

Summary

Grindstaff, Mark

From: Richard Cloues [Richard_Cloues@dnr.state.ga.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 3:25 PM
To: Grindstaff, Mark
Cc: Elizabeth Shirk; Ray Luce
Subject: Fort Attaway

Mark! I think Betsy's e-mail message to you has been misunderstood. Nobody is trying to "blind-side" you; if we were, we wouldn't have asked for a meeting before sending out a formal response to your report. And nobody is questioning your credentials as a historian or implying that your report wasn't worth the time or effort; indeed, several staff here including myself continue to believe that you have produced a most complex and thought-provoking report. The point of Betsy's e-mail was simply to propose a get-together to talk through some concerns that Ray has raised in his reading of the report. I don't think that qualifies as "holding a meeting without GDOT's participation" (in fact, I'm confused about what you meant by this, unless you're referring to Betsy's and my meeting with Ray? it seems like this hardly qualifies as a "meeting" but rather a simply in-house staff discussion).

Ray raised three issues that we thought should be discussed with you before deciding where to go with them. The first had to do with what Ray perceived as the "tone" of your report--he thought the report was pretty aggressive in going after local historians and their interpretations, and he raised a red flag about this possibly fanning the flames rather than resolving issues--or that in fanning the flames, the issues would be overlooked. The second was Ray's concern about the very real possibility that third parties might seize upon the questions you raise about the location of Fort Attaway and question the validity of DOT's initial studies leading to considering the site eligible in the first place, which could certainly throw a monkey wrench into the section 106 process. The third was Ray's idea that, in light of the strongly entrenched positions on the issues surrounding Fort Attaway that the various parties have taken, it might be in DOT's interests to have an "independent" historical review--meant in a non-pejorative way with regard to anyone's professional qualifications, just "independent" in terms of not being closely affiliated with any of the involved parties, so that no one can raise this as a side-show issue and deflect attention from the real issues involved with completing the Section 106 process for this project.

Again, all we wanted to do was to get together to talk about these issues. Just you and us, nobody else, to see what we all think and what the best course of action might be to get this project through the compliance process.

*Current -
to be
resolved
interests
and
issues
are
related
to
compliance
1/5*

*Already
has*

*407-657-8480
M.M.*

- *disclaimers?*
- *3/15/04 compliance deadline*
- *independent picture*
- *How 1. tone is down?*
- *Reasons for tonight down?*

*Why is S.H.I.P.O of
D.O.T. Having secret
meeting to meet compliance
with 106*