



Section 106 NHPA Consulting Parties

Meeting #1

Carpenter Street Underpass

Meeting Summary

July 23, 2015

1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Foundation Hall - Old State Capitol

1 North Old State Capitol Plaza, Springfield, Illinois 62071

Distribution of this Report: 8/13/15

**Submitted By
Kristina Miller, RK&K**

July 23, 2015 Meeting Participants

Name	Organization	E-mail
Alice Ramey	personal history/connection to the site	Redaction Note: E-mail addresses have been omitted from this summary.
Douglas King	African American History Foundation	
Irma Wallace		
Yvonne Singley	Springfield-Decatur Area Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.	
Pastor T. Ray McJunkins	Faith Coalition for the Common Good	
Linda Hayes	Faith Coalition for the Common Good	
Jim Dixon	Faith Coalition for the Common Good	
Amy Bulpitt	Hospital Sisters Health System	
Charles Lucore	Hospital Sisters Health System	
Kim Luz	Hospital Sisters Health System	
Dave Olejniczak	Hospital Sisters Health System	
Matt Butcher	Office of State Representative Tim Butler	
Terry Martin	Illinois State Museum Research and Collections Center	
Frank Butterfield	Landmarks Illinois	
Mitchell Johnson	Memorial Medical Center and Mid-Illinois Medical Center	
Teresa Haley	NAACP - Springfield Chapter	
Jerry Jacobson	Save Old Springfield	
Wesley McNeese	Southern Illinois University School of Medicine	
Jerrie Blakely	Springfield & Central Illinois African-American History Museum	
Steve Myers	Myers Commercial Real Estate	
Chris Hembrough	Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce	
Josh Collins	Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce	
Ron Ladley	Springfield Historic Sites Commission	
Nathan Bottom	City of Springfield	
Rachel Leibowitz	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	
Joe Phillippe	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	
David Halpin	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	
Garth Madison	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	
Andrea Martin	Federal Railroad Administration	
Laura Shick	Federal Railroad Administration	
Kevin Seals	Hanson Professional Services, Inc.	
Christopher Stratton	Fever River Research	
Floyd Mansberger	Fever River Research	
Lesa Branham	Favor Public Relations	
Kristina Miller	RK&K	

Copied on this Meeting Summary (in addition to the participants listed on the prior page)

Name	Organization	E-mail
Candace Trees	Springfield-Decatur Area Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.	
Carolyn Farrar	Springfield-Decatur Area Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.	
Theresa Clay	Epsilon Sigma Chapter of Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc.	
Samuel Wheeler	Sangamon County Historical Society	
Al Riley	State Representative	
Tim Butler	State Representative	

Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to seek input on the following from Consulting Parties:

- historic significance ,
- anticipated effects of the project on the archaeological site, and
- options to mitigate adverse effects.

Meeting Overview

Date: July 23, 2015

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location: Foundation Hall - Old State Capitol, 1 North Old State Capitol Plaza, Springfield, Illinois 62071

Meeting participants were requested to sign the attendance sheet and were given an agenda and comment sheet. Ms. Martin opened the meeting and participants took turns introducing themselves. Ms. Martin provided a brief review of prior public meetings and stated the purpose of the current meeting (as summarized above). Ms. Shick reviewed the historic preservation requirements and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 process.

Mr. Mansberger gave a brief overview of the site's historic significance and the boundaries of excavation to date. Mr. Seals discussed the current archaeological site; anticipated effects of the project on the site; and potential treatment/mitigation ideas previously discussed at public meetings. The majority of the meeting included an open discussion, with meeting participants asking questions and sharing ideas for site treatment options.

A summary of comments provided by meeting participants, motions, and action items are listed below. After the discussions, Ms. Martin reviewed the next steps in the Section 106 NHPA process and adjourned the meeting.

Meeting Discussions Summary

Section 106 Process:

- Mr. Jacobson – Is local government involved?
- Ms. Shick – Yes, the City of Springfield is the project applicant/recipient of a grant administered by FRA.

Site Importance & Research Boundaries:

- Mr. Mansberger distributed the following draft report, Executive Summary, Results of the Phase II archaeological testing for the proposed carpenter street underpass, Springfield rail improvements project (DRAFT July 23, 2015).
- Dr. McNeese – What if there are interesting properties outside the boundary investigated? Concern was noted for resources outside that area.
- Mr. Mansberger – Area of potential effect (APE) is being determined as part of the project
- Dr. McNeese – Will this body consider what may be outside the investigated area?
- Ms. Martin – The City of Springfield only owns the area bounded by the green line (reference to slide 13).
- Ms. Shick – Federal funding, triggering the Section 106 process, relates to the rail project and there is no federal funding outside that green area.
- Mr. Mansberger – Archaeology to-date exposed house foundations and completed small test units to assess the depth and complexity of artifacts/resources.
- Mr. King – Has your company done any excavation since late last fall/early winter?
- Mr. Mansberger – No, the site has been covered up and work has been put on hold.
- Mr. King – Is there still archaeological work to be done?
- Mr. Mansberger – We only scratched the surface on the excavation.
- Mr. King – Part of why we are here is to determine what should be done with the artifacts recovered already and what will be done with the site?
- Mr. Mansberger – Yes, with respect to this construction project, the determination of appropriate mitigation of data recovered and the remaining site.

Archaeological Site Today & Anticipated Effects Overview:

- Mr. Seals – Noted that there is a utility corridor through site G. In that area, data recovery has been completed and work may progress.
- Ms. Martin – Work may also be done along Mason Street.
- Mr. Seals – Reviewed the protection of site.

Treatment Options/Mitigation Measures:

- Ms. Leibowitz – The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency's mission is to preserve and protect resources with avoidance of adverse effects to the greatest extent possible. With preserving an archaeological site in place, the resource is maintained in place and does not risk degradation. Once removed, its context is lost.
- Mr. Phillippe – While historians are able to do research in libraries,

Terminology

Treatment Options and Mitigation Measures

These are ways to avoid, address, resolve or lessen the adverse effects on a resource caused by the project.

Avoidance

No impact to a resource from a project or action. For example, the construction footprint would not be located within the archaeological boundary eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. When compared to the No-Build/No-Action baseline conditions, no additional adverse effects would occur to the resource due to the project.

archaeology is destructive because once removed, it is no longer at the location. It is finite and not renewable.

- Ms. Leibowitz – Data has been collected and can be learned from. The IHPA is focused on preservation and protection of the resource with a preference for retaining the resource in place.
- Ms. Martin – The focus for this meeting is on the resources located between Carpenter Street and Madison. What would the meeting participants like to see happen with the resource?
- Mr. Phillippe – The site can still be studied if preserved in place with research-specific questions and new technology. It is not all or nothing.
- Ms. Leibowitz – There may be potential for in-depth studies.
- Mr. King – The artifacts have stories behind them. The stories of African Americans and other people of color have not historically been told. Too often, the race riot and mob situation that occurred has not been fully told. For example there is a name associated with the people that lived in those houses. We need to do all we can do to uncover as much history before it is covered up. Otherwise, we do ourselves and the history of Springfield a disservice. I prefer you dig and find as much information as possible.
- Ms. Leibowitz – Protection of the site is critical so not to lose the resources.
- Ms. Martin – There may be options for avoidance of the rail project so that resources are not impacted.
- Ms. Leibowitz – There is a high expense with archaeological data recovery to be completed and uncertainty of funding.
- Ms. Shick – The Carpenter Street Underpass project is going forward but the 10th Street Rail project is to be determined. The schedule and funding could be later.
- Dr. McNeese – Is the 10th Street corridor negatively impacting this site? Has that been determined?
- Ms. Martin – The 10th Street project may be able to be engineered to avoid the archaeological site. The resource is located within the right of way but the rail project footprint could avoid the resource.
- Ms. Shick – The footprint may be able to be redesigned to avoid the resource.
- Mr. Jacobson – Would it go through the houses?
- Ms. Shick – Yes, currently, but that could change.
- Mr. Dixon – We keep talking about “stuff” with some “oh wow” discoveries. I would like an opportunity to look at the stuff to make an informed decision, a review of what has been found so far. What is in the 25 boxes?
- Mr. Mansberger – The site itself is what has been identified, see Figure 23 from the report distributed.
- Ms. Haley – The NAACP would like the artifacts uncovered to-date to be cataloged, stored, and displayed with glass casing and a placard with details on the history in the intermodal building (new train/bus station on 10th Street), a public place.
- Mr. Mansberger – The artifacts will be cataloged and documented.
- Ms. Martin – In the fall of 2014, the unanticipated discovery of this resource triggered reconsideration of the engineering plans. Design considerations will avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.
- Ms. Shick – The site cannot stay in its current condition. The exposed site needs to be addressed.
- Pastor McJunkins – I would like to revisit the focus of the meeting. Is IHPA recommending to preserve in place?
- Ms. Leibowitz/Mr. Phillippe – Yes, with no additional excavation at this time. Our first position is to

preserve in place for protection of the resource.

- Dr. McNeese – I am in favor of additional excavation to acquire additional artifacts.
- Ms. Haley – Does it mean adjusting the tracks to avoid impacts?
- Mr. Bottom – Discussions need to still occur with the railroad owner with consideration for the geometric requirements. So, total avoidance may not be possible.
- Mr. Jacobson – I support a park-like surrounding near the site and a facility made, providing for security and visibility with the artifacts going to various locations as others have recommended. If the right of way can be moved, the problem is solved.
- Mr. Ladley – Who will own the archaeological site if the tracks are moved and right of way not needed?
- Ms. Leibowitz – It could go into a protected covenant (contract/deed) to be preserved by the state.
- Mr. Madison – Not ownership, but a protected resource covenant
- Mr. Jacobson – Is a state permit required for the site?
- Mr. Phillippe – Not necessarily, that would need to be determined.
- Mitch Johnson – Who owns the site now?
- Ms. Martin – The City of Springfield owns the current site within the right of way, and St John's Hospital owns the rest of the parking lot. Consideration in the future may include identification of a historic district. The current excavation needs to be addressed.
- Dr. McNeese – I agree that the site needs to be protected and the railroad not to go over it.
- Mr. Bottom – Certain standards have to be met and it may not be avoided. It will be evaluated.
- Ms. Shick – Movement of the design could potentially impact other resources.
- Mr. Seals – Major shifts and full avoidance could impact 11th Street and may cause community facilities relocations.
- Mr. Jacobson – Plan B needs to be considered for minimizing impacts if the site cannot be avoided.
- Mr. Phillippe – If only Carpenter Street is considered, the resource can be avoided; however, when considering the 10th Street project, full avoidance may not be possible.
- Mr. Seals – Design requirements and potential solutions are under consideration, but the railroad has rejected them.
- Ms. Haley – What is the contingency plan?
- Mr. Seals – This site was discovered after the design was approved.
- Ms. Ramey – What about the history of the race riot. Why was it not known?
- Mr. Seals – Subsurface digging was not approved until after the right of way was purchased.
- Mr. Jacobson – Floyd [Mr. Mansberger] has located the foundations of homes destroyed as part of the 1908 race riots. If the site cannot be avoided, why not complete the archaeology at another site?
- Dr. McNeese – Why not excavate the site and relocate it? Can they be reconstructed elsewhere and interpreted, possibly close to the Badlands but further from the railroad project?
- Mr. Mansberger – Archaeological mitigation could be done by collecting the artifacts and telling the story based on the data collected. It could be uncovered, recorded, and relocated. It is expensive and is an option that tells the story. If the site can be avoided, that is first priority.

- Ms. Martin – These are unanticipated discoveries. We knew the race riots happened but the archaeological investigations could not occur until the right of way was obtained. Negotiations with the railroads about the engineering is in progress. Determination of what to do about the current site is the focus of this 106 meeting. Examples were noted like a mural at the Carpenter Street Underpass and other ideas. First, ideas need to be collected. The City may need to hear from the Consulting Parties on options at the site to help avoid/minimize the impacts and footprint of the public.
- Ms. Martin – The minimum track center distance is 13.5 feet.
- Mr. Butterfield – Question on the design alternatives.
- Ms. Haley – City and Hanson are here, why not talk about it now?
- Mr. Bottom – It may be helpful for this group to write to the railroad companies and explain the importance of the site and request reducing their impacts to the resource.
- Ms. Martin – The design is not set in stone.
- Ms. Haley – We should voice the concerns in a letter. Make it happen, avoid and minimize the impacts to the resource.
- Mr. King – I disagree with moving to another site. We would not want to move Lincoln's home and we should not move this site. This is important history in this location.
- Dr. McNeese – Plan 1 is to avoid it and not impact it. Plans 2 and 3 need to be developed if Plan 1 is not an option. Is it possible to move or relocate the foundations after excavation, to set them up in a museum or display context elsewhere?
- Ms. Leibowitz – I think it is possible to do so, but that it would be expensive; it also is not a preferred option because it removes the homes from their site context. It's important to see these small foundations placed closely together, and to understand their distance from the state capitol, the Lincoln Home site, etc.
- Dr. McNeese – I am in favor of a little more excavation.
- Mr. Ladley – Is there a chance that the railroad will accept covenants?
- Ms. Martin – It would be brought back to the City that owns the right of way.
- Dr. McNeese – The Tulsa, Oklahoma Race Riot has a commemorative park with a rail line. It even had a waterfall.
- Ms. Singley – There should be examples and other models to help us make these decisions.
- Ms. Leibowitz – Another example is a reflective* park with information to document the history at the location. (**Meaning "contemplative," a place for quiet reflection or thought. A commemorative site with thoughtful, honest, factual interpretive signs, if any.*)
- Jerry Jacobson – Are there other Badlands sites?
- Mr. Mansberger – We have developed the context for the historic event of the 1908 Race Riot with photos keyed to a map. It identifies homes destroyed. It is frustrating that we were not able to find any photos of the homes in the current site boundary. Photos of house sites are very limited.
- Ms. Martin – The Draft Phase 2 report is available to the Consulting Parties and the full report is available. Please request it from Kristina and she will e-mail a pdf file. Some of the information is emotional but it could be placed on-line or only provided individually to the Consulting Parties due to the sensitivity of the material. Typically, archaeological information is kept private or in an academic setting so to protect the resource from the general public.
- Mr. Mansberger – There was a systematic approach to identification of archaeological resources as part

of the EIS. *(Mr. Mansberger reviewed the documents completed.)*

- Ms. Ramey – My grandpa was in the Race Riot and his stories are not consistent with what is being told from the archaeologists. My grandpa was caught in it because my grandma was having a baby. The homes were burned. One of the best hatters, pressers and cooks lived in those homes. It seems like you don't want to talk about it and it is part of the history that we need. When the bricks were removed (and disassembled for reconstruction of the Old State Capitol) they were marked for proper placement. The stones were safely stored at the state fairgrounds. I know the history of this town and I love this town. We can talk to the railroad with more intelligence and tell them not to mess with the homes.
- Mr. Mansberger – We want to tell the story.
- Ms. Ramey – We should put it on the website.
- Mr. Halpin – The point is that it could be made public.
- *During the break, Ms. Singley clarified her prior comments and asked for examples of other mitigation options used in similar situations. She would like a copy of the report, yvonnwsingley@comcast.net. Pastor McJunkins also asked for a copy of the report and several people would like the list of meeting participants.*
- Ms. Martin – To address Ms. Singley's question, an example in the state of Missouri was shared regarding a historic site mitigation. *(Details are included on page 11.)*
- Mr. Martin – Funding sources are important to determine options for mitigation costs.
- Mr. Mansberger – We should think outside the box for mitigation, possibly including educational programs.
- Ms. Martin – Some money is set aside for this project at this site. There is potential to combine funds with other sources.
- Ms. Leibowitz – A National Park Service grant window is closing but may be an option to pursue for a small amount of money. *(Please refer to page 11 for additional information concerning this grant.)*
- Ms. Haley – Why did the grant opportunity lapse?
- Mr. Phillippe – That is separate from the 106 obligation.
- Mr. Madison – There are projects, Carpenter Street and 10th Street with mitigation needs.
- Ms. Haley – If we apply for grants when money is available then we would have that in place to build on it before the deadline. It is disappointing if we missed an opportunity.
- Ms. Leibowitz – The opportunity has come up annually and I will call the Park Service to see if the application can be submitted by the deadline. It is not a lot of money to cover costs of the types of things we are talking about so it does not go far but it is a start.
- Ms. Martin – Funding is still to be determined. Based on the prior TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) grant funds, this is the last meeting at this time that is funded for FRA.
- Mr. King – We are jumping ahead.
- Mr. Hembrough – Our purpose is to come to consensus on how to move forward. I understand that complete avoidance may not be possible, so as a starting point to move forward:
 - Avoid additional impacts as much as possible going forward
 - Preserve in place
 - Complete excavation where avoidance is not possible to document the findings and put the artifacts on display
 - Memorialize the event with a mural on one of the new underpasses

- Mr. Mansberger – Explore the possibility of inclusion in the educational system.
- Ms. Leibowitz –
 - Educational materials created and coordination of groups to see the archaeology being done without inhibiting the excavation.
 - Creation of film/video documentary coverage (available on-line), possibly on display at the intermodal station.
- Mr. Myers – Where was the location of the fire destruction? If on the west side of the right of way, enhance the look/feel of the Amtrak station and other improvements on the east side of the right of way to provide proximity to the resources. The community aspects of the station could be developed into the 1908 Tribute Building and the story could be told to visitors and school buses that come to the location. There is the potential for artists to help represent the history.
- During the meeting the following ideas were written on the Flip Chart (as shown in the photographs to the right):

1. Start to set framework to move forward

- Avoid what is possible
- Preserve in place what won't be in the way of the railroad
- Excavate what cannot be avoided
- Collect and curate (articulate story)
- Educate (film)
- Memorialize events (mural/names/events)
- Intermodal Station (potential location for a display on the significance of the archaeological site and some of the excavated artifacts)

2. Consulting Parties letter to Union Pacific

3. What to do with the site now (short-term) while we work on items 1 and 2 above. (Defer to the archaeologists to do what is best to protect the site. If the site is covered, video record the process.)

4. Phase 2 (25 boxes to clean/catalog/curate) will take 1 year or longer to finish.

- Ms. Singley – I would like clarification that this is just a start of the discussion on what will be done and not a final decision.
- Mr. Butterfield – What is the timeframe?
- Ms. Shick – The current site needs to be protected further.
- Mr. Phillippe – It is better to cover it up and plant grass to protect the site.
- Mr. Jacobson and Mr. Myers – Concurred on preservation in the meantime.
- Ms. Martin – (Referring to the Flip Chart) Would this list need to be brought back to your groups?
- Ms. Haley – As group leaders, can we make decisions today to move forward?
- Mr. Jacobson – "Nay" to avoid or excavate. It does not provide for a Plan B or Plan C.

Meeting Flip Chart

① Start → Set framework to move forward

- Possible Avoid + Preserve what won't be in the way of the RR
- Excavate what we cannot be avoided
- Collect + Curate articulate story
- Educate (film)
- Memorialize events (mural/names-events)
- intermodal

② Consulting parties letter to UP

③ What to do w/ site now/short term? (while we work on #1 & #2)

defer to the archaeologists re: what is best to protect site. If covered, video record the process

④ Phase 2 (25 boxes to clean/catalog/curate) 1+ year to finish

A motion was called and seconded to vote on the flip chart items. The vast majority of meeting

participants said yes and the motion carried.

- Mr. Bottom – A letter could be drafted to go to the Union Pacific regarding avoidance (e.g., access road could be eliminated).

A motion was called and seconded to vote on development of a draft letter to Union Pacific (UP) for the meeting participants to review that discusses the importance of the site and urges UP to avoid impacts. The vast majority of meeting participants said yes and motion carried. (Side Note: Reference Section 4(f) DOT Act and Section 106 NHPA.)

- Pastor McJunkins– Will UP budge?
- Mr. Seals – They (Union Pacific Railroad) have been asked to minimize the footprint and have said no. It may help to hear from the community on the importance of this site.
- Mr. Myers – Avoid the west side of the corridor, compress footprint, eliminate the access road, and ask Senator Durbin to deliver the letter to CEO of Union Pacific.
- Mr. Bottom – Bill Houlihan, with Senator Durbin’s office, may deliver the letter to the Senator.
- Mitch Johnson – I propose a motion to cover and preserve the current site to protect it as recommended by Joe [Mr. Phillippe].
- Mr. Bottom – I am concerned about public funds to cover it up and then excavate it later.
- Mr. Phillippe – The sooner it is protected, the better. It would be best to cover it up.
- Mr. King – Can you do work there now?
- Mr. Mansberger – No work can be done there now pending the Section 106 process.
- Ms. Leibowitz – The IHPA position is to protect it ASAP.
- Ms. Martin – Clean fill can not be put there if there is frost/freeze.
- Ms. Haley – Leave that decision up to the experts to protect it and document/film what is happening and during the protection.

A motion was called to vote on covering the site. The vast majority of the group concurred to trust the archaeology experts to decide on what needs to be done with the existing site regarding additional protective cover while the 106 process continues.

- Ms. Leibowitz – With the current boxes (data collected), what is the curation process/length for what you already have?
- Mr. Phillippe – How much time and money will that take for 20-25 boxes? Also, another possibility is to allow that work to be done and display for the public.
- Mr. Mansberger – It would take more than one year. That is currently not funded for it, pending this 106 process. Phase 2 has been funded for the report but not completion of the artifacts to be cleaned, analyzed and cataloged.
- Mr. King – The archaeologists should come together to decide what to do and determine the timeline and cost.
- Ms. Shick – FRA, IHPA, and the City need to come together to determine funding.
- Mr. King – We understand that you should come up with that funding.
- Mr. Bottom – The State has provided \$372,000 toward funding mitigation for this site.
- Mr. King – Language should be considered in any public documentation. A glossary for terms is needed

and plain English used throughout. For example, “avoidance” could sound like nothing is being done when in this context it means to avoid impacts.

Next Steps

Ms. Martin reviewed the next steps:

- Send additional feedback for this meeting (including any comment sheets) to Kristina Miller by July 30, 2015 so that that input can be retained in this meeting summary.
- Draft meeting minutes (for participant review), summary of comments, and the meeting sign-in sheet will be e-mailed to participants and organization representatives by August 10, 2015.
- Meeting materials will be posted on the Springfield Rail website by August 10, 2015 (<http://springfieldrailroad.com/newsite/>) and the Draft Phase 2 Summary will be provided electronically to meeting participants through requests sent to Kristina Miller.
- Review Site Treatment Options and Mitigation Measures.
- Begin Development of the Draft Memorandum of Agreement.

Action Items

- All Meeting Participants –
 - Review this meeting summary and send edit requests with any needed corrections to Kristina Miller as soon as possible.
- Ms. Shick –
 - Draft the letter to Union Pacific and provide it to the meeting participants for review (via distribution by Ms. Miller).
- Ms. Leibowitz –
 - Contact the National Park Service to determine if an application may be submitted for the Underrepresented Community Grant. *(See page 11 for additional information concerning this grant.)*
 - E-mail other state historic preservation offices regarding similar sites for mitigation ideas.
- Mr. Mansberger –
 - Provide the reports to Ms. Miller in individual pdf files of the entire report and by section/chapter to give people download options regarding file sizes.
 - Consult with IHPA to determine immediate site protective measures.
- Ms. Miller –
 - Distribute this draft meeting summary for participant review, address comments, and finalize the summary.
 - Collect requests and provide the reports electronically. *(During the meeting, Ms. Singley and Pastor McLunkins have requested copies during the meeting.)*
 - Include mitigation examples from around the country. *(See list below.)*
 - Distribute the draft letter to Union Pacific.

Examples of Commemorative Projects

- John Hope Franklin Reconciliation Park in Tulsa, OK, commemorating the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921
<http://www.jhfcenter.org/reconciliation-park/>
- Interactive map (and referred to as a new way to teach history), commemorating Tampa's Central Avenue, <http://tampacentralave.org/> - Once the hub of Tampa's African-American community and called "Harlem of the South" in the '40s, '50s and '60s, when it hosted top entertainers and civil rights activists.
- MoDOT will be conducting additional research and providing context on the historical African American community in relation to the Lincoln University President's Home property and the Craftsman/Monastery Historic District per the Memorandum of Agreement signed by MoDOT, FHWA and the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office. The final product will be a report that will be made available to SHPO, Lincoln University and the Missouri River Regional Library. Additional copies shall be provided to the appropriate local historical societies and retained by MoDOT. MoDOT will prepare a pamphlet and presentation based on the Architectural and Archaeological surveys and the report prepared above. These materials can be used by Lincoln University, the Cole County Historical Society, other local organizations and residents in order to preserve and share the history of the area.
http://www.modot.org/central/major_projects/documents/Whitton_DEIS_ExecutiveSummary_ES-1.pdf (Item 16, page E-9.)
- Section 106 Success Stories: http://www.achp.gov/sec106_successes.html
- Case Digest: Section 106 In Action (2012) summary of case studies, <http://www.achp.gov/docs/CaseDigestSpring2012.pdf>

National Park Service - Underrepresented Community Grant

That grant opportunity (referenced on page 7) closed on June 15, 2015. It may be offered again in 2016. In 2014, grants between \$25,000 and \$70,000 were awarded for survey and inventory, or for National Register nominations; however, no archaeology grants were awarded. For more information on this grant opportunity, see: <http://www.nps.gov/preservation-grants/community-grants.html>.

Comments Supplementing Input from the July 23, 2015 Consulting Parties Meeting (July 23, 2015 – August 10, 2015)

One comment sheet that was given to the project team at the July 23 meeting and one e-mail that was sent to Ms. Martin immediately following the meeting are summarized below. No additional comments have been sent to Ms. Miller prior to distribution of this draft meeting summary.

Mitchell Johnson (Memorial Medical Center and Mid-Illinois Medical Center)

Mr. Johnson noted **support** for the following:

- preserving (in place) as much of the site as possible,
- preserving (in place) as many house foundations as possible (if the entire site cannot be preserved),
- utilizing the preserved site to tell the story of the 1908 Race Riot,
- display artifacts from the site at a future multi-modal transportation facility located on the 10th Street Rail line,
- mural on the 10th Street underpass along Carpenter Street,
- plaques at or near the site,
- interpretive park at or near the site, and
- educational curriculum for area students and/or history scholars.

Mr. Johnson stated that he does **not support**:

- physically removing and relocating the foundations of the homes to another site in the community due to the cost.

Jerry Jacobson (Save Old Springfield)

Mr. Jacobson would like to clarify that he voted "Nay" (leading into the vote to proceed with the items listed on the Flip Chart on page 8) to avoid or excavate as it did not provide for a Plan B or Plan C. Specifically, he

supports:

- providing a plan to preserve the site for public viewing (in an appropriate setting) whether or not avoidance is possible;
- if the site is avoided, then excavate in part to obtain more information and then preserve for public viewing in an appropriate setting;

Mr. Jacobson noted that:

- "Two plans were presented should avoidance not be possible, and following further excavation: Mr. McNeese suggested moving the site to another location in the Badlands; I recommended consideration of finding another similar, preferably nearby site from the 1908 Riot, excavating it, and preserving it for public viewing, in an appropriate secure and attractive setting."

Carolyn Farrar (Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Springfield-Decatur Area Alumnae Chapter)

Ms. Farrar **supports:**

- preserving "all or a significant portion of the Carpenter Street Underpass archeological site and the African American heritage that it represents."



Springfield Rail Improvements Project: Carpenter Street Underpass
Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting
Please Sign-In

July 23, 2015

PLEASE PRINT!

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME
Kevin	SEALS
Lesa	Brannan
Laura	Shick
Kristina	Miller
JERRY	JACOBSON
JOSH	Collins
Wes	McNeese
Irma	Wallace
Douglas	King
STEVE	MYERS

Redaction Note:
Addresses have been omitted
from this summary.



Springfield Rail Improvements Project: Carpenter Street Underpass
Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting
Please Sign-In

July 23, 2015

PLEASE PRINT!

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME
CHRIS	Hamberger
Alice	Ramey
Amy	Bulpitt
Chuck	Lucore
Kim	LUZ
Dan	Olejniczak
Jim	DIXON
TERRY	MARTIN
Matt	Butcher
Linda	HAYES

Redaction Note:
Addresses have been omitted
from this summary.



Springfield Rail Improvements Project: Carpenter Street Underpass
Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting
Please Sign-In

July 23, 2015

PLEASE PRINT!

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME
FRANK	BUTTERFIELD
JERRIE	BLAKELY
Teresa	Halley
Joe	Phillippe
David	Halpin

Redaction Note:
Addresses have been omitted
from this summary.



Springfield Rail Improvements Project: Carpenter Street Underpass
Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting
Please Sign-In

July 23, 2015

PLEASE PRINT!

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME
Row	LADLEY
Nathan	Bottom
Mitch	Johnson
Yvonne	Singley
T. Ray	McJunkins
Rachel	Leibowitz

Redaction Note:
Addresses have been omitted
from this summary.

Comment Sheet

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act Consulting Parties
July 23, 2015 - Additional Meeting Input



* Please Print *

Name: Mitchell L. Johnson

Organization / Interest in the Resource: Memorial Medical Center and Mid-Illinois Medical Center

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

E-mail Address: [REDACTED]

- 1) Do you have any comments/questions that were not shared during the meeting?
- 2) Would you like to provide additional detail about a comment you provided during the meeting?

I support preserving as much of the site as possible while completing the 10th Street Rail Consolidation. If the entire site cannot be preserved, I support preserving as many house foundations as possible (even 1 or 2) and utilize the preserved site to tell the story of the 1908 Race Riots effectively. I like the recommendation of the NAACP to display artifacts from the site at a future multi-modal transportation facility located on the 10th Street Rail line. I also support other recommendations from other participant consulting parties including a mural on the 10th Street underpass on Carpenter Street, plaques at or near the site and possibly an interpretive park of some sort at or near the site, along with some educational curriculum for area students and/or history scholars.

I do not support physically removing and relocating the foundations of the homes to another site in the community due to the cost.

Zimbra**kmiller@rkk.com**

FW: Carpenter St.

From : andrea martin _____

Mon, Jul 27, 2015 02:57 PM

Subject : FW: Carpenter St.**To :** _____

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Jacobson _____

Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 8:40 PM

To: Martin, Andrea (FRA)

Subject: Carpenter St.

Hi:

Thanks for the good meeting today.

I can't make the August meeting, but I wanted to make the following comments, which I'd like to reach all consulting parties and others who attended today:

I voted "Nay" on the motion re:avoid or excavate @ it did not provide for a "Plan B" or C, i.e, how to provide for preserving the site for public viewing (in an appropriate setting) whether or not avoidance is possible. Should the site be avoided, then it should be excavated in part to obtain more information and then preserved for public viewing in an appropriate setting. Two plans were presented should avoidance not be possible, and following further excavation: Mr. McNeese suggested moving the site to another location in the Badlands; I recommended consideration of finding another similar, preferably nearby site from the 1908 Riot, excavating it, and preserving it for public viewing, in an appropriate secure and attractive setting.

--Jerry

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

Zimbra

Archaeological Project Regarding the Carpenter Street Underpass

From : cfarrar _____

Mon, Aug 03, 2015 03:33 PM

Subject : Archaeological Project Regarding the Carpenter
Street Underpass**To :** _____**Kristina Miller**

I am requesting that every effort should be made to preserve all or a significant portion of the Carpenter Street Underpass archeological site, and the African American heritage that it represents.

I am personally interested in the project and hope that it can be preserved.

Thank you.

Carolyn Farrar

