



Community Engagement Council
August 20, 2026
Meeting 10.5
Virtual

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Facilitators	Joanna Gilmore, Clay Middleton
CEC Members * = attended virtually	Abby Dairaghi, Lisa Jones, Harlan Greene, Jim Newhard, Jerry Harris, Walter Brown, Eric Manning, Stephen Cofer-Shabica, Millicent Brown, Jeff Harjo, Madison Lee, James Njonjo, Luqman Rasheed, Norm Dickerson
Advisors	Demetria Clemons
Consultants	--
Liaison	--
Staff	Mark Berry
Invited Guests	--

- I. Call to order at 6:00pm (Joanna)
 - a. Jerry - Motion to accept the agenda and proceed as outlined
 - i. Seconded by Walter
 - ii. Approved via voice vote
- II. New Business
 - a. CEC Response to the BOT's letter of July 9
 - i. Motion was provided by Jim in advance of the meeting (full text is attached)
 - ii. Jim (summary) – the motion reaffirms the roles and responsibilities of the CEC per the CEC-approved Mission, Objectives, Goals, and Values and the Organizational Hierarchy, Roles, and Responsibilities document prepared by the administration. The formal motion document includes findings, affirmations, requests, and wording adjustments to bring into alignment all documents regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Community Engagement Council.
 - iii. Seconded by Jeff
 - iv. Jerome – supports the motion and states that there is expectation of a response. *Response from Mark*: expectation is noted
 - v. Jerome – call for vote
 1. Harlan - approve

2. Eric – approve
3. Stephen – approve
4. Jerry – approve
5. Millicent – approve
6. Madison – approve
7. Walter – approve
8. Abby – yes
9. Jeff – yes
10. Jim – yes
- vi. No objections were noted
- vii. The motion passes
- b. Implementation of observers for archaeological monitoring
 - i. Written motion was submitted by Jim in advance of the meeting (full text is attached)
 - ii. Jim (summary)– the motion asks the College to establish and fund a cultural monitoring program for all activities conducted during stages 2A and 2B (perimeter fence, SWPPP work, removal of YWCA foundations and parking lot) of the archaeological work plan at 106 Coming Street. This monitoring programs gives members of Nations and descendant communities the opportunity to observe and verify that work is happening properly, and to advise the archaeologists on any cultural material that may be found.
 - iii. Seconded by Jerry
 - iv. No discussion
 - v. Call for the vote
 1. Eric – yes
 2. Stephen yes
 3. Lisa – yes
 4. Madison – yes
 5. Millicent – yes
 6. James – yes
 7. Jerry – yes
 8. Walter – yes
 9. Abby – yes
 10. Harlan – yes
 11. Jeff – yes
 12. Luqman – abstain due to late arrival
 - vi. No objections were noted

- vii. The motion passes
- c. Letter circulated by Muscogee Creek Nation re: conflict of interest
 - i. Documents were provided by Abby in advance of the meeting (full text is attached)
 - ii. Abby – conflict of interest due to 106 Coming Street senior project manager for College of Charleston for 106 Coming Street is married to the 106 Coming Street senior project manager for Terracon. This is a violation of College and State policies. Questions include why was this not previously shared with CEC? Are all involved agencies and participants aware? Did other archaeological companies submit proposals for this project?
 - iii. Response by Mark – President Hsu provided a response that has already been provided to the CEC. No additional response at this time and any other questions can be put in writing.
 - iv. Jim – it was noted that the College will thoroughly review the process. Who is doing the review? Is it independent of the chain of command?
Response (Mark): a third party is conducting the review
 - v. Jim – when will the review be completed? *Response:* not known
 - vi. Walter – when that review is completed, will the findings be shared with the CEC? *Response:* mostly likely not unless there is a change
 - vii. Jim – will the Muscogee (Creek) Nation receive a copy of the review?
Response (Mark): I can't speak to that at this time and don't want to make false promises
 - viii. Abby – would it be beneficial for me to re-send each of my questions for President Hsu's response, as I don't believe all my questions were answered? *Response (Mark):* you are welcome to type them out and resubmit
 - 1. Jerry – which questions were not answered?
 - 2. Abby – (in summary) Integrity and fairness? Ms. Worrell on selection committee? Office of State Engineering notification of conflict of interest? How can this not be considered conflict of interest under College policy? Was the decision to choose Terracon for this project influenced by any other means? Is Terracon the best company to conduct this work? Do state procurement rules apply? Has state fiscal accountability office been advised on this matter?
 - 3. Jerry – will these questions be part of the review process
Response (Mark): yes

4. Abby – will the answers to those questions then be provided to me, or the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, or the CEC? *Response (Mark):* that will be between the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and the College
5. Jeff – is Terracon still on the contract? *Response:* they are the cultural resource management firm of record and are still on contract. They have reassigned the project lead to another person in the company?
6. Abby – Has the project lead for the College changed? *Response (Mark):* She is still involved with the project?
7. Jerry – since the Muscogee Nation submitted the question and the review will address those questions, it is appropriate for the CEC to request that the review be shared with the CEC, if the Muscogee agrees. *Response (Abby):* that is okay with the Muscogee Nation
8. Jerry – motion that the CEC receive a copy of the response from the College regarding those questions
 - a. Seconded by Walter
 - b. Discussion:
 - i. Walter - not sure why there is a distinction between what the College is willing to share if the Muscogee Nation is part of the CEC. If there is a legitimate concern about conflict of interest, why was it even necessary to make a motion for the CEC to receive a response?
 - ii. Eric – If any individual CEC member wants to share any useful information with the larger group, then that would be up to them to have that level of transparency
 - iii. *Response (Mark)* – out of respect for the Muscogee (Creek) and the representatives who brought that question to the College. Our understanding is that our correspondence is between just the Nation and the College.
 - iv. Eric, Jim – there is nothing that would prohibit the Muscogee (Creek) from socializing it with the rest of the CEC members
 - c. Eric – call for the question

1. Jim – approve
 2. Jerry – approve
 3. Walter – approve
 4. Millicent – approve
 5. Eric – approve
 6. Madison – approve
 7. James – approve
 8. Norm – approve
 9. Abby – approve
 10. Jeff – approve
- d. No objections were noted
- e. Motion passes
9. Jim – while this review is underway, what is Worrell’s level of involvement in Terracon’s scope of work, amendments, invoices, staffing, performance, or other business-related transactions? *Response (Mark):* none
10. Clay – for clarification, has Worrell ever had any involvement in Terracon’s scope of work or invoices? *Response (Mark):* I don’t want to misspeak and would rather the review process play out
11. Millicent – Did the College not think it was important for us to be made aware of this potential conflict? This could have been resolved a year ago and the CEC could have been in the position to tell the community that this was not a problem. Why would this not have been shared with the CEC? *Response (Clay):* There was not anything done nefariously. There was an RFP and Terracon won the project. As previously stated, further responses will be provided.
12. Lisa – do we know the date when the project was awarded to Terracon *Response (Abby):* March 13, 2025
13. Harlan – did other companies respond the RFP? *Response (Mark)* – there were two vendors?
14. Madison – did the RFP make clear that archaeology was in the scope of this project? *Response (Mark):* not sure
15. Walter – is the third party doing the review the State Procurement Office procurement office? *Response (Mark):* No, that office would not do this type of investigation. State procurement office would have un the RFP because of the size of the bid

16. Walter – is it likely that the State Procurement Office missed this conflict of interest? *Response (Mark)*: that is to be determined by the third-party review
17. Abby – can we know who the third-party review is being conducted by? *Response (Mark)*: I don't have that information
18. Walter – There is a reference to the procurement office in the information about the funeral director engagement. It is important to note that the procurement office will be involved again in this process.
19. James – It is odd that Abby shared the conflict of interest letter on the CEC email thread and President Hsu responded on that same thread, yet the College intends to share the results of the review only with the Muscogee Nation and not the entire CEC. *Response (Mark)*: Good points and something for us to consider moving forward.
20. Mark - Abby, in the future it would be helpful for you to clarify if your communication is as a representative of the Muscogee Nation or as a representative of the CEC. *Response (Abby)*: For this letter, I sent it as both a representative of the Muscogee Nation and as a representative of the CEC. When we get to other sensitive situations such as NAGPRA, that are specific to the Muscogee Nation, then I will be clear on that.
21. Abby – do we have an estimated time on when the review will be completed? *Response (Mark)*: we do not

d. Notification practices, transparency, and communication

- i. Millicent and Jerome asked for this item to be on the agenda
- ii. Jerry – much of the discussion was captured in the conversation we just had and in the resolution we approved that was presented by Jim
- iii. Jerry – concern that the College will be going back to the BAR on August 31 with an application for reconsideration of their concept and there was no prior consultation with the CEC, particularly considering that this has to do with commemoration and memorialization. What questions did the BAR ask of the College and what is Terracon presenting in response to those questions? *Response (Mark)*: Terracon is not presenting. The architectural drawings and archeological work plan have been submitted to the BAR. That was the question brought up by the BAR in the July meeting. The archaeological work plan was submitted. There was also a question

about the location of the grab and go food in relation to the commemoration space.

- iv. Jerry – I was not clear that BAR was asking for those things, so perhaps there was additional communication between the College and BAR. Can we have more information about that communication? This was an opportunity for the College to be more transparent with the CEC.
- e. PRB statement on the proposed pre-archaeology gathering
 - i. Madison previously circulated the statement to the group
 - ii. Madison – several CEC members drafted and signed a statement with concerns about the timing of discussions of a ceremony, and that any plans made should be community-centered, transparent, and based in education. I missed the previous meeting where I understand there was conversation about forming a subcommittee, so my apologies if this was discussed then. *Response (Joanna)*: there was discussion about a sub-committee, now task force. An update from the task force was shared at the last meeting. We can discuss now or at the next meeting.
 - iii. Eric, Jim – suggestion to put update from the task group on the agenda for the next meeting (Sept 3)
 - iv. Jim – suggestion to put this on the agenda.
- f. CEC Review of CZC conditions
 - i. Written motion was submitted by Jim in advance of the meeting (full text is attached)
 - ii. Jim (summary) – this has to do with unresolved process concerns and opportunities to improve communication that the CEC is receiving, specifically timely notice, information sharing, follow through, consultation, adequacy of review time for important issues brought to the CEC, work plans being submitted prior to CEC consultation, all of which put the CEC in reactive mode. Motion aims to make clear changes as early as September.
 - iii. *Response (Mark)*: regarding the 24-hour notice prior to the YWCA demolition, the College communicated a window of time on Friday. The demolition did not take place until Wednesday. Reference to Jerry’s comment, “we didn’t want one day’s notice” and that the College understood that comment to mean “early notice” not necessarily “24-hour’s notice.” What did the College communicate to the CEC that is inconsistent with what was communicated to the BAR.

- iv. Jim – Liollo told the BAR that architectural elements and brickwork would be incorporated into the design phase. The CEC was told at a meeting that bricks could not be saved. *Response (Mark)*: To clarify, in response to Walter’s question at that meeting, Liollo said that some of the bricks would try to be saved and that saving all would not be possible because they would be crushed. Since then, the demo crew has tried to save pallets of brick that can be incorporated into the archaeological design. *Response (Walter)*: Respectfully, I never asked for bricks to be saved. I asked for the YWCA building to be left alone. *Response (Jim)*: the point is that there are times when communication from the College is not clear. Sometimes the exact time/date cannot be shared because the university does not have control of that information, and this should be made clear. *Response (Joanna)*: the College did say the exact date was dependent on weather and contractor availability.
- v. Clay – Some CEC members may have a different interpretation
- vi. Jim – if others have a different understanding, the motion can be amended
- vii. Jim – references individual CZC conditions (#1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9) and their relevance to stakeholder consultation, review, and input. Request that this motion be forwarded to DES and SHPO.
- viii. Seconded by Jeff
- ix. Discussion
 - 1. Jerry – what Jim just walked us through is exactly what I was referring to earlier regarding transparency and opportunities for enhanced communication between the CEC, the community, the College and regulatory agencies. I support the motion.
 - 2. Walter – I support the motion. The YWCA building was demolished at the will and authority of the College. The College is going to continue to do what’s in its will and authority.
- x. Eric – call for the question
 - 1. Millicent – yes
 - 2. Jerry – yes
 - 3. Abby – yes
 - 4. Stephen – yes
 - 5. James – yes
 - 6. Walter – yes
 - 7. Luqman – yes

- 8. Jeff – yes
- 9. Jim – yes
- xi. No objections noted
- xii. Motion passes

III. Additional comments/discussion items

- a. Jim – There is a walkthrough scheduled for August 25, correct? Is it correct that the walkthrough occurs after the Land Disturbance Permit is issued?
Response (Mark): The Land Disturbance Permit has not been issued. My understanding is that this walkthrough is leading up to the issuance of the permit.
- b. Jerry – has the final GPR report with recommendations been written by Dr. Harris? Was it raw data only or raw data and analysis? *Response (Mark):* that report has been submitted to SHPO for a 30-day review before it can be shared with the CEC. The raw data was shared with SHPO at the end of July. The report was submitted on August 13. The report does not include recommendations, but rather an interpretation of what the data shows.
- c. Jim – With SHPO’s 30-day review, we should anticipate the report coming to the CEC around Sept 11.
- d. Joanna – at the last meeting, you mentioned that you would like to hear from a bioarcheologist. Abby shared a helpful list of bioarcheologists. Are there specific questions you would like the presenters to be prepared to answer on September 3?
 - i. Jim – an understanding of the relationship between the bioarcheologist and the funeral director (roles, responsibilities, storage, logistics)
 - ii. Jim – concern about having sufficient time to adequately cover all agenda items, in addition to bioarcheologists
 - iii. Jim - Meeting priorities for Sept 3 are
 - 1. Old business – task force report/discussion force, responses to the motions passed tonight
 - iv. Walter – request to put funeral director engagement back on the agenda. Will submit pre-questions to Joanna.
- e. Joanna – is there anything I can provide for you over the next two weeks so you can feel prepared for the next meeting?
 - i. Eric – Request to stick with time constraints as outlined on the agenda
 - ii. Jim – task force report (or bullet point list) prior to the CEC meeting

IV. Meeting adjourned at 7:20pm