



**Community Engagement Council**  
**June 4, 2026**  
**Meeting 8**  
**125 Bull Street**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Attendees**

<b>Facilitators</b>	Clay Middleton, LaSheia Oubre, Joanna Gilmore
<b>CEC Members</b>	Sharon Ramirez, Millicent Brown, Walter Brown, Patty Ploehn, Madison Lee, Jim Newhard, Jalen Evans (virtual), Abigail Dairaghi (virtual), Harlan Greene, Norm Dickerson, Luqman Rasheed
<b>Advisors</b>	Omar Muhammad, Demetria Clemons
<b>Consultants</b>	--
<b>Liaison</b>	Courtney Howard
<b>Staff</b>	Mark Berry, Paul Patrick
<b>Invited Guests</b>	Laura Lee Worrell, Darryl Fyall
<b>Other Guests</b>	Matt Hansen, Victoria Hansen, Sam Spence, Kevin Sack, Graham Glaab, Allison Sterrett-Krause, Karen Smith, John Fisher, Sam McDorman, Christopher Judge

- I. Call to order at 6:07pm (Clay)
  - a. Welcome
  - b. Two CEC members are participating virtually
  
- II. Old business
  - a. Reminder to submit reflections from Tuesday’s charrette and ideas
  - b. Joanna - Acknowledgement of Luqman and Lisa as CEC stewards for listening to community feedback. Thank you to all who attended. Liollo will go through the feedback and provide an update.
  - c. Millicent – I feel we need to acknowledge the CEC member who resigned during the last meeting. *Response:* that is in the reflection section of the agenda
  - d. Jim – concerns about insufficient advertising for Tuesday’s charrette  
*Response:* we would have liked to see a larger turnout. It went out through the usual channels (emails to listserv, website, contact list from Asiko); this will be addressed later on the agenda
    - i. Recommendation for the College to send notifications to all faculty, staff, and students about future events related to this project

### III. New Business

- a. Work Plan Updates (Joanna and Laura Lee) - We are doing our best to balance getting into the weeds vs higher level overview
  - i. Review of revisions submitted to SHPO and DES
    1. Work Plan Tree (Laura Lee)
      - a. Deep red – areas that CEC recommendations are requested from the College (documentation, funeral director, treatment – analysis, treatment – storage, Cemetery & Commemoration Work Plan)
    2. The College has submitted the 5<sup>th</sup> revision of the workplan that addresses all collective responses. SHPO acknowledged receipt of the revised baseline work plans in their current form (as of June 3). Any changes moving forward will be made through the established amendment process. (Clarification email from SHPO received 6/8/2026 – CZC Condition #14)
      - a. Millicent - Did we not have a conversation about the CEC seeing the work plans before being submitted?  
*Response:* The CEC asked for prior review but the College's response was that plans would be submitted concurrently to SHPO and CEC.
      - b. SHPO's comments reflect CEC feedback
      - c. Work plans address CEC comments in a thematic program
      - d. Walter – have the measured drawings been approved?  
*Response:* yes, the measured drawings have been approved by SHPO (6/1/2026)
      - e. Walter – I submitted a comment about how unfortunate it was that 6 pages of field measurement drawings have been condensed to one sheet. *Response:* there is a single sheet drawing (representative of the NPS Holland Prize) and individual sheets of enlarged elevations, details, and features. CEC has both in the Google Drive and they will be sent out again
      - f. Jim – when we will get the response that was received yesterday. *Response:* later today or as soon as possible
    3. Amendment process- the plans are set as base plans. Any alterations, modifications, or changes can be submitted based

on community feedback, CEC feedback, and new information or discovery for SHPO review and approval. The College is the formal applicant, so amendments must be submitted by the College (reference feedback loop in work plans). SHPO's base response period is 30 days.

4. Millicent – when will we get to discuss the comments that are submitted so we can be aware of what we each are sharing?

*Response:* that is our hope for today

ii. CEC Recommendations and CofC Response

1. See slide: green – submitted, yellow – in progress, red – not moving forward

iii. CEC Feedback Themes and Work Plan Revisions

1. See slide/handout – 3 themes – clarification of CEC role/authority; regulatory process oversight, archaeology/treatment of human remains

iv. Clarified Engagement Framework

1. See handout/slide – CEC comments/questions and College response

2. Millicent – I do not see where the CEC's request for an independent cost-benefit analysis is addressed on these slides  
*Response:* the College has decided not to move forward with that

3. Millicent – I notice that on the documentation that has been provided, there are some alternative sites on that previous analysis do not include cost figures.

4. Madison – the cost analysis and parking updates about the Wentworth Garage are incomplete and/or not consistent with previous documentation

5. Harlan – does the College have a point of financial infeasibility if this project is delayed year after year? Jim – the College says it will sell the property if the project gets to be too expensive. SHPO responded to that and the College addressed that response. It's in the documents

6. Jim – the discussion about the alternatives is very important. What other types of options are there. *Response:* it is not the scope of the CEC to analyze alternatives; it is the College/BOT's decision. The 2023 Blueprint is a plan, but that has not been discussed by the CEC

7. Millicent – the 2023 blueprint needs to be updated and discussed by the CEC. Even if the update shows that 106 Coming is the best site, we need to know how much all of that will cost. We need a comprehensive updated cost analysis that includes exhumation, reinterment, etc.
8. Millicent, Norm – The College can't say that it cannot find another location for our dorm because of cost, only to find out that all of the costs and time delays for construction, exhumation, etc. could be higher on this site than if on a different site
9. Jim – there are ways to give a comprehensive comparative report without giving the raw numbers. Can standardize. It is incumbent upon this body to review the workplans to ensure the College is following the conditions
10. Response from Clay – I ask the CEC to deliberate on all the costs of commemoration, not just focused on the structure of the building
11. Harlan – it might be useful to get the exhumation and other related costs from the Anson Street project to get an idea of what those costs could be
12. Millicent – we can reach out to some of the examples for the cost to do a proper exhumation, reinterment,
13. Millicent – this seems to be the default place position—it's too expensive to build on another site, but Coming Street is going to be expensive.
14. Response from Clay – let's stay centered on the charge of the CEC. Given this information (slides/handout), are there themes and College responses that are listed inaccurately
15. Millicent – CEC did not just get formed because the College thought it was a good idea. There are regulations already in place that require ongoing community engagement.
16. Omar - there is precedence for how community engagement is to be incorporated
17. Jim – there is tension between why the College set up the CEC (advisory on commemoration/memorialization) and the mission statement written by the CEC (consent)
18. Norm –Add the cost for delay caused by exhumation, reinterment, and archaeological work to the cost analysis

19. Millicent – do we have a response to the fact that our tribal Council members have offered suggestions on customs and traditions. Harlan: it's right here in the summary (shows on the page)
  20. Norm – one of the more compelling presentations was on the previous sites and if that could be updated with costs, it would be more compelling *Response*: an updated version was provided
  21. Jim – ACHP says “no alternatives exist” not “no better alternative exists” (American Council for Historic Preservation)
  22. Millicent - Brass tax; people do not want to see the land disturbed
- v. Clarified Process and Oversight
1. See slide/handout
  2. Avoidance has not been fully explored
  3. Preservation in place should remain an option
  4. Development should occur elsewhere
  5. Jim – I really want to see SHPO's letter. It's hard to comment without seeing it
  6. Joanna reads the letter from SHPO
    - a. Laura Lee will request clarification on whether the letter confirms receipt or approval, as the language does not clearly state approval
- vi. Archaeology, Human Remains, and Commemoration
1. How will human remains be treated with dignity and respect?
  2. What specific archaeological methods will be used?
  3. Will the CEC be notified if remains are discovered?
  4. How will NAGPRA-related concerns be addressed if indigenous remains are encountered?
  5. Abigail – it has been stated that there is open communication to the tribal nations, but one letter in the mail is not open communication or dialogue with tribes. With the archaeological investigation, have other companies been considered or brought on?
  6. Jim - to what extent is the College working to develop a policy or protocol on working with the tribes? ACHP does not inform project plan, it's part of the project plan

7. Abigail – the College is not consulting with the tribes. Harlan – points to page 9 of the CZC Certification Conditions document. *Response:* The College has sent letters. Responses from Catawba and Muscogee only. We can reach back out to Catawba. There is no formal consultation with the tribes per NAGPRA until something is found on the site.
8. If remains are found on site, what happens next? *Response:* SHPO and tribes are contacted, follow steps by NPS
9. Walter – reactive vs proactive? Why is there no plan prior to getting started?
10. Jim – this is a potter’s field and we know that
11. Patty – if there is a historic precedent that indigenous people are known to have been interred on this site, then there should be a plan for that
12. Millicent – if we as a Council are to serve in this advisory capacity, wouldn’t it be a good idea to take advantage of the experiences of other communities that have dealt with this? *Response:* educational process of learning about practices and traditions of various indigenous tribes is important. Get clarity, understand gaps, make sure some questions are answered
13. Norm – I see benefit in letting tribes know that there is a possibility that a tribal member is buried on this site. If something is found, then move forward. If not, then there is nothing to do.
14. Millicent – questions about the sincerity with which tribal outreach has taken place. Was the letter sent to the correct tribal representative?
15. Patty – we are talking about two different things: consultation is a federal regulation vs. conversation with tribal representatives. We are advising the College to have a plan in place and to send representatives from the College to the communities. Abigail has flown herself to the College at least twice. What is the College doing to reciprocate that level of outreach?
16. Jim – consultation is important. Reference to Keystone Pipeline on missteps re: consultation with indigenous communities.

What constitutes human remains? Elements that identify a tribe? Early engagement is critical.

17. Abigail – “reminder that I am a NAGPRA coordinator and we have reburied over 2000 Muscogee ancestors into our homeland; I have spoken to several other Nations that want to get involved and don’t know how. When asked how it will know if the ancestor is of Native ancestry, the College said “that is not our job.” If you don’t want to figure out, then we have to assume that everyone in there is Native and NAGPRA law will be followed”
18. Luqman- question about workplan matrix *Response*: matrix summarizes all stop gaps in the workplan
19. Luqman – the College has been saying it is moving forward; 141 Wentworth houses city administrative building. That land mass is bigger than the 106 Coming St/Vanderhorst site. That site should be considered. Reference to prejudice and destruction of the history of African Americans
20. Walter – Please explain the reference on the slide that says that student involvement would not involve handling human remains. *Response*: that response is to the question: should students participate in work associated with human remains? The placement of the question/response on the slide is incorrect.
21. Jim – the College’s archaeology program director does not think students should be involved because the project does not meet archaeology standards

vii. Summary by condition number

1. See handout/slide

- b. If permits are given, there might be priorities that you would like to discuss before the fence goes up and land is disturbed
  - i. Jim – condition 3a ii – refers to silt fencing only
  - ii. Millicent – condition 2 – what about a real process of descendant engagement because that is very complex. What do we mean by descendant engagement, and can the CEC advise the College?  
*Response*: on the Google drive is a packet called “engaging descendent communities”

- iii. Definition of descendant (American Anthropological Assoc) – groups who share a broader historical or cultural connection to those buried at the site even when direct genealogical links cannot be traced
- iv. Response: how do each of you define descendant communities?
- v. Patty – Motion to have another meeting sometime in June prior to the next scheduled meeting
  - 1. Harlan – with Zoom option
    - a. Sharon – I would second that
  - 2. Millicent – to address what?
    - a. Harlan – to complete today’s existing agenda with an option for new business
    - b. Patty – I agree with that
  - 3. Combination – in person/Zoom
  - 4. Patty – week of June 22
    - a. Any day except 22, 24, 25
    - b. Tuesday June 23 (consensus by voice/hands)
    - c. If no location, virtual-only is acceptable
  - 5. Walter – will demolishing the YWCA building happen before disturbing the ground? *Response: Yes*
  - 6. Paul – we have BAR approval to demolish the building; we do not have the land disturbance permit to move forward with the demolition
  - 7. Joanna – before the next meeting, we recommend that you all think about the sort of ceremonies—whether it includes prayers, the pouring of libations, for example—before the land is disturbed. The fencing could be installed between 8-12 weeks, so the CEC needs to recommend pre-disturbance ceremonial protocols before that happens
  - 8. Jim - Will there be monitors to monitor the monitors?  
*Response: Not at this point*
  - 9. Jim – I would suggest that we have monitors monitoring the monitors

IV. Meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm