paper titled "Reconstruction of the Cemetery Fence" for additional details.

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?  
   No  
   X  Yes  Source or Reference WACC, Archeological Survey, 1999;
   Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because an area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance was so extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

   X  Name and number(s): Sentry Post IDLCS #58668  location: NR status: 7
   X  Name and number(s): Police Post IDLCS #58667  location: NR status: 7
   X  Name and number(s): Main Entrance Sign Posts IDLCS #58670 location: NR status: 7
   X  Name and number(s): Main Entrance Gateway IDLCS #58669 location: NR status: 7
   X  Name and number(s): Cemetery Monument and Poles IDLCS #58681 location: cemetery NR Status: 7
   MANZ Cultural Landscape

(REPEAT FOR EACH AFFECTED RESOURCE)

5. The proposed action will: (Check as many as apply.)
   X  Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
   X  Replace historic features/elements in kind
   ___ Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure
   ___ Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
Add nonhistoric features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape

Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible

Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible

Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources

Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrains, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources

Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)

Other (please specify)

6. Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties (Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant):

A comprehensive archaeological survey has been done to pinpoint the location of missing features. Numerous historic photographs clearly document the site as it was during the historic period. The State Landmark Plaque is mounted on a stone plinth that was constructed by the same Japanese American stone mason who built the Sentries and Police Posts. The plinth will be carefully disassembled so that its removal will not damage the Sentries Post, and its stones numbered and inventoried so that it can be reconstructed in another location. The son of the original stone mason will be consulted and he might be able to oversee this work. A replica of the original relocation center sign exists at the Eastern California Museum, and this plus photographic and written documentation will assure that the new sign is accurate. The cemetery fence appears in a photograph taken by Ansel Adams during the center’s operation.

7. Supporting Study Data: (attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number):

Manzanar GMP, 1996.


Prepared by: Robyn Jackson Date: 10/28/99

Title: Historical Architect, PGSO, PC. Telephone: 415-427-1399
B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park’s cultural resource specialist/advisers as indicated by check-off boxes or described below:

SPECIALISTS: Your comments here (or attached) show that you have reviewed this proposal for conformity with requirements of Section 106, with the 1995 Service-wide PA (if applicable), and applicable parts of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, NPS Management Policies, and NPS-28, and have given your best professional advice about this project and the issues relevant to the Section 106 process, including identification and evaluation of historic properties and further consultation needs.

ARCHAEOLOGIST
Name: Krogue, Kelly
Date: Nov. 11, 1999
Comments: Agree

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [ ]
Assessment of Effect: ___ No Effect ___ No Adverse Effect ___ Adverse Effect ___ Programmatic Exclusion
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

CURATOR
Name: Slocum, Warren
Date: 11/2/99
Comments: Agree

Assessment of Effect: ___ No Effect ___ No Adverse Effect ___ Adverse Effect ___ Programmatic Exclusion
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

ETHNOGRAPHER
Name:
Date:
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: ___ No Effect ___ No Adverse Effect ___ Adverse Effect ___ Programmatic Exclusion
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Assessment of Effect: ___No Effect ___No Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Programmatic Exclusion
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Historical Architect:
Name: [Signature]
Date: [Date]
Comments: [Comments]

Assessment of Effect: ___No Effect ___No Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Programmatic Exclusion
Check if project meets Secretary's Standards [✓]
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Historical Landscape Architect
Name: [Signature]
Date: [Date]
Comments: [Comments]

Assessment of Effect: ___No Effect ___No Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Programmatic Exclusion
Check if project meets Secretary's Standards [✓]
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Other Advisers
Name: [Name]
Title or area of specialty: [Title/Area]
Date: [Date]
Comments: [Comments]

Assessment of Effect: ___No Effect ___No Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Programmatic Exclusion
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
C. PARK 106 COORDINATOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS (completed by the park Section 106 coordinator)

1. Assessment of Effect:
   - [ ] No Effect
   - [x] No Adverse Effect
   - [ ] Adverse Effect

2. Compliance requirements: (The following is the park’s assessment of Section 106 process needs and requirements for this undertaking):
   - [✓] A. STANDARD 36 CFR PART 800 CONSULTATION
     Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.
   - [ ] B. PROGRAMMATIC EXCLUSION UNDER THE 1995 SERVICEWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA)
     The above action meets all conditions for a programmatic exclusion under Stipulation IV of the 1995 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.
     APPLICABLE EXCLUSION: Exclusion IV.B [Specify 1-13 or IV.C addition to the list of exclusions.]
   - [ ] C. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING
     Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 1995 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800. Specify plan/EA/EA:
   - [ ] D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT
     The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a state-wide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR Part 800.7 or counterpart regulations. Specify:
   - [ ] E. STIPULATIONS/CONDITIONS
     Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects.

Recommended by Park Section 106 coordinator:
Name ____________________________
Title ____________________________
Date ____________________________

D. SUPERINTENDENT’S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to NPS Management Policies and NPS-28 and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

Name/Signature of Superintendent ____________________________
Date ____________________________
Reconstruction of the Cemetery Fence

Part of the Millennium grant has been earmarked for the reconstruction of the cemetery fence at Manzanar NHS. Although the restoration of the cemetery was not included in the approved GMP preservation treatments, we believe that a restored cemetery area is compatible with the overall objective of managing the park as a cultural landscape. The only cultural landscape treatment approved in the GMP was the rehabilitation of some of the rock gardens and ponds constructed by internees. The rehabilitation, or more properly, the restoration of those areas will require the reconstruction of missing landscape features, just as a restoration of the cemetery area will require the reconstruction of the cemetery fence. Rebuilding the historic cemetery fence is technically a component in the restoration of a cultural landscape. According to cultural resource guidelines, restorations, unlike reconstructions, do not require the Director’s approval. However, since the restoration of the cemetery and reconstruction of the cemetery fence is not mentioned in the GMP, and was not discussed publicly during the GMP process, it is mentioned here.

The cemetery at Manzanar still exists and is located along the western perimeter of the relocation camp’s residential area, just outside of the historic camp perimeter fence. The cemetery is about one half acre in size and is surrounded by a barbed wire fence installed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LAWPD) in 1980 to prevent cattle from entering the area. There are six existing graves within the fenced area, and concrete monument surrounded by concrete posts that look like tree trunks. There is a large, unpaved parking lot adjacent to the cemetery, which was constructed to accommodate the large number of vehicles that arrive each spring for the Manzanar Pilgrimage.

Some of the existing landscape features, such as the graves, monument and posts, date from the relocation camp era and were constructed by evacuees. The concrete monument, which is in the shape of an obelisk, bears the Japanese inscriptions that translate to “Monument to console the souls of the dead” and “Erected by the Manzanar Japanese August 1943.” Both the fence and the monument, as well as a rope supported by concrete post constructed to resemble tree trunks, are visible in the photograph taken by Ansel Adams during his visit to Manzanar in 1943 and published in Adams’ book Born Free and Equal.

Each year the Manzanar Committee sponsors an annual reunion, known as the Manzanar Pilgrimage, which consists of a memorial service, a picnic and a clean-up service project. The reunion is a day long event centered at the cemetery and attended by 150 to 200 people. Although the number attending the event is a small fraction of the annual visitation to the park, the Manzanar Pilgrimage is the only special event scheduled at the park, and it serves the Japanese Americans interned at the camp, as well as their friends and family. As a memorial site, the cemetery is a place of special importance to the Japanese American evacuees, their families and concerned citizens. As the population of evacuees ages, fewer of them are able to attend the pilgrimage, giving urgency to the desire to rehabilitate the cemetery area.

The General Management Plan recommends that Manzanar NHS be managed as a cultural landscape based on the World War II relocation center period. Under the GMP, orchards will be restored, camp roads will be rehabilitated, dense tree growth will be thinned, the perimeter fence restored, a watch tower reconstructed, and some rock gardens and ponds rehabilitated. The GMP does not go into detail on how to accomplish the cultural landscape treatments, and there is no mention of the cemetery fence. Instead, the GMP recommends that a Cultural Landscape Management Plan be completed. Funding for a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) for Manzanar NHS, which will include treatment recommendations, is scheduled for FY 2001 and 2002. Although we realize that more detailed treatment plans will be available within when the CLR is completed, funding for the reconstruction of the cemetery fence was included in the 1999 Millennium Grant, and those funds must be spent by June 30, 2001.
Manzanar War Relocation Center Cemetery Monument with fence in background.
Photo by Ansel Adams circa 1943.
Manzanar Relocation Center Sign, view looking toward the northwest.
Toyo Miyatake photograph, circa 1942-1944
Manzanar Relocation Center Entrance, stone bearing National Historic Landmark Plaque, photo by Anthony Veerkamp, NPS, 1993
Marzban National Historic Site
MANZ 1999 A
Main Entrance
20 FEET

Tree
Rock alignment
Concrete foundation slab or existing structure
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ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Manzanar National Historic Site
   Park district (optional)

2. Work/Project Description:
   a. Project name: Preservation Work on Structures and Features of Manzanar National Historic Site date: 1/25/01
   b. Describe project and area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.2[c]): explain why work/project is needed.

   The proposed action would entail the removal of vegetation from the tops and around the foundations of the historic stucco finish on one of the listed of the Military Sentry Post. The potential impact of vegetation removal will be approximate sample taken would be approximately one square inch and is needed for compositional analysis preparation for total rehabilitation of all similar stucco finishes within Manzanar National Historic Site including the guard stations, the cemetery and barbecues.

   * per conversation with
   G. Simpson 2/2/01

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?
   - No
   - Yes Source or reference: Three Farewells to Manzanar, the Archaeology of Manzanar National Historic Site (Burton 1982)
   x Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance was so extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):
   Name and number(s): Chicken Farm Foundations location: NR status: Listed
   Name and number(s): Administrative Area Features location: NR status: Listed
   Name and number(s): North Barbecues location: NR status: Listed
   Name and number(s): Military Sentry Post location: NR status: Listed

5. The proposed action will (check as many as apply)
   - Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
   - Replace historic features/elements in kind
   - Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure
   - Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
   - Add nonhistoric features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
   - Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
   - Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible

Release Number 2
September 1997
His\n\n6. Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties:
(\nRemember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.\nIf cultural deposits are encountered, vegetation removal will be discontinued. Samples will be\ntaken from an area identified as being in poor condition and subject to planned rehabilitation.\n\n7. Supporting Study Data: (Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and\nproject or page number.)\n\n8. Attachments: [ ] Maps [ ] Archeological survey, if applicable [ ] Drawings [ ]\nSpecifications [ ] Photographs [ ] Scope of Work [ ] Site plan [ ] List of Materials [ ]\n Samples\n[ ] Other\n
Prepared by: Glenn D. Simpson Date\n1/31/01\nTitle: Exhibit Specialist Telephone: (305) 948-6704\n
B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS\nThe park 106 coordinator requested review by the park’s cultural resource specialist/advisors as\nindicated by check-off boxes or as follows:\n\nSPECIALISTS: Your comments here (or attached) show that you have reviewed this proposal for\nconformity with requirements of Section 106, with the 1995 Servicewide PA (if applicable), and\napplicable parts of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic\nPreservation, the NPS Management Policies, and the NPS Cultural Resource Management Guideline.\nand have given your best professional advice about this project and the issues relevant to the Section 106\nprocess, including identification and evaluation of historic properties and further consultation needs.\n\n[ ] ARCHAEOLOGIST\nName: \nDate: \nComments: \nAny archeological needs to be monitored by an Archeologist that meets Sec. of Interior Standards. To\nmitigate the effects of increased visitation and potential\nvandalism, cleared features should be mapped and\nphotographed. Any inscriptions should be photographed,\nwhat drawn, and plotted on the feature maps,\n
Release Number 2 - September 1997
Check if project does not involve ground disturbance[ ]

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect __ No Adverse Effect __ Adverse Effect
__ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[ ] CURATOR
Name:
Date:
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect __ No Adverse Effect __ Adverse Effect
__ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[ ] ETHNOGRAPHER
Name:
Date:
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect __ No Adverse Effect __ Adverse Effect
__ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[ ] HISTORIAN
Name:
Date:
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect __ No Adverse Effect __ Adverse Effect
__ Programmatic Exclusion

Release Number 2  
September 1997
HISTORICAL ARCHITECT
Name: 
Date: 
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect  __ No Adverse Effect  ___ Adverse Effect
Check if project meets Secretary's Standards

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

HISTORICAL LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
Name:  
Date:  
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect  __ No Adverse Effect  ___ Adverse Effect
Check if project meets Secretary's Standards

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

OTHER ADVISERS
Name:  
Title or area of specialty:  
Date:  
Comments:

Assessment of Effect: __ No Effect  __ No Adverse Effect  ___ Adverse Effect
Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Release Number 2  September 1997
The Section 106 process is described in regulations promulgated by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as 36 CFR Part 800. PLEASE SEE ESPECIALLY 36 CFR 800.4, 800.8, and 800.9. Additional guidance published by the Advisory Council includes Section 106, Step by Step and Preparing Agreement Documents. Both of these discuss information and documentation needs involved in Section 106. The following discussion is not a substitute for those documents, but a brief set of reminders.

This form may be used for actions that are undertakings as defined for purposes of Section 106. It is a model that may be altered to suit the needs of a particular park and its advisers. It may or may not be the most effective format for documenting Section 106 compliance, depending on the complexity and planning needs of history of the undertaking. It can be a starting point for the review process within NPS, and it may be used to document programmatic exclusions under the 1995 Service-wide Programmatic Agreement (stipulation IV). For some cases, a memorandum, more detailed report, or NEPA document that includes information meeting documentation requirements in 36 CFR Part 800 may be necessary or preferable.

The form is designed to follow, in a condensed way, the basic questions that should be asked and answered in meeting responsibilities under 36 CFR Part 800. The basic questions are:

A. What is the project and how did the park identify it as an undertaking subject to Section 106?

(As defined in 36 CFR 800.2[a], an undertaking means a project, activity, or program of activity that can result in changes in the character or use of properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If in doubt about whether a project is an undertaking subject to Section 106 review, the park’s Section 106 coordinator should consult the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) or others in the park’s group of CRM advisers on Section 106.)

B. Does the park know whether the project’s “area of potential effects” includes properties in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places?

(Shall the park define the area of potential effects in a comprehensive way? What historic properties will be affected by this undertaking? How did NPS identify those properties? Did NPS make a reasonable and good-faith effort to ensure that no places that might be eligible for the National Register have been overlooked? Did NPS have enough information to evaluate the Register eligibility of properties in the area? Documentation may include descriptions of those properties and of efforts to identify them, such as National Register forms and reports or narratives summarizing the resources and survey efforts.)

C. How will the project affect any such eligible historic properties?

(How did the park and its advisers apply the criteria of effect and adverse effect in 36 CFR 800.97? How did the park get the advice of the SHPO, and of other interested persons, on this point?)

D. Did the park provide opportunities for comment by local governments, Indian tribes, other interested persons, and the public that were appropriate to the scale and type of the undertaking and the known or expected public interests?)

Release Number 2 September 1997
6. If the undertaking would have adverse effects, how did the park and its advisers consider alternatives that would avoid or mitigate the potential for adverse effects?

Generally, Section 106 consultation results in an agreement document of the types described in the Council's Preparing Agreement Documents. That booklet provides suggestions for writing agreement documents and sample formats, as well as some standard language for conditions and stipulations.

Decisions about which CRM disciplines and technical skills are relevant to the project at hand are important. This form should reflect information showing how the park made decisions about which CRM specialists should participate in and advise on individual projects. It should be used to indicate how CRM specialists have been involved in those decisions. This does not mean, however, that every one of the park's CRM advisers must comment on every undertaking.

ITEM BY ITEM:

No. 2: "Area of potential effects" is defined in 36 CFR 800.2(c) as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist."

No. 4: In the first blank, please include applicable park facility or site numbers or IRLCS, IDLCS, ARL & HARS/HAER numbers. For location, please note UTM coordinates, if available, or township, range, and section if applicable and available. If neither of these is readily available, other location description may be used. In the last blank, specify National Register status of affected resource(s), entering the appropriate number from the list below:

(1) listed in Register and documented
(2) listed but not documented
(3) determined eligible by the Keeper of the Register
(4) determined ineligible by the Keeper
(5) found eligible for 106 purposes through consultation with the SHPO
(6) found not eligible for 106 purposes through consultation with the SHPO
(7) a designated National Historic Landmark
(8) within a Register-eligible district – please name district
(9) status unknown by person completing Part A of the form
Len Warner
01/28/2001 10:33 AM
MST

To: Mark Morten/SANTEFE/NPS, Glenn Simpson/SANTEFE/NPS
cc: Manzanar Sentry House Photos
Subject: Manzanar Sentry House Photos

I hope the historic images of the sentry post that I sent from Kim's computer at Manzanar will be of some help to you guys. Let me know what specifically you're looking for re: the cemetery fence. I suspect the best source for these photos locally, i.e., near San Francisco, will be either at the Bancroft library at UC Berkeley or at the National Archives in San Bruno, but both require some planning and scheduling before I can begin to browse their collections. Therefore, it may be more efficient if you need additional images of the historic cemetery fence rather soon, to contact Kim Linse on CC Mail and see if she might be able to look through the folders of historic photos in the auditorium file on site.

Let me know what you think. Thanks,

Len Warner
Glenn Simpson
01/26/2001 11:21 AM
PST
To: Jake Barrow@NPS
cc: Jeff Brown/SANTAFE/NPS@NPS
Subject: Manzanar Conservation Work

Jake,

I have just concluded my meetings with the Manzanar NHS staff and have a signed project agreement for preservation services. Included in the agreement is the conservation of the simulated wood stucco finishes we discussed. Some of the work is replicating the finish and the rest is the removal of some non-historic paint and graffiti. I photographed everything as you requested and was also able to take a sample of the finish while there. The finish appears to be much like a slip made from a cement slurry. I will get you the sample by Monday and we can send it out for analysis. The photos should be ready by the end of next week and I will route those to you as soon as I receive them. The budget for the conservation work is $18,036.00, which includes $10,000.00 for the conservator’s salary, $5,535.00 for travel, and $2,500.00 for materials and testing. The money for the conservation work must be spent or obligated by Sept 30, 2001, and the account number is 8765-7001-600. Since the source of the money is a State of California Grant we will have to present the Manzanar NHS Budget Officer with copies of all expenses in preparation for a State Audit. Also, I will need copies of all of the testing and conservation related documents for inclusion in the completion report. I will be in the office all next week if you have any further questions. I am really looking forward to getting things underway and appreciate all of your help with the conservation issues.

Thank you,

Glenn
Kim Linsee  
To: Mark Marker/SANTA/FNPS, Glenn Simpson/SANTA/FNPS  
cc: Jeff Burton  
Subject: Cemetery Fence

01/30/2001 02:34 PM MST

Hi guys,

I just spoke with Jeff Burton, the Archeologist who has done most of the archeology research here. He has an aerial photo that "gives a very good idea of where the fence was." He has done considerable researched in that area. His number at WACC is 528-670-6501 ext. 258

He said he'd share his info. with you if you give him a call.

Also, his crew replaced the cement tree trunks by the first sentry post in July of 1999: After Manzanar closed, DWP wanted everything cleared out. A DWP employee took the sculptures and put them in his yard here in Independence. The family donated them, Ross worked out the details, and Jeff put them back. He can give you details on that, too.

- Kim Linsee  
(760) 878-0662
Debbie,

I spoke with Scott Hayne at MANZ yesterday regarding the wood procurement for the cemetery fence. He indicated he had found a source that was willing to let the taking occur, but that an agreement needed to be made between the Park and the Land Steward group guide the taking. He also indicated that the harvest would have to be done very soon in order to avoid the spring irrigation window in which no takings may occur. Therefore, we must act quickly if were are to successfully procure the wood. I was also told you are no longer acting Superintendent and that Robert Reynolds was appointed to the position. I am asking that you forward this problem to him and that he be encouraged act quickly to get approval and get Scott going on the procurement. Thanks for all of your help.

Glenn
Attached is an AutoCAD map showing the cemetery today and in 1944 based on air photos. The outlined plot on the 1944 map is the largest possible area at the cemetery that would have been enclosed by the fence. This would be a rectangle 40 ft by 140 ft centered on the monument. From the historic photos I’ve seen the historic fence was in about the same location on the west side of the cemetery as the current fence. Photographic evidence of the south alignment is nil, the north alignment appears to be north of the current fence, and the east alignment is much further east than the current fence. We had petty good results testing for the historic perimeter security fence and I’d expect finding evidence of the cemetery fence would be no different. Our work last year was hampered by the existing fence. We couldn’t finish our testing because it would have required removing the fence and the superintendent thought it would be best to wait until construction of the new fence was more imminent. I sent Debbie a budget for finishing the field work we’ll see what happens.

-cem1.dwg
Opps! I just had our AutoCAD person superimpose the "1944 cleared area" on my excavation map. The first thing that was obvious was that I gave you the wrong dimensions for the area, its not 40 by 140 ft its 155 by 120 ft. I really shouldn't try to do measurements from maps after our AutoCAD person has gone home! (But since I'm not base funded and have no project funds for this I have to do it on my own time.)

Remember these measurements are based on 1944-era air photos so its plus or minus 10 ft or more. If you center that size area on the monument (and make some adjustments for where we think we know where the fence really was) you can see that Fsa. 1 is left out of the area.

Feature 1 includes a post like those in historic photos that mark the graves, but excavations revealed no grave there. Was it a marker placed to memorize the man who died and was left on Mt. Williamson or a post replaced later by someone in the wrong location? Fsa. 1 is included within an area bounded by an old fence alignment that was being maintained by the Manzanar Committee and parts of that fence were also likely the one built by the WRA when the camp closed. The WRA fence would have been completely within the historic decorative fence. So was Fsa. 1 fenced in later or should it be included in your new fence?

As I said before it shouldn't be any problem to find some evidence of the historic fence and if Fsa. 1 was outside the WRA fence or not. Plus, there is also a row of graves that includes at least one body that hasn't been located yet. Finding that row would be especially important since it wouldn't have been outside the fenced area. The row may even be under the current parking lot. Hopefully we will be able to finish the archaeology so you can build the fence.

**Fences at the cemetery from oldest to newest: (1) decorative internee-built fence, (2) WRA fence built at closing, (3) fence maintained by Manzanar Committee, and (4) current LADWP-built fence.**

As it stands now we know where 4, 3, most of 2, and the west alignment of 1 are, all else is guesswork.

Regards,
Jeff
Debbie,

Look's good to me. I have been receiving the info I requested from Jeff Burton, but now I am told that George Teague called our Division Archeologist (again) with questions about compliance for the cemetery fence. I did prepare the compliance for the other aspects of our project work, but it was my understanding that compliance had already been prepared for the fence project. In addition, Jeff Burton is now telling me he has to do additional work before we can get the fence in. I have not had a chance yet to review the information he sent me, but from what I gather it provides an incomplete picture of the subsurface cemetery features. I'll call you today sometime to talk more about this.

Glenn
Misty,

Mark may have a different response than me, and in the meeting we had with Robbyn Jackson I thought we decided to just let the sign weather with out treatment, but on second thought, the unpainted portions of the sign could be slightly burned and brushed along the grain to provide the immediate appearance of age. And then later, in a few years, and water repellant and UV blocker could be applied to the sign to increase its longevity. I do not think any oil-based stains or wood preservatives should be applied at this time. Hopefully, this information is helpful. If you need any further info on the light burning and brushing technique I'd happy to share what have. This technique was used on many of the exterior redwood elements of Scotty's Castle in Death Valley during its original construction.

Glenn
Hi Glenn & Mark,

I was wondering if you guys would mind giving some of your professional input/advice on a question the vendor has about completing our historic camp entrance sign.

The question is:

should we apply a finish to the redwood back and the white pine signs? If so, what kind?

I'm not sure whether the original was finished or not. Looking at old pictures, I suspect not but I know very little about woodwork.

Do we not finish them in order to remain as historically accurate as possible or do we finish them because even though it is a reproduction of a historic sign, it is in our best interests that the wood be protected for the long term?

Do you remember seeing pictures of the sign? It has a redwood 42" x 72" back with smaller white pine boards affixed to it. The smaller boards then had the words painted onto them.

Thanks! Misty
Basicall, I agree with what Glenn said. Another idea is to treat the sign with “wood death” which can be made from fertilizer mixed with water into a dilute solution, and brushed on, or putting some nails in a pan of vinegar for a couple of days, and brushing that on. The problem with both of these is that it is a little hard to control - and you can end up with wood that turns a little dark over the years. But in any case, I think WE should do any treatment - not the vendor.

MM

Hi Glenn & Mark,

I was wondering if you guys would mind giving some of your professional input/advice on a question the vendor has about completing our historic camp entrance sign...

The question is:

should we apply a finish to the redwood back and the white pine signs? If so, what kind?

I'm not sure whether the original was finished or not. Looking at old pictures, I suspect not but I know very little about woodwork.

Do we not finish then in order to remain as historically accurate as possible or do we finish them because even though it is a reproduction of a historic sign, it is in our best interests that the wood be protected for the long term?

Do you remember seeing pictures of the sign? It has a redwood 42" x 72" back with smaller white pine boards affixed to it. The smaller boards then had the words painted onto them.

Thanks! Misty
Misty,

We aren’t planning on any here.

Glenn
United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
INTERMOUNTAIN REGION
Intermountain Support Office - Santa Fe
P. O. Box 728
Santa Fe, New Mexico  87504-0728

In reply refer to:

March 2, 2001

Bill Tucker
Architectural Reproductions
4375 West Reno
Las Vegas, NV 89118

Dear Bill,

Enclosed are copies of the historic photographs of the Manzanar NHS Sentry Posts. This is the best information we have regarding the appearance of the doors and windows. Based on these photographs and the dimensions you and I agreed upon during our site visit on February 22, 2001, we would like you to construct the windows, doors, and stop material for Manzanar NHS as follows:

The door for the Police Post (the smaller western building) had two lights, one light over the other, but the lower part of the door is obscured by the people in the photos. We believe the bottom of the door should be single recessed panel and that the other two doors for the Military Post (the larger eastern building) were of the same configuration. Also note that the two side windows of the Police Post will be two light, one over the other, casement style windows that open outward. The rear window of the Police Post will be fixed, four light, two lights over the other two. As mentioned above the doors for the Military Post will be of the same configuration as those of the Police Post. The smaller side windows for the Military Post, of which we will need four, will be fixed, two light windows, one light over the other. The two larger side windows which resemble the rear window of the Police Post will be fixed, four light windows, with two lights over the other two.

You will have to estimate the width of the sashes and stiles for each set of doors and windows based on the photographs. The profiles of the sashes and muntins will have and standard ogee on the sides facing the insides of the buildings. The window frame material for the one small window on the west end of the south elevation of the Military Post will be constructed according to the dimensions taken during the site visit. We also require enough 1.5 inch Dia, quarter-round to use as exterior stop for the four small windows of the Military Post. The outside of the sashes and muntins will be glazed using the linseed oil-based putty we have provided. We would like you to use the Tie-Bond II or III waterproof glue or an adhesive similar qualities that meets the National Wood Window and Door Association (NWWDA) Quality Standards. All of the doors, windows, window frame stock, and rectangular and quarter-round stop material will be constructed out of clear, kiln-dried, vertical-grain Douglas fir. The glass for the windows will be 0.25 inch laminated safety glass. We understand that this type of glass will significantly increase the cost of the window and door construction, but it is required for visitor safety and to protect the interiors of the Post from vandalism. Also included with the photographs is a set of specifications drafted by Mark Morrier, our Historical Architect. These should serve a guide during the window and door construction. In addition, we will be providing our own hardware for the doors and casement windows, and we will install and paint them ourselves. Below is a summary of the products we would like you to produce, and as a reminder we agreed during out meeting at Manzanar NHS in February, the windows and doors will be delivered no later than April 9, 2001.
Police Post
1 - Two-light door with recessed lower panel (slab only),
1 - Four-light fixed window (slab only),
4 - Two-light Casement Style sashes for two complete Casement Style windows that can be opened;

Military Post
2 - Two-light doors with recessed lower panel (slabs only),
2 - Four-light fixed windows (sashes only),
4 - Two-light fixed windows (sashes only),
1 - Set of window frame stock for two-light fixed windows,
1 - Set of stop material for windows and doors.
1 - Set of 1.5 inch Dia. Quarter-round for the four, two-light fixed windows.

If you have further questions about the specifications or other issues, please feel free to contact me at my office or at the Furnace Creek Ranch in Death Valley where I will be staying from March 5 to March 22, 2001 (907-786-2345), or you may contact Mark Merrier at his office in Santa Fe (505-988-6794). Thank you in advance for all of your efforts in helping us to restore these important buildings.

Very Sincerely,

[Signature]

Glenn D. Simpson
Exhibit Specialist
Division of Architectural Conservation
(505) 988-6794
glenn_simpson@nps.gov

cc: Mark Merrier
enclosures: 3 Copies of Annotated Historic Photographs
1 Window and Door Specifications
Glenn,

What day will you start digging post holes and how long do you think it will take to finish the actual digging? If possible, I’d like to plan our work so that we were done right before you started so that the area is not left unfenced (unprotected) too long and so I can leave someone behind for a day or two to do the monitoring.

Jeff
Jeff,

We will be arriving on April 10 and the crew will be laying out the fence line on the next day (4/11) and might begin the post holes on the same day or the following day. I haven’t had a chance yet to look at the dirt you sent me so I am unsure of the size and location of the fence, but it was not my intention to take down the existing fence until the new one is constructed. We may want to leave at least three sides up for boundary protection even after the fence is completed, however this may be visually intrusive. I need to talk this over with the MANZ staff. Any input you have regarding this is welcome. I’m in the field now at DEVA and can be reached by email or at the Furnace Creek Ranch (760-786-2345) until 3/22. Then I’m on annual leave from 3/23-4/2. By the way, thanks for the fence construction detail, it helps rule out the use of wire. I suspect the fence was fastened with nails.

Regards,

Glenn
We need to remove the existing fence so we can do the archeological work. I just assumed it wouldn't remain after the new fence went in. Seems like leaving it would indeed be a visual intrusion. Just look at the historic entrance ... does everything at Menzamar need two fences? Plus the two fences will likely cross each other. Could you use the old fence posts to make a low unintrusive barrier along the edge of the parking lot? Any ideas Robyn?

We could remove sections of the existing fences as needed if you or the park don't have time to before we arrive. How should we deal with the barbed wire -- should it be saved? Rolled up? Left in as long pieces as possible?

Jeff,

We will be arriving on April 10 and the crew will be laying out the new fence line on the next day (4/11) and might begin the post holes on the same day or the following day. I haven't had a chance yet to look at the data you sent me so I'm unsure of the size and location of the fence, but it was not my intention to take down the existing fence until the new one is constructed. We may want to leave at least three sides up for boundary protection even after the fence is completed, however this may be visually intrusive. I need to talk this over with the MAME staff. Any input you have regarding this is welcome. I'm in the field now at DEVA and can be reached by email or at the Furnace creek Ranch (760-794-2345) until 3/22. Then I'm on annual leave from 3/23-4/2. By the way, thanks for the fence construction detail, it helps rule out the use of wire. I suspect the fence was fastened with nails.

Regards,
Glenn
Since the metal boundary fence is up, the cemetery should be protected once its present fence is down. I would ask Misty to ask the maintenance fellow (who happens to be her husband, but I don’t remember his name) what the park wants to do with it. One thing the park needs to think about is the Eagle Scout Project out by the cemetery. I don’t know the correct term, but it is 2 posts and a lintel in a Japanese style. It is not part of the fence, but close to it and will likely intrude on the historic scene. The park probably should be sensitive to this donation and have it re-erected nearby—perhaps in the parking area somewhere.

Robbyn

We need to remove the existing fence so we can do the archeological work. I just assumed it wouldn’t remain after the new fence went in. Seems like leaving it would indeed be a visual intrusion. Just look at the historic entrance... does everything at Manzanar need two fences? Plus the two fences will likely cross each other. Could you use the old fence posts to make a low unintrusive barrier along the parking lot? Any ideas Robbyn?

We could remove sections of the existing fences as needed if you or the park don’t have time to before we arrive. How should we deal with the barbed wire—should it be saved? Rolled up? Left in as long pieces as possible?

Jeff,

We will be arriving on April 10 and the crew will be laying out the fence line on the next day (4/11) and might begin the post holes on the same day or
Jeff and Robbyn,

As I said I’m not exactly sure where the current fence(s) lay in relation to the historic fence, but it is my feeling the cemetery should be protected. As I recall the cemetery sits on the west side of the metal boundary fence and once the existing fence is removed the cemetery would be outside the boundary fence. The question is whether the reconstructed historic fence would provide enough of a barrier against grazing animals (if there are any in the area) and people approaching the site from the west, to provide an adequate measure of protection? If you are removing the current fence for archeological investigations, that would be a great help to us as we will be trying to complete our work before the pilgrimage. Also, I see no need to retain the barbed wire unless it’s somehow historic. Check with Scott Hayne, the maintenance person at MANZ and he should be able to find a way to dispose of it for you. In regards to the Eagle Scout Project, we could move it to a location designated by MANZ during our project, unless it will have to be displaced by your work. Either way, the park will have to designate a new location. I’m not sure where that leave’s us. Robbyn, I’d be interested in your thoughts on this.

Thanks,

Glenn
Glenn,

The cemetery is outside the historic redwood post and barbed wire fence, but it is within the recently installed all-metal boundary fence. If that fence is still in good condition (there were some breaks due to elk, but I think they have been repaired) it should keep grazing animals out of the cemetery when the present, non-historic fence is down. To protect the cemetery from people wandering in from the west, perhaps some small posts with surveyor’s flags slightly beyond the new fence line to show the rough boundaries. The barbed wire and posts are fairly recent. I think about 10 years old, so no need to save them unless the park has a use for them. I would be careful about leaving piles of un-installed branches unprotected on-site - particularly over the weekends - as firewood harvesting has been a major pastime on the site (now discouraged of course).

Robbyn

Jeff and Robbyn,

As I said I’m not exactly sure where the current fence(s) lay in relation to the historic fence, but it is my feeling the cemetery should be protected. As I recall the cemetery sits on the west side of the metal boundary fence and once the existing fence is removed the cemetery would be outside the boundary fence. The question is whether the reconstructed historic fence would provide enough of a barrier against grazing animals (if there are any in the area) and people approaching the site from the west, to provide an adequate measure of protection? If you are removing the current fence for archaeological investigations, that would be a great help to us as we will be trying to complete our work before the pilgrimage. Also, I see no need to retain the barbed wire unless it’s somehow historic. Check with Scott Hayne, the maintenance person at MANH and he should be able to find a way to dispose of it for you. In regards to the Eagle Scout Project, we could move it to a location designated by MANH during our project, unless it will have to be displaced by your work. Either way, the park will have to designate a new location. I’m not sure where that leaves us. Robbyn, I’d be interested in your thoughts on this.

Thanks,

Glenn
Not sure if Scott can take down the barbed wire before 4/6 or not. Depends on locust pole project. He is also gone for the week of March 19th. Will be meeting DAVA for removal of locust pole chips/slash on 3-27, 28, 29.

Glenn, Scott would like you to please call him & confirm length of poles. Auditorium # 760-878-2867 or office (my #, leave a message) 760-878-2932.

Misty

---

Subject: Re[3]: Cemetery Fence Logistics
Author: Jeff Burton at NP-WACC
Date: 3/6/01 5:38 PM

Some questions for you to pass on... until we figure out what that new maintenance guy's name is. Will he be able to remove the barbed wire before we arrive -4/6, or we could help him after that. We'll pull the posts as needed while we're doing the archaeology. Also can/will he be running the backhoe/ditch for us or do I need to make other arrangements? Could use him Friday, Monday, and maybe Tuesday, the other days we will be excavating by hand.

---

Subject: Re[3]: Cemetery Fence Logistics
Author: Robbyn L Jackson at NP-WHO
Date: 03/06/0001 3:55 PM

Since the metal boundary fence is up, the cemetery should be protected once its present fence is done. I would ask Misty to ask the maintenance fellow (who happens to be her husband, but I don't remember his name) what the park wants to do with it. One thing the park needs to think about is the Eagle Scout Project cut by the cemetery - I don't know the correct term, but it is a post and a lintel in a Japanese style. It is not part of the fence, but close to it and will likely intrude on the historic scene. The park probably should be sensitive to this donation and have it re-erected nearby - perhaps in the parking area somewhere.

Robbyn
You probably don’t need this, but I thought you’d like to see it.

I just came across this Toyo Miyatake photo, taken in 1949 or 1950...windows had been removed.

The station wagon was Toyo’s and the thing on the passenger window is the air conditioner unit.

- sentry4.bmp
Hello all,

Sorry to bug you but looking for more advice - more questions from the historic entrance sign vendor:

The vendor says that the black paint for the letters will bleed onto unfinished white pine. Their suggested solution is to do a very shallow routing of the letters (1/8”). Then paint in a primer which will keep the black paint from bleeding. Then paint in the black paint. Then run through a sander so that the routing is reduced to almost nothing, maybe 1/32” – 1/16”.

We had told them the letters needed to be painted not routed since that is how the original sign was done. They thought this solution’s end result would be such that one could hardly tell that any routing was done. Do you think this is acceptable?

Which makes me wonder - we specified that the sign should remain unfinished yet with painted black letters. If the paint bleeds on unfinished wood, then what do you think the original makers of the sign did to avoid the bleeding paint?

The vendor actually wanted to do the sign without the letters & let us paint the letters on. I think they are frustrated with this! But I didn’t think it was an option for us - that’s why we are paying them to make the sign:

Thanks for your input.

Misty
To: Jeff Burton, Robbyn L Jackson, Glenn Simpson/SANTAFE/NPS
CC: Re[8] Cemetery Fence Logistics

Jeff, Robbyn, Glenn,

We are having a staff meeting with Debbie next week & will then also get her input on all this logistics stuff including Scott's schedule, removal of barbed wire fence, Eagle Scout project, etc.

In the meantime, my humble opinion:

I THINK Scott should be able to get to removal of the barbed wire the week of April 1st but we should double check with him & Debbie to make sure I am not forgetting anything she's got planned for him. Also assuming the locust pole cutting project is complete.

He should also be able to run the bobcat for you but we don't have a backhoe. (is that for Friday 4/6, Monday & Tuesday 4/9 & 10?) If we need the (our) backhoe from MEWA we need to tell Debbie about it right away so she can negotiate for us to use it. What do you think?

I vote that we don't keep both the locust pole & the barbed wire fence. Too much. Not certain if we would have a future need for the wire or if we should just get rid of it. Can we use it for future repairs to the historic perimeter fence (is it the same kind of wire? OK to mix/match wires in historic fence repairs?) or the modern boundary fence? I'll ask Scott if he can think of any other reason to keep it.

I also think the Eagle Scout project thing should be moved or removed. If it stays, there should be some explanation that it is not part of the historic scene. If moved, I have no clue as to where. Will bring up with Debbie. What do ya'll think for a location?

Thanks,

Misty

---

Subject: Re[8]: Cemetery Fence Logistics
Author: Jeff Burton at NP-WACC
Date: 3/7/01 3:13 PM

I don't mind taking down the wire I just don't look forward to dealing with it afterward. Guess I've been nagged by too many barbed wire fences in the past.
Misty,

I don't really see a problem with the technique the vendor wants to use as long as they do what they say they are going to do. If the final depth of the routing exceeds 1/16" then some shadowing may occur in certain lighting conditions and this may deviate from the character of the original sign. Just curious how it was decided that the sign material should be constructed of pine. What type and grade of pine did you specify? Differences in type and grade could make a big difference in how the sign holds up over time. Also, is the vendor reproducing the steel strap brackets for hanging the sign? And, what about the chain? Do we (IMSF) need to provide any of this?

Scott,

The specifications for the Black Locust cemetery fence pole are as follows:

3000 lin. feet.
Each piece should be approximately 6 feet in length.
The majority (90% or 460 pieces) of pieces may vary from 1-1/2" to 2" at the small ends to no more than 3 inches at the large ends.
The remaining 10% or 50 piece may vary from 2" to 2-1/2" at the small ends to no larger than 5 inches and the large ends.

You may want to harvest an additional quantity of fence poles so that you have some in reserve for making accurate repairs in the future - perhaps as much as 10%. Based on an analysis of historic photos of the fence, I think we will be using stainless steel finish or common nails, or screws ranging in size from 3 - 4 inches. We will provide extra for you to use in making repairs.

I hope this information has been helpful. Please let me know if I can be of any more assistance.

Glenn
Misty,

On the sign, I've been looking at the Ansel Adams picture in the Manzanar book. I think we should let them use a matt finish clear coat that would protect the pine and keep the paint from blending. It should be applied to all surfaces of the pine (but none of the redwood).

Robbyn

---

Misty,

I don't really see a problem with the technique the vendor wants to use as long as they do what they say they are going to do. If the final depth of the routing exceeds 1/16" then some shadowing may occur in certain lighting conditions and this may deviate from the character of the original sign. Just curious how it was decided that the sign material should be constructed of pine. What type and grade of pine did you specify? Differences in type and grade could well make a big difference in how the sign holds up over time. Also, is the vendor reproducing the steel strap brackets for hanging the sign? And, what about the chain? Do we (IMSPP) need to provide any of this?

Scott,

The specifications for the Black Locust cemetery fence pole are as follows:

3000 lin. feet.
Each piece should be approximately 6 feet in length.
The majority (90% or 450 pieces) of pieces may vary from 1-1/2" to 2" at the small ends to no more than 3 inches at the large ends.
The remaining 10% or 50 piece may vary from 2" to 2-1/2" at the small ends to no larger than 5 inches and the large ends.

You may want to harvest an additional quantity of fence poles so that you have some in reserve for making accurate repairs in the future - perhaps as much as 10%. Based on an analysis of historic photos of the fence, I think we will be using stainless steel finish or common nails, or screws ranging in size from 3
Robbyn L Jackson

To: Jeff Burton, Glenn Simpson/SANTAFE/NPS, MANZ Administration

CC: Re[6]: Cemetery Fence Logistics

Subject: Re[6]: Cemetery Fence Logistics

03/06/2001 12:21 PM MST

If there is going to be bobcat or backhoe use during the project, will an archaeologist need to be present? Seems to me the answer would be yes, if so, Jeff, are you planning to be there?

On the barbed wire - unless the wire matches the wire of the historic fence it would not be appropriate to use it - it would be likely be okay to use it on the boundary fence though.

Robbyn

---

Jeff, Robbyn, Glenn,

We are having a staff meeting with Debbie next week & will then also get her input on all this logistics stuff including Scott’s schedule, removal of barbed wire fence, Eagle Scout project, etc.

In the meantime, my humble opinion:

I THINK Scott should be able to get to removal of the barbed wire the week of April 1st but we should double check with him & Debbie to make sure I am not forgetting anything she’s got planned for him. Also, assuming the locust pole cutting project is complete.

He should also be able to run the bobcat for you but we don’t have a backhoe. (Is that for Friday 4/6, Monday & Tuesday 4/9 & 10?) If we need the (our) backhoe from DEVA we need to tell Debbie about it right away so she can negotiate for us to use it. What do you think?

I vote that we don’t keep both the locust pole & the barbed wire fence. Too much. Not certain if we would have a future need for the wire or if we should just get rid of it. Can we use it for future repairs to the historic perimeter fence (is it the same kind of wire? OK to mix/match wires in historic fence repairs?) or the modern boundary fence? I’ll ask Scott if he can think of any other reason to keep it.

I also think the Eagle Scout project thing should be moved or removed. If it stays, there should be some explanation that it is not part of the historic scene. If moved, I have no clue as to where. Will bring up with Debbie. What do ya’ll think for a location?

Thanks,
To: Robbyn L. Jackson, MANZ Administration, Glenn
Simpson@SANTEFE/NPS
cc: Subject: Re[8]: Cemetery Fence Logistics

We’re using the backhoe to locate evidence of the original fence. The fencing crew will be using a power auger for their post holes and we’ll be monitoring that work.

If there is going to be bobcat or backhoe use during the project, will an archeologist need to be present? Seems to me the answer would be yes, if so, Jeff, are you planning to be there?

On the barbed wire – unless the wire matches the wire of the historic fence it would not be appropriate to use it – it would be likely be okay to use it on the boundary fences though.

Robbyn

Jeff, Robbyn, Glenn,

We are having a staff meeting with Debbie next week & will then also get her input on all this logistics stuff including Scott’s schedule, removal of barbed wire fence, Eagle Scout project, etc.

In the meantime, my humble opinion:

I THINK Scott should be able to get to removal of the barbed wire the week of April 1st but we should double check with him & Debbie to make sure I am not forgetting anything she’s got planned for him. Also assuming the locust pole cutting project is complete.

He should also be able to run the bobcat for you but we don’t have a backhoe. (is that for Friday 4/6, Monday & Tuesday 4/9 & 4/10?) If we need the (our) backhoe from DEVA we need to tell Debbie about it right away so she can negotiate for us to use it. What do you think?

I vote that we don’t keep both the locust pole & the barbed wire fence. Too much. Not certain if we would have a future need for the wire or if
Misty,

I don't really see a problem with the technique the vendor wants to use as long as they do what they say they are going to do. If the final depth of the routing exceeds 1/16" then some shadowing may occur in certain lighting conditions and this may detract from the character of the original sign. Just curious how it was decided that the sign material should be constructed of pine. What type and grade of pine did you specify? Differences in type and grade could make a big difference in how the sign holds up over time. Also, is the vendor reproducing the steel strap brackets for hanging the sign? And, what about the chain? Do we (IMS) need to provide any of this? If so, I need to know the thickness of the sign where the brackets will attach.

Scott,

The specifications for the Black Locust cemetery fence pole are as follows and are based on the dimensions provided by Jeff Burton:

3400 lin. feet.
Each piece should be approximately 6 feet in length:
The majority (at least 430 pieces) of pieces may vary from 1-1/2" to 2" at the small ends to no more than 3 inches at the large ends.
The remaining pieces (at least 144) may vary from 2" to 2-1/2" at the small ends to no larger than 5 inches and the large ends.

You may want to harvest an additional quantity of fence poles so that you have some in reserve for making accurate repairs in the future - perhaps as much as 10%. Based on an analysis of historic photos of the fence, I think we will be using stainless steel finish or common nails, or screws ranging in size from 3 - 4 inches. We will provide extras for you to use in making repairs.

I hope this information has been helpful. Please let me know if I can be of any more assistance.

Glenn
Glenn & Robbyn,

I am not sure where the specs for the white pine came from. Debbie Bird placed the original order & not sure where she got the info. I suspect it was from looking at the pictures of the original sign & guessing. not sure of type or grade - just white pine. Do I need to contact the vendor & ask?

The vendor is reproducing the chain & brackets as well.

Consensus? Clear finish or shallow routing? The vendor did start to suggest finishing with a polyurethane seallant but changed her mind because it has a tendency to turn white & peel after lots of sun exposure.

Here is what Jeff Burton had to say:

"I suspect there was indeed a primer and it was a flat white primer/whitewash and the black lettering outlined in white was done using a real paint (lead-based/semi-gloss)? . . . I would stay away from doing anything overly complex like the proposed routing and sanding."

Do ya'll agree? I am now thinking I should tell the vendor to use a primer or a clear finish.

Thanks again for helping me with this! I wouldn't know where else to turn if ya'll weren't so helpful.

Misty
Historic Preservation Report 100
Here's what I sent Debbie.

---

**Forward Reader**

**Subject:** MANZ Cemetery Scope of Work

**Author:** Jeff Burton at KP-NACC

**Date:** 03/09/2001 2:18 PM

Debbie,

Attached is a scope of work and cost estimate for the archeological work at the Manzanar Cemetery. This is the sort of document we normally prepare, let me know if you need it in some other format. I've scheduled field work for April 6-10, this will leave the cemetery unfenced for the least amount of time and allow for one of us to stay behind to monitor the fence construction beginning on the 11th.

Jeff

- cemete-1.doc
Scope of Work
Archeological Investigations at the Relocation Center Cemetery
Manzanar National Historic Site, California
Jeffery F. Burton

The Western Archeological and Conservation Center proposes to complete investigations at the Manzanar Relocation Center cemetery in Manzanar National Historic Site. The Historic Site was established by Congress on March 3, 1992, and is administered by the National Park Service. Manzanar was one of ten camps at which Japanese-American citizens and Japanese immigrants were interned during World War II. Construction of the camp at Manzanar began in March 1942; it remained in operation until late in 1945. At its peak, Manzanar held a population of about 10,000. The Manzanar War Relocation Center was listed on the National Register of Historic Places on July 30, 1979, for its association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, specifically the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. Manzanar was less than 50 years old at the time it was listed on the National Register, but it was deemed to be of exceptional importance. This scope of work summarizes the project history, describes the specific work to be accomplished, outlines components of the report to be completed, and details the costs.

Project History
Manzanar National Historic Site has been awarded a "Save America's Treasures Planning Fund" grant which includes funding to reconstruct the original internee-constructed fence at the relocation center cemetery. The current proposal is to finish the archeological investigations to locate the post holes and other evidence of the original fence needed for its accurate reconstruction, critical at such a controversial park. Part of the project includes completion of the verification of the location, number, and extent of the graves present, considered necessary for the future management of the cemetery which has been abandoned for over 50 years. The archeological work is considered an agency responsibility under Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

About two-thirds of the necessary field work has been completed, as well as the human osteology report for the burials encountered to date. The previous archeological work found evidence of the west alignment of the internee-built fence and portions of a fence built by the WRA at the relocation center's closing and later maintained by the Manzanar Committee. Excavations at rock outcrops within the cemetery revealed three graves containing human remains, five graves where human remains had been removed and empty boxes left, four areas that never contained a grave, and four old trees. A granite marker for Baby Jerry Ogata was found to not mark a grave. Excavations in other "unmarked" areas of the cemetery encountered one grave containing human remains and three graves with empty boxes.

One week of field work for an excavation team (including a backhoe and operator for 2-3 days) is needed to complete the project before the final report can be completed. This work, which would require removal of the existing fence, was postponed so that it could be scheduled to precede more closely the reconstruction of the historic fence. With the completion of the archeological field work proposed here, the cemetery fence construction project would meet the requirements of the programmatic agreement between the NPS and the California State Historic Preservation Office.
Proposed Work and Methods
Field work will include searching for the location of five historically-documented but now-unmarked grave sites, portions of the 1945 WRA-constructed fence, and the internee-constructed fence. Excavation to locate fence remains will entail making wide, shallow excavations with a front loader/backhoe provided by Manzanar National Historic Site. Excavations will be designed to expose the fencepost locations, which are expected to be indicated by post remnants, rocks used to support the posts, or differential soil colors. Previous work indicates that recent sediments up to 6 inches deep cover the relocation center-era ground surface. Therefore, shallow broad exposures will be the most efficient way to locate any in situ post remains or post holes.

1940s photographs will be matched against extant features to determine the most likely fence locations, and hence the location of the initial excavations. Discovered post remnants and post holes will be mapped, photographed, and marked with pin flagging. For each its location, spacing, depth, and details of construction will be recorded. The presence of nails, screws, wire, and other artifacts encountered during the work will also be noted, since they provide clues to construction. All artifacts will be collected.

The row of graves that needs to be located is important in determining the original fence locations and to make sure all graves are included within the newly constructed fence. In addition, determining whether the graves are occupied or not is necessary to allow Baby Jerry Ogata’s stone marker to be placed in the right location. Any burials encountered will be exposed and photographed without moving any human remains. Skeletal elements will be examined in situ by a Physical Anthropologist to determine age, sex, race, and stature if possible. No human bone or any associated funerary object will be collected. Human remains will be covered by a cotton sheet and backfilled the same day they are exposed. After backfilling, rocks will be used to mark the location and the grave will be mounded with earth to match historical photographs. Sterile fill will be brought in from off-site to provide material for the low mound.

Background research will include a review of already compiled records, photographs, and locational data. Additional information will be retrieved from relocation center director Ralph Merritt’s office files housed at the University of California, Los Angeles, Special Collections, during a brief stop en route to the Manzanar field work.

Schedule and Reports
George Teague will direct the project and review and edit all reports. Jeff Burton will supervise the field work and write the final report. Compliance documentation necessary of the fence construction can be completed as soon as funds of the archeological work are obligated. Field work, scheduled for April 2001, will be conducted out of the town of Lone Pine. A crew of up to four archeologists and three volunteers will be employed during the five-day field phase. Fence construction will immediately follow the archeological work, so that the lead archeologist can monitor the construction for potential impacts to pre-relocation center cultural components with a minimum of travel costs. A final report on the archeological investigations and monitoring will be completed by September 2001. The report will include background information, methodology, osteological report, other analyses, and results, as well as supporting photographs, drawings, maps, and appendices.

Support and Curation
The National Park Service’s Western Archeological and Conservation Center will provide all necessary administrative, technical, and logistical support. All photographic materials, site and feature records, maps, and field notes will be catalogued into the Automated National Catalog System (ANCS) and curated to National Park Service standards at the Museum Collections.
Repository, Western Archeological and Conservation Center, National Park Service, Tucson, Arizona.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging – 27 days @ 55.00/day</td>
<td>1,485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;IE – 37 person days @ $42.00/day</td>
<td>1,554.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Rental (Tuc-MANZ)</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Rental (LA-MANZ)</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Mileage (Chico-MANZ)</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare (Tuc-LA)</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,394.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11 (1 PP, inc. monitoring)</td>
<td>2,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-9 (1 PP, inc. some drafting)</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-5 (7 days)</td>
<td>685.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Anthropologist (6 days)</td>
<td>volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer (7 days)</td>
<td>volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe and operator (2-3 days)</td>
<td>not included*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Write-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11 (2 PP)</td>
<td>4,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-9 (1 PP, drafting)</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-5 (1/2 PP, archives)</td>
<td>490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Supplies</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$15,749.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be provided by Manzanar National Historic Site.
Jeff,

The scope of work looks great. You might want to mention Manzanar's NHL designation in the introduction. I think the only thing Debbie might require in your final report is project cost data broken by travel, materials and supplies, and personnel services. These costs are typically reported on NPS Form 10-174. Hope this helps.

Glenn
Jeff Burton
03/19/2001 03:15 PM
MST

To: Glenn Simpson/SANTAFE/NPS
cc: Subject: Re[2]: MANZ Cemetery Scope of Work

Thanks, having the form number makes all the difference. Our A0 was able to find it on the NPS web site. The form seems more suited to a construction project, but if that's what she wants...

Jeff,
The scope of work looks great. You might want to mention Menzanar’s NHL designation in the introduction. I think the only thing Debbie might require in your final report is project cost data broken by travel, materials and supplies, and personnel services. These costs are typically reported on NPS Form 10-174. Hope this helps.

Glenn
Misty,

I have ordered three lock sets for the three doors of the sentry posts, however I cannot order the keys and cores for the lock sets. They have to be order by the Park.

I ordered three Heavy Duty Standard Entry Lock Sets.
The vendor is Best Access.
The cost can be charged to the SAT account number 8760-7001-600.

Please let me know if you are able to do this. I will need the cores and cylinders within a few weeks.
Thanks.

Glenn
Robbyn, Joe, David and Mark,

I could do the investigation of the asbestos removal, but I'm really not clear where it is I am supposed to look. I do have a digital camera and could transmit some images to whoever requires them next week when I get back to the office. Please let me know exactly what and where I am supposed to look at.

Thanks.

Glenn

Mark Mortier

04/23/2001 04:29 PM MDT

To: Glenn Simpson/SANTA@NPS

cc: Re: [S] manzalar asbestos

Glenn - can you help these guys out? Give me a call and we can talk about it a little bit...

Also, you might want to write Robbyn and give her an update.

MM

----- Forwarded by Mark Mortier/SANTA@NPS on 04/23/2001 04:17 PM -----

Mark L. Jackson

04/23/2001 10:32 AM MDT

To: Mark Mortier/SANTA@NPS

cc: Joseph Balachowski, David Ballard/DENVER@NPS

Subject: Re: [S] manzalar asbestos

Mark,

Could you please ask Glenn if he can do this - it should not take much time (less than an hour). How are the projects coming? Is everything going to be done for the Pilgrimage? Wish I could be there, but I have asked Einball and Len to take lots of photos.

Robbyn

Subject: Re: manzalar asbestos

Author: Mark Mortier at NPS

Date: 4/23/01 9:13 AM
In reply refer to:

May 2, 2000

Louis Kado
11820 Sunwood
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Dear Mr. Kado

I am currently engaged in some restoration work at the cemetery and Military and Police Sentry Posts at Manzanar National Historic Site. It was given your name by Richard Stewart of the Manzanar Development Committee and he indicated the mason that constructed the Sentry Posts was your father. Part of our scope of work is the repair of the wood finti, which have simulated wood grain applied to them. We would like to replicate this finish and were told by Mr. Stewart that you might also be familiar with the technique used to produce the finish, or that you may know of a craftsman who does. I have included four photographs of the Posts for your reference that show the finishes these finishes. I would greatly appreciate any assistance you might be able to provide toward replicating these beautiful finishes. I thank you in advance and look forward to your response.

Very Sincerely,

Glenn D. Simpson
Exhibit Specialist
Architectural Conservation Projects
(323) 988-6704
glenn_simpson@nps.gov

Enclosures: 4 Photographs
Frank,

I have not yet had a chance to check-in with my work leader, Delbert Brown, to see how far that proceeded with the windows and doors. When I spoke to him yesterday morning he indicated that they might have everything installed before they, but would not be able to finish the paint work until the return trip in June. As for security, plywood could temporarily be screwed to the window or door open as needed until we return in June. They may have already done that. Including the final paint work, there are a few tasks we still need to complete such as a small amount of masonry repairs to the BBQ’s at the northeast corner of the park. Also, there is some additional vegetation I would like them to complete in the area of the Chicken Farm. These tasks should take no longer than a few days and would relieve the crew available to assist with other tasks you may come up with related to the barracks. One other task Jeff Burton and I identified was the vegetation removal around the foundations of the camouflage net factory. Of course, we would need archeological clearance for this.

Regarding the barracks procurement, I will be able to assist beginning June 11, 2001, but am completely committed to other projects until then. Our Historical Architect, Mark Mortier, who was assisting with the roofing work on the Sentry Post, has offered to assist in the interim while I am away on other projects. We would need an estimate from a house moving company from Bishop or perhaps even Reno for the actual transportation. Some stabilization of the buildings may be required before they can be moved, and a site within the park would need to be prepared for them prior to when they are moved. It would only take a week of the crews time to prepare the buildings for transportation, and the site for temporary placement. The costs for the crew are already covered under the Project Agreement/SAT Funds but the cost of the house mover is an indefinite at this point. Mark Mortier may be able to assist with finding moving contractors to move the buildings and getting estimates. Has Robbyn Jackson had an opportunity to comment on this idea yet? I spoke with her briefly and she mentioned she had seen the buildings and that they were in good condition. She was also going to check to see if the SAT Funds could be used for this type of project work. I am especially interested in her opinion. I suspect the costs for a moving contract would exceed $2500 so it would have to go out to bid. Perhaps this can be fast-tracked once we get the estimates together.

Also, I left a phone message at your office regarding compliance documentation for some of our project work. I will send that to you via USPS mail as soon as it is completed. I will be out of the office from 5/7 to 6/8, but will be reachable by e-mail and will assist in any way possible from the road.

Glenn
Dear Mr. Glenn Simpson,

I received your letter dated May 2, 2001 Saturday May 5th. It is great news to hear that the Sentry Post at the entrance to Manzanar is being refurbished.

I first started to work for my father during summer vacation at age fourteen. I worked with my father in Manzanar on week ends and whenever I was not in school. Then during vacation time while attending College. I am familiar with fabrication of the simulated wood log. There is a metal lattice form onto which a primary coat of cement, sand/cement ratio of 4 to 1 is applied. Then a coat of a yellow-orange colored cement ratio 1 to 1 cement/sand and then is sprinkled with brown color powder and finished to form.

I have samples of this work in my front yard (I will mail you a copy of it). I have several thoughts on how to refurbish this. Finding good adhesion to the old cement is the problem. My mechanical engineering degree background should be helpful in solving this problem.

I will start thinking about the process and will try them.

What is the projected time frame for starting and completing this project. Looking forward to hearing from you. My email address is lk118@att.net and my phone No. is (510) 391-4789.

Sincerely,

Louis Kado
Frank, Misty and Kim,

I have set up a meeting for July 2 at 10AM at the Sentry Posts with a man named Louis Kado. He is the son of the mason/internee who made the simulated wood grain finishes on the various structures within the park. He is going to look at the problems with me and explain how the original process worked and how we might best approach treatment. Also meeting with (I hope) will be Bob Hartler, a conservator I recently hired. Mr. Kado is 75 years old and may have been interned at Manzanar with his father. He will be traveling from Los Angeles for the site visit (446 mile round trip) and staying for one night. I recommended the Dow Villa Motel and he may have already made a reservation, but I'm not sure if he received the government rate. I will call him and let him know he will be receiving a volunteer application in the mail. Here is his address and telephone:

Louis Kado
11320 Stanwood Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
(310) 384-0719 Home
(805) 479-5736 Cell

I have extended the crew to three weeks on-site this month instead of two and feel that they can easily complete the extension of the redwood fence as requested. We will need to procure wire and fasteners for them. Perhaps Scott can look at the existing wire and fasteners as work with Misty to buy them. I have not yet heard from Jeff Burton, but as soon as he is back online I feel we will be able to identify additional tasks for the crew.

I spoke to Craig Stubble yesterday and he is still going to inspect the barracks buildings on June 18, 2001, so I will not be doing that on my site visit.

Please let me know if you need any additional information. Thank you.

Glenn
The constricting ditch/berm at the entry should go.

The gate is at Barracks 10 in Block 20, actually more of an arbor, it's just three pieces of limb wood, so I'm not sure what could be done to improve it (see PIA 74, page 182). There is also a wood clothes line pole at Barracks 11, Block 29 (PIA 74, page 182).

Another idea: How about uprighting in its correct (original) position that overturned manhole made to look like a stump at the hospital (PIA 74, page 178).

Jeff

Reply Separator

Subject: Re[3]: MANZ Preservation and Conservation Tasks
Author: Kimball Koch at NP-WRO
Date: 05/18/2001 6:03 AM

Jeff/Frank

Sounds like a good plan... They could potentially go after a lot of the recently established tamarisk as well (where it is clearly not historic)

One other thought... Is there enough information out there that they could eliminate the recently created berm near the second entry building (where the road appears to narrow and everyone is worried about a Winnebago taking off the corner of the roof)? Jeff, if I remember correctly, you said that berm or road edge was artificial in this spot. Removal of the berm would lessen the fears people have about using this entry and the potential impact on the structures.

One other question, Jeff: you pointed out one wooden entry gate that was still standing near a patch of tamarisk along the tour route. Would it make sense to have Glenn look at this to make sure its stabilized for the present?

Kimball

Reply Separator

Subject: Re[2]: MANZ Preservation and Conservation Tasks
Author: JeffBurton
Date: 06/16/2001 7:56 PM

Here's a thought: How about getting rid of the tamarisk at the Block 12 pond. It is slowing destroying the feature and was not there historically. There is
Frank Hayes AT NP-WK@NPS_CCMA

To: Glenn Simpson/SANTAFE/NPS

cc: Mail Forwarding Information

Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence

06/19/2001 09:18 AM MDT

Hi Glenn,

Can we try to get this done while your crew is here? Let me know how we can help.

Thanks,
Frank

--- Forward Header ---

Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Jeff Burton at NF-MACC
Date: 6/16/01 7:16 PM

Yes please do have the Santa Fe crew put in that fence.

It makes more sense from an interpretive standpoint, since visitors had to get approval from two places before entering the relocation center (that’s why they’re parking spaces between the sentry post and police post).

I was told that it couldn’t be done by the fence crew because it was left out (inadvertently?) of the original fencing contract. The fence should go to the corner of the police station concrete slab. They should also widen the road north of the police post by filling in the small NADMP flood control ditch and moving the displaced border rocks off the roadway and back to the fenceline.

--- Reply Separator ---

Subject: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Frank Hayes at NP-WK
Date: 06/04/2001 5:17 PM

Jeff,

Do you know why the historic perimeter fence was not reconstructed in the area parallel to the historic entrance? You have pvc pipes marking the location of the redwood posts. Is this something the Santa Fe crew may be able to complete if they have the time and capability?

Frank

--- Forward Header ---

Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Jeff Burton at NF-MACC
Date: 11/05/2001 9:45 AM MDT

Frank,

I think the shrub was planted as a temporary fix to the fence before the Santa Fe crew could get to it. Jeff Burton

--- Reply Separator ---

Subject: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Frank Hayes at NP-WK
Date: 11/05/2001 11:41 AM MDT

Jeff,

I don’t think they have time to work on the fence now, but thanks for the heads up. I’ll check back with them and see if they can do it later.

Frank
Frank,

No problem. I spoke with Jeff this morning and we went over a list of tasks we can accomplish which included:

- Removal of the berm by the Internal Police Post
- Extending the historic fence
- Vegetation removal from on and around the Camouflage Net Factory
- Resetting the Sewer Access Concrete Stump
- Flattening out the berms at the entrance to the cemetery
- Removal of the Tamarisk tree/shrub at the mound on the north end of the pond on Block 12.

I will contact Delbert Brown and go over these tasks with him. Jeff will be getting together the information related to the original location of the Sewer Access Stump. Let me know if there is anything else.

Thanks,

Glenn

Frank Hays AT NP--WR@NPS_CCMAIL

cc:Mail Forwarding Information

To: Glenn Simpson
cc: Jeff Burton AT NP--WACCC
Date: 06/16/2001 07:16 PM
To: Frank Hays AT NP--WR
Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence

Glenn,

Can we try to get this done while your crew is here? Let me know how we can help.

Thanks,

Frank

Forward Reader

Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Jeff Burton at NP-WACCC
Frank Hays AT NP-WR@NPS_CCMAL  
To: Glenn Simpson@SANTAFE/NPS  
cc: Mail Forwarding Information  
06/19/2001 03:50 PM MDT

Subject: Re: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Jeff Burton at NP-WACC
Date: 6/16/01 7:16 PM

Yes please do have the Santa Fe crew put in that fence.

It makes more sense from an interpretive standpoint, since visitors had to get approval from two places before entering the relocation center (that's why they're parking spaces between the entry post and police post).

I was told that it couldn't be done by the fence crew because it was left out (inadvertently?) of the original fencing contract. The fence should go to the corner of the police station concrete slab. They could (should?) also widen the road north of the police post by filling in the small LADWP flood control ditch and moving the displaced border rocks off the roadway and back to the fenceline.

---

Frank Hays AT NP-WR@NPS_CCMAL  
To: Glenn Simpson@SANTAFE/NPS  
cc: Mail Forwarding Information  
06/04/2001 5:37 PM MDT

Subject: Historic perimeter fence
Author: Frank Hays at NP-WR
Date: 06/04/2001 5:37 PM

Jeff,

Do you know why the historic perimeter fence was not reconstructed in the area parallel to the historic entrance? You have pvc pipes marking the location of the redwood posts. Is this something the Santa Fe crew may be able to complete if they have the time and capability?

Frank
Bob Hartzler
To: Glenn Simpson/SANTAFE/NPS
06/21/2001 01:30 PM MDT
cc: Manzanar

Subject: Manzanar

Glenn-
I still hope to get to Manzanar, should know next week. I'll have our AO do my travel, but I need some information. Should I fly into Las Vegas, and drive from there? And exactly where is it I am going? How should I contact you in Calif. to make a room reservation for me if you're there when I make these arrangements. (Travel Sun. 7/1, return 7/7) Finally, do you have a cost code? I'll provide you with a copy of my voucher when I return.

Thanks,
Bob
Bob,  

I would fly either into Las Vegas or Reno, rent a car and drive to the site, which is located approximately 8 mile north of Lone Pine, California. It's about a 5 hour drive from either airport. The site is on the west side of US Highway 395 and there are two entrances. I am scheduled to meet Mr. Louis Kado at 10am on July 2, 2001 in front of the Military Sentry Post (the first entrance if you're heading north). I have attached a picture of the Military Sentry Post for your reference. It is visible from the highway. You should try to make arrangements to stay at the Dow Villa Hotel in Lone Pine (400-824-9319). The account number is 8760-7901-600. Please make copies all receipts for rental cars and gas, etc.; the park has requested copies in case they are audited by the State of California for conformance with spending guidelines of the grant we are working from. Please let me know if you need anymore info. Look forward to seeing you there.

Glenn

(See attached file: 047205pv.jpg)
Glenn,

I'm set to fly to Vegas on Sunday, so I will see you there. Staying at the Dow Villa Hotel ($52, does that sound right?). Will you bring Anne Oliver's report with you? I would like to read it before we meet with Mr. Kado on Monday. I'll head back on Tuesday.

Bob

---

Bob,

I would fly either into Las Vegas or Reno, rent a car and drive to the site, which is located approximately 8 mile north of Lone Pine, California. It's about a 9 hour drive from either airport. The site is on the west side of US Highway 395 and there are two entrances. I am scheduled to meet Mr. Louis Kado at 10am on July 3, 2001 in front of the Military Sentry Post (the first entrance if you're heading north). I have attached a picture of the Military Sentry Post for your reference. It is visible from the highway. You should try to make arrangements to stay at the Dow Villa Hotel in Lone Pine (800)-884-9317). The account number is 8760-7501-660. Please make copies all receipts for rental cars and gas, etc.; the park has requested copies in case they are audited by the State of California for conformance with spending guidelines of the grant we are working from. Please let me know if you need anymore info. Look forward to seeing you there.

Glenn

(See attached file: 04720Epv.jpg)
Attached is Miyatake photo # 83. It shows the fence continuing beyond the concrete/rock pillars. It appears to be the same 1-strand and 4x6 construction. I'm not sure of the photo's date, but I suspect its late, the building (which is not on any blueprints I have) appears to be for checking people out of the center quickly (?), perhaps when the camp was closing. I came across the photo just yesterday while I was looking for some Minidoks photos, otherwise I might not have remembered it.

- entryf-1.jpg
Weekly Reports

WEEK 01
April 6 through April 8, 2001

CREW
Susan Yewell, IMSF-CAC Documentation Technician.

TRAVEL
Yewell departed Santa Fe, NM on April 6, 2001 for MANZ.

SHIPEMENT and RECEIVING of MATERIALS
Limitations: None

PRESERVATION WORK
Yewell began documentation of graffiti and inscriptions on Internal Police Post.

TOOLS and MATERIALS USED
See Appendix A.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
None encountered during this week.
WEEK 02
April 9 through April 13, 2001

CREW
Glenn Simpson, IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist (project leader); Mark Mortier IMSF-
CAC Historical Architect; Delbert Brown IMSF-CAC Preservation Work Leader;
William Kinlicheene, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Matthew Thompson,
IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Serafin Vigil IMSF-CAC Preservation
Technician; Jeff Burton WACC Archeologist.

TRAVEL
Brown, Kinlicheene, Thompson and Vigil departed Santa Fe, NM on April 9, 2001 in
IMSF-CAC vehicle and arrived at Manzanar NHS on April 10, 2001. Simpson and
Mortier arrived separately on April 10, 2001

SHIPMENT and RECEIVING of MATERIALS
Limitations: Prior to the commencement of the project, most of the equipment
required for project were assembled by in Santa Fe, NM by IMSF-CAC personnel
and was delivered to MANZ by Brown, Kinlicheene, Thompson and Vigil.

ARRIVAL and MOBILIZATION
IMSF personnel arrived at MANZ on April 10, 2001 and temporarily stored
equipment in the Auditorium.

SAFETY MEETING
Prior to commencement of work on April 11, safety issues were discussed at a morning
meeting. At the meeting, the use of scaffolding was discussed.

PRESERVATION WORK
Monday: Travel Day. Documentation of Internal Police Post.

Tuesday: Travel Day. Completion of documentation of Internal Police Post.

Wednesday: Simpson, Mortier and Vigil begin removal of shingles from Internal
Police Post. Brown, Kinlicheene, and Thompson transport locust poles to cemetery
and begin laying out fence line with Burton. Yewell begins documentation of
Military Police Post.

Thursday: Simpson, Mortier, and Vigil begin placement of new shingles on Internal
Police Post. Brown, Kinlicheene, and Thompson begin drilling holes for fence posts
with Burton. Yewell continues documentation of Military Police Post.

Friday: Simpson, Mortier, and Vigil continue placement of new shingles on Internal
Police Post. Brown, Kinlicheene, and Thompson finish drilling holes for fence posts
with Burton and begin setting poles. Yewell continues documentation of Military
Police Post.
TOOLS and MATERIALS USED
Black locust poles, John Deere skid steer tractor with auger attachment.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
None encountered during this week.
WEEK 03
April 16 through April 20, 2001

CREW
Glenn Simpson, IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist (project leader); Mark Mortier IMSF-CAC Historical Architect; Delbert Brown IMSF-CAC Preservation Work Leader; William Kinlicheene, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Matthew Thompson, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Serafin Vigil IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician.

TRAVEL: Mortier returns to Santa Fe, NM on 4/20/01

SHIPMENT and RECEIVING of MATERIALS: None

ARRIVAL and MOBILIZATION: None

SAFETY MEETING: Crew met on Monday and discussed issues related to working around and on scaffolding as well as respiratory, eye and hearing protection while working.

PRESERVATION WORK:
Monday: Simpson and Mortier completed applying shingles to Internal Police Post roof, but did not install flashing and finish shingles at ridge and hips. Vigil, Brown, Thompson, and Kinlicheene finished setting posts at Cemetery and cut tops off posts with chain saw to establish fence height.

Tuesday: Simpson finished installing aluminum flashing and finish shingles on Internal Police Post while Mortier and Vigil removed old shingles from the Military Police Post. After removal of old shingles, Vigil cleaned out the soffits with the shop vacuum and Mortier began applying the new shingles. Latticework at the dormers was inspected by Simpson and Mortier and determined not to need any further treatment. Brown, Thompson, and Kinlicheene began installing the fence rails and cross pieces for the Cemetery fence.

Wednesday: Simpson and Mortier continued with application of new shingles to Military Police post roof while Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene continued with Cemetery fence construction.

Thursday: Simpson and Mortier completed installation of new shingles on the north and south slopes of the Military Police Post. 6-inch Aluminum flashing was installed along the entire length of the ridge under the last two courses of shingles. The third from the top sheathing board on the east slope was replaced in-kind and stamped with the “NPS-IMSF-CAC” stamp as well as the date. Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene continued with Cemetery fence construction.
Friday: Simpson finished applying the new shingle to the east and west slopes of the Military Police Post except for the hip flashing and finish shingles. Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene continued with Cemetery fence construction.

TOOLS and MATERIALS USED: Black locust poles, John Deere skid steer tractor with auger attachment, 3-1/2, 4-1/2, 5-inch stainless screws, Certigrade Blue Label cedar shingles, 6-inch aluminum flashing. 4d, 6d and 8d galvanized common nails.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: None encountered this week.
CREW
Glenn Simpson, IMSF-CAC Exhibit Specialist (project leader); Delbert Brown IMSF-CAC Preservation Work Leader; William Kinlicheene, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Matthew Thompson, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Serafin Vigil IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician.

TRAVEL: Simpson returns to Santa Fe, NM on 4/28/01


SAFETY MEETING: Crew met on Monday and discussed issues related to working around and on scaffolding as well as respiratory, eye and hearing protection while working, with particular emphasis on respiratory protect while doing vegetation removal.

PRESERVATION WORK
Monday: Simpson continued applying flashing and finish shingles to Military Police Post. Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene completed Cemetery Fence and cleaned up construction area at Cemetery, removing vehicle tracks and excess building materials. Excess Black locust poles and rails were returned to the Auditorium parking area for storage to be used for fence repairs in the future. Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene then began vegetation removal at Administrative Area.

Tuesday: Entire crew worked together to install reproduction Entrance Sign. Special fasteners and chain were procured from McMaster-Carr to best match original hardware identified in historic photos. Entrance sign was mounted on original posts. New hardware included: plain steel “S” hooks, plain steel chains, zinc-plated ½” eyebolts (plain steel was not available), plain steel nuts, and zinc-plated washers. After the sign was hung Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene moved the California Historic Landmark plaque away from the Military Police Post to a spot chosen by Simpson directly across the entrance from the National Historic landmark plaque and adjacent to the Blue Star Memorial Highway plaque. The stonework on the east elevation of the military Police Post was cleaned using a solution of muriatic acid. They then finished vegetation removal in Administration Area and the Camp Director’s Residence. The fallen dead tree was removed from the stonewall of the Director’s Residence and the section of concrete slab displaced by the falling of the tree was reset in its original position. Simpson completed application of the flashing and finish shingles to Military Police Post.

Thursday: Simpson installed hinges, and strike plates in the door and window frames of the Police Posts. The new hinges placed in the window frames of the Internal Police Post were an exact match to the originals based on impressions left in the wood window frames and the configuration of the existing screw holes. The finish of the original hinges is uncertain and brushed brass was used, as no other finishes were available. The door hinges installed in both Posts matched the original only in size.

Friday: Simpson and Vigil began applying the oil-base primer to the wood surfaces of the Military Police Post. Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene continued vegetation removal at the Chicken Farm.

TOOLS and MATERIALS USED: Bobcat and GOV trucks for vegetation clearing; Certigrade Blue Label cedar shingles, 6-inch aluminum flashing. 4d, 6d and 8d galvanized common nails, sign hardware, muriatic acid, brass Best Access strike plates, 4-inch block hinges, 3-1/2 inch block hinges, decorative hinges (for the windows of the Internal Police Post) procured from Lee Valley/Veritas Tools and Hardware, Valspar oil-base wood primer, and Valspar clear stain.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: None encountered this week.
WEEK 05
April 30 through May 4, 2001, and May 12, 2001

CREW
Delbert Brown IMSF-CAC Preservation Work Leader; William Kinlicheene, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Matthew Thompson, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Serafin Vigil IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician.

TRAVEL:
Crew left Manzanar NHS for other project work at Death Valley NP.

SHIPMENT and RECEIVING of MATERIALS:

PRESERVATION WORK:
Monday: Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene discontinued vegetation removal at Chicken farm and primed doors and windows for both Police Posts and began applying finish paint to the Military Police Post.

Tuesday: Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene began installation of doors and windows into the frames of both posts, with the exception of the west window of the south elevation of the Military Police Post. The original window frame for this opening was missing so Brown constructed a new frame from dry No. 2 Standard and Better Douglas fir to match the original in the other openings.

Wednesday: Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene finished the installation of the windows but encountered some problems with the doorframe on the north elevation of the Military Police Post.

Thursday: Vigil, Brown, Thompson and Kinlicheene completed applying finish paint to both Posts with the exception of the problematic doorframe on the north elevation of the Military Police Post. Crew cleaned work areas and packed tools.

Friday: The crew departed for work at the Emigrant Junction ranger Station in Death Valley National Park.

Saturday, May 12, 2001: Brown and Kinlicheene traveled to MANZ on this to complete installation and painting of the door on the north elevation of the Military Police Post.

MATERIALS USED: Bobcat and GOV trucks for vegetation clearing, brass Best Access locksets, Valspar oil-base wood primer, and Valspar clear stain.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: None encountered this week.
WEEK 06-08
June 11 through June 29, 2001

CREW
Delbert Brown IMSF-CAC Preservation Work Leader; William Kinlicheene, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Matthew Thompson, IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician; Serafin Vigil IMSF-CAC Preservation Technician.

TRAVEL:
Travel from Santa Fe, Nm to Manzanar NHS and back.

SHIPMENT and RECEIVING of MATERIALS: None

SAFETY MEETING:
Conducted by work leader.

PRESEVATION WORK:
During this time crew continued vegetation clearing at Chicken farm. They also stabilized the stonework of the sign holder in the Administration Area and cleaned and stabilized the North Barbeques. No further details of the preservation work conducted during this time are available.

TOOLS and MATERIALS USED: Bobcat and GOV trucks for vegetation clearing, masonry tools.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: none encountered during this period.
Materials Data

See next page.
This type of smooth sawn architecturally uniform cedar shingle is preferred for its natural and tailored appearance and is used on traditional and modern residential and non-residential structures. For use on roofs and sidewalls.

- **NUMBER ONE GRADE, BLUE LABEL**

  **Description**-Lengths 16-inch, 18-inch, 24-inch; width 4"minimum, 14" maximum on 24-inch and 3" on 16-inch and 18-inch; thickness of 16-inch is 5/2" (5 butts together is 2" thick), 18-inch is 5/2 1/4" thick, 24-inch is 4/2" thick. Clear heartwood; 100% edge grain; no defects.

  **Recommended Use**-For walls and roofs on 3:12 pitch and steeper where a premium quality product is desired.

- **NUMBER 2 GRADE, RED LABEL**

  **Description**-Lengths 16-inch, 18-inch, 24-inch; thickness of 16-inches 5/2", 18-inch is 5/2 1/4", 24-inch is a 4/2"; width 4"minimum, 14" maximum. Face must be 10", 11" and 16"clear or better on 16-inch, 18-inch and 24-inch shingles, respectively. Limited sapwood and flat grain are allowed. Limited knots and defects are allowed above the clear portion.

  **Recommended Use**-For walls and roofs on 3:12 pitch and steeper where a good quality product is desired.

- **NUMBER 3 GRADE, BLACK LABEL**

  **Description**-Lengths 16-inch, 18-inch, 24-inch; thickness of 16-inches 5/2", 18-inch is 5/2 1/4", and 24-inch is 4/2". Width 3" minimum, 14" maximum on 18-inch and 24-inch, 2 1/2" minimum on 16-inch. Face must be 6" clear on 16-inch and 18-inch, 10"clear on 24-inch. Unlimited sapwood and flat grain allowed. Limited knots and defects above clear portion.

  **Recommended Use**-For walls and roofs on 3:12 pitch and steeper where an economy product is acceptable.

- **Undercoarsing Grade**

  **Description**-Lengths 16-inch and 18-inch, thickness 5/2" and 5/2 1/4", respectively; width 2 1/2" minimum, 17" maximum. Unlimited defects, flat grain and sapwood.
**Recommended Use**—For the underlying starter course at eaves and undercoarsing for double course wall construction.

### Roof Exposure Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch</th>
<th>Maximum exposure recommended for roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12 to 4:12</td>
<td>16&quot;-18&quot;- 24&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:12 and steeper</td>
<td>3-3/4&quot; 4-1/4&quot; 5-3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wall Exposure Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shingle Length</th>
<th>Maximum Weather Exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot;</td>
<td>7-1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>8-1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>11-1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Maximum exposure for #2 grade is 10"
##Maximum exposure for #2 grade is 11"
PRESERVATION RESOURCES GROUP, INC.

JP-146 LOW VISCOSITY EPOXY
PRODUCT DATA SHEET

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION:

JP-146 EPOXY CONSOLIDANT IS A TWO-COMPONENT LOW-VISCOSITY MODIFIED EPOXY RESIN SYSTEM THAT IS CAPABLE OF SATURATING THE DETERIORATED FIBERS OF WOOD THAT HAS BEEN DAMAGED BY DECAY. THE WOOD MUST BE DRY TO ALLOW FOR PROPER PENETRATION OF THE EPOXY. JP-146 EPOXY CONSOLIDANT WILL NOT DISPLACE WATER FROM THE WOOD AND WILL NOT PROPERLY BOND TO WET WOOD. JP-146 EPOXY CONSOLIDANT MUST NOT BE APPLIED IN A WAY THAT WILL TRAP POCKETS OF DAMP WOOD BELOW THE EPOXY SATURATED WOOD.

PHYSICAL PROPERTIES: NORMAL CURE

- Weight Per Gallon (lbs.) 9.04
- Viscosity (77 Deg. F) 90 - 120 cps
- Potlife (100 gms. 77 Deg. F) 12 to 15 Minutes
- Color Honey Clear
- Mixing Ratio
  - (By Weight) 80% "A" to 20% "B"
  - (By Volume) 3.66:1 By Vol.

WOOD PREPARATION:

Wood area to be consolidated must be cleaned of old coatings, oils, grease, waxes, fungus, and other contaminants that may be detrimental to penetration. Wood must be dry prior to consolidation of deteriorated fiber. Use release agents and/or plastic sheeting to protect surfaces that are not to be treated from accidental contact with epoxies.

MIXING:

Stir each component individually prior to measuring and mixing. If using a complete unit of the epoxy, open Component "B" and pour the entire contents into the Component "A" container. Agitate and thoroughly mix Components "A" and "B" together. If using less that a complete unit of the epoxy, measure out the appropriate amount of component "A" and "B" into a separate container. Measure
in exact amounts using either the weight or volume ratios. Thoroughly blend components "A" and "B" together. It is extremely important to thoroughly and aggressively mix the two components.

PERSONAL PROTECTION / EXPOSURE CONTROLS

Wear eye protection, hand protection, respiratory protection, protective clothing, and adequate general and local ventilation, Wash at the end of each work shift and before eating, smoking or using the toilet. Launder or discard contaminated clothing.

See MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET for more detail.

APPLICATION:

JP-146 EPOXY CONSOLIDANT can be applied to dry deteriorated wood by way of brushing, pouring, or injecting. Deteriorated wood fiber saturated with JP-146 Epoxy Consolidant will harden as epoxy cures. Use enough epoxy to provide adequate saturation of deteriorated fibers. It may be necessary for the epoxy to be applied more than once to achieve complete consolidation. After the epoxy has been allowed to cure, the zone of deterioration can be probed to determine if any non-consolidated deteriorated wood remains. Probing to see if consolidation is complete can be achieved by using a drill and a thin drill bit of appropriate length. When test drilling an area, check the cuttings from the drill bit to determine if non-consolidated deteriorated wood remains. The holes drilled to test the consolidation process can be used to provide access for new epoxy application through the area of wood already consolidated. Be careful not to allow epoxy to flow out of the wood and onto adjoining surfaces or materials.

When preparing structures for injection, use a hand caulking gun to form a bead of Epoxy Bonder Paste #6 directly over the crack surface. Use a putty knife to flatten the bead over the area to be repaired. A bead of epoxy can also be used to secure injection ports and tees to the face of the structure to be injected.

CLEAN UP:

Clean equipment and tools immediately after use. Use a mixture of 50% MEK and 50% Xylene or NUSOL for cleaning. Wash hands and skin areas with soap and warm water.

Refer to material safety data sheet.

PACKAGING:

Standard packages are in sets of containers of half gallons and gallons volumes. Each container shall be clearly marked with the product name, component designation ("A" or "B"), batch number and component mixing ratio.

STORAGE:

Store JP-146 EPOXY CONSOLIDANT in a dark, cool, dry location. Do not freeze. Shelf life is one year in unopened containers, stored as specified. If
containers are opened and partially used, it is very important to tightly seal containers and store as specified. Do not contaminate one component with the other and do not pour unmixed epoxies back into containers. Keep outside surface of the containers free of drips and spills.

The facts stated and the recommendations made for the use of all products are based on tests, which we believe to be reliable. However, no guarantee of their accuracy can be made due to the great range of field conditions that exist and also because of variations encountered in methods of installation. For these reasons the products are sold without warranty, expressed or implied, and on the condition that the purchaser shall make their own tests to determine the suitability of the product for their particular purposes. Under no circumstances will SCI or PRG be liable for damages to anyone in excess of the purchase price of the products. This information is subject to change without notice and supersedes all previous specifications.

Emergency Telephone: Chem-Tel, Inc. 800/255-3924
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Appendix A - HABS/HAER Site Introduction and Plan

See next page.
As the nation’s principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.