

EXHIBIT A

Minutes of Ad Hoc Fort Ward Park
and Museum Area Stakeholder Advisory Group
Meeting of August 24, 2010

Memorandum

August 24, 2010

To: Ad Hoc Fort Ward Park and Museum Area Stakeholders Advisory Group

From: Dave Cavanaugh

Subject: Comments and Recommendations

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on management and use of Fort Ward Park.

The 35 acres of Fort Ward Park is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a significant City owned resource for passive recreation and entertainment.

The City of Alexandria was aware of many of the African American home sites and graves within the Park. However, it was only recently that members of the community felt strongly that the overlooked story of African Americans during and after the Civil War be made part of the history of the military fort.

The City of Alexandria, Archaeology Museum prepared a **Draft Inventory of Historical Resources dated August 2009**. The Draft Inventory identifies known resource values and areas where additional resources are likely to be located. The Inventory did not prioritize or provide conclusions on which sites are more significant or provide options for how best to manage the sites. Nor did the inventory provide any suggestions on how best to commemorate, acknowledge or interpret the African American history associated with the Fort and the aftermath of the Civil War.

The Office of Historic Alexandria plans to award a contract for an Archaeology Assessment (Documentary Study) of the archaeology and history, with a focus on the African American heritage at the park. Although the proposed contract and negotiated statement of work has not been shared with the public, it was my understanding the archaeology assessment (Documentary Report) was to complete the 2009 Draft Inventory and:

- 1) Identify the location and approximate boundaries of known and unmarked burial grounds;
- 2) Identify the location of early home and building sites and other landscape features such as witness trees, and historical roads;
- 3) Identify the probable location of a Native American tool making site;
- 4) Assess the significance and integrity of the resources as they relate to the African American use of the land after the Civil War;
- 5) Identify potential threats to the integrity of the resources and provide options for how best to protect and manage them.

Although the early draft of the Statement of Work did include provisions for “scrapping and shovel testing” the amount and location of areas subject to surface disturbance activities was unclear.

Since the August 2009 Draft Inventory was prepared, additional information has been uncovered through test of the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR), and new information has been uncovered regarding the possible location of other grave sites. It is understood the results of the GPR will be incorporated into the Archaeology Assessment (Documentary Report).

I suggest the proposed contract for an Archaeological Assessment (Documentary Report) be awarded with the condition that archaeology field work be delayed until finalization of the Archaeology Assessment (Documentary Report). During the time of preparing the Archaeology Assessment known sensitive areas should be protected from any surface disturbances or other recreation, maintenance or management uses and activities that would be detrimental to protection of these resources.

This action will allow the City to complete the necessary studies documenting the known and likely location of important, sensitive historic and cultural resources, assess their historic and cultural importance, recommend a course of action to document, recover, protect or conserve them in place. Priority should be given to materials and objects that tell a story, enhancing the interest and experience of visitors to the park.

The Request for Proposal, the negotiated statement of work, and reports and studies used to make funding decisions should be available on City websites for review and comment by the public.

Sincerely,

Dave Cavanaugh

Schreiner, William

From: fulton-oleary [fulton-oleary@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Schreiner, William
Subject: FW: Stakeholder Meeting
Attachments: Draft_Letter_to_Stakeholders Group.DC.doc

EXHIBIT B

Minutes of Ad Hoc Fort Ward Park
and Museum Area Stakeholder Advisory Group
Meeting of August 24, 2010

Bill; could you include this in our records? Thanks, Tom

From: Dave Cavanaugh [mailto:dacavalx@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 1:32 PM
To: Tom Fulton
Subject: Stakeholder Meeting

I appreciate the chance to speak at your Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. You do a great job in conducting the meeting and inviting comments.

You raised a great issue on how to influence decision making in a fluid situation. The City has convinced folks that the decision making process must be fluid, the resource inventory is a work in progress, "archaeology" includes history, all in an effort to allow the City to have complete flexibility and continue to do what they want to do. They have no guidelines for making decisions other than to mollify public criticism, throw money at the problem so it looks like they are doing something.

In the absence of a resource management plan or the direct participation of citizen groups in providing oversight, it will likely continue. The City Manager's office should be more directly involved and accountable in making decisions where there are cross-cutting, overlapping and conflicting interests. Dumping dirt on a compacted gravel base is not a solution. The no mow policy is not based on science. Spending money on expensive archaeology field work throughout the park is a misuse of limited resources. Replacing the chain link fence at the OBC Cemetery with a similar chain link fence may not be consistent with the historic character of the park and the cemetery. Making the contracting process for awards over \$25,000 more transparent to the public would help.

It doesn't look like the City is interested in funding a Fort Ward Park resource management plan anytime soon. Cost may be an issue. It is possible they are unfamiliar with the management concept. The report of the Stakeholder's group may help nudge City Council in that direction.

It is important that the public see a deliverable, a product that increases public interest and support for maintaining the historic park into the future.

I have so little confidence that our City officials can make sound decisions. Until that changes citizens need to be more directly involved in advising City staff.

Attached is my written statement. There is some possible confusion in terms. The City uses a broad, undefined term, documentary report to confuse people. Basically it is a full-blown archaeology report that includes scrapping, digging, and shovel testing. My point was that before engaging in the expense, archaeologist should first provide an archaeology assessment which identifies what is likely to be uncovered, the importance and significance of the archaeology material, and different methods for documenting, recording, recovering or protecting the artifacts. It is a management tool that can help set priorities.

9/3/2010

Again thanks for your commitment and hard work.

Dave Cavanaugh

(703) 869-8362

"Time is but the stream I go fishing in."-Henry David Thoreau