

**Arlington National Cemetery Monument Removal**  
**Consulting Party Meeting**  
**20 September 2023 @ 3pm**  
**Virtual Meeting Hosted on Zoom**

**Moderator:** Hello everyone. While we wait, please type your name, role, and organization/affiliation into the chat box (reply to "Everyone"). For those on the phone, we will call on you during roll call by your phone number to get your name and organization/affiliation.

This meeting will begin promptly at 3 pm Eastern time. Thank you for joining us today.

**COL Wiker:** Good Afternoon everyone. Thank you for attending this meeting of consulting parties regarding the Confederate Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery. If you haven't already, please write your name, role, and the organization you represent in the chat box. For those on the phone, we will call on you during roll call by your phone number to get your name and organization/affiliation. Next chart please.

If you are interested in using closed captions, we'd ask that you, you look at the instructions on the chart and click the captions button on your mobile or the show captions button, which will show up on your computer. And then as people speak, the closed caption will appear at the bottom of your screen. If you would like to, you can then click the button again to turn off the captioning. I'll give you a second to look at the screen so you can follow if you like. Next chart please.

Before we discuss the project at Arlington National Cemetery, I want to set out some ground rules and etiquette for this meeting.

First, all attendees should keep their microphone and camera off until they are called on to speak. Once called, you will have the ability to unmute your microphone and turn on your camera. At that time, each person will have the same allotted amount of time to speak. Only one individual per consulting party will be allowed to provide oral comments during this meeting. All others will be in listen-only mode. If the spokesperson would like to cede the remainder of their time to another spokesperson or subject matter expert, they may, but they will not receive additional time to speak. If a party has no comment on a topic, please "pass" when you are called on.

Please be courteous and respectful of other's opinions and statements. All voices are equally valued. But please respect the personal truth of others. Set aside judgments and assumptions. This meeting aims to receive input from a diverse group of interested parties, each with their own valuable perspective.

I would like to stress that if anyone makes rude or inappropriate comments, they will be warned through the chat box and may be removed from this Zoom meeting and will not be allowed to re-enter if the actions continue.

The audio and visual portions of this meeting are being recorded, and a transcript is being written to help with the writing of the draft EIS. If you do not wish to be part of the public record of this meeting, please do not make any comments (written or verbal) during the meeting.

Lastly, should you have any issues hearing or seeing the presentations, entering questions into the chat box, or for any other technical issues with Zoom, please type your issue into the chat box. Those on the phone should try one of the other numbers in your Zoom email confirmation if you have difficulties. Next chart please.

**COL Wiker:** First, I would like to introduce myself and the other presenter. I am COL Wiker, the Arlington National Military Cemetery Director of Engineering. My co-presenter this afternoon is Ms. Caitlin Smith, the Arlington National Military Cemetery Cultural Resources Program Manager, and our compliance lead for the NHPA Section 106 efforts.

If you have not done so yet, I invite you to visit the project website. The website is shown on this slide:

<https://www.arlingtoncemetery.mil/About/Confederate-Memorial-Removal>.

The project website hosts all information gathered to date including the project scope, all consultation with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office, the Confederate Memorial Phase II Survey Report, and the Public Comment Form, among many other pieces of information.

There is also a project email, that has been included here. Although we will accept comments received through the email address, I encourage you to access the comment form that will once again be accessible from the project website starting on September 29: and that email is [anc-commemorative-works@army.mil](mailto:anc-commemorative-works@army.mil). I'll leave the email and website up so you can write it down. Next chart please.

**COL Wiker:** Our agenda is shown on this slide.

First, we will have introductions and a roll call of attendees. Then, we will lay out for you the role of our consulting parties and what the expectations are for your participation. Next, we will provide an overview of the project and briefly describe the Section 106 process and where we are currently at in that process. It is during this segment that we will ask for comments on various aspects of the Section 106 process.

And then following the comment period, we will go over the next steps for the Section 106 planning process.

At this time I am going to turn it over to Ms. Caitlin Smith, our Cultural Resources Program Manager. Next slide.

**Caitlin:** Good afternoon. So, on this slide you will be seeing a listing of organizations and affiliations represented today during this consulting parties meeting. Hopefully you will see your name on this list. I believe uh it's on more than one slide. So if you do not see your name yet we'll show you the next one in just a second. This list is largely alphabetical. We're going to do a brief roll call in a moment to check that everyone is on the list, and everyone is in attendance. This again is not the list, as noted in

the email, this is not everyone who has been invited as a consulting party, this is everyone who accepted the invite to today's meeting. So, I'm going to be calling out your organization's name and if we can have the main POC for each organization, just raise your hand and put a note in the chat, we'll just do our roll call that way. Due to the large number of participants it will be difficult to do a verbal roll call. So we're going to do it virtually through the chat. If you are on the phone though when I call out uh when we call out your organization we're going to ask you to unmute yourself, state your name, role, and organization/affiliation so that we know you are represented and we can track your participation in this meeting. Everyone else online if you haven't already done so, please enter your information in the chat box, your name, your role, your organization/affiliation. So go ahead and do that now and then I'm going to real quick run through this list one by one.

We just updated this based on registrations as of 2pm. Let us know if you are not represented.

- American Institute for Conservation (AIC)
- Americans for the Arts Public Arts Network
- American Battlefield Trust
- Arlington County Government, Historic Preservation Department
- American Historical Association
- Arlington Historical Society
- Arlington House Family Circle
- Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)
- Defend Arlington
- I believe we have an individual representing Defend Arlington; Veterans Defending Arlington; and Heritage Protection of North Alabama
- Relatives of Moses Ezekiel
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 3
- Guardians of American History
- Heritage Protection of North Alabama
- Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office
- Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
- Missouri State Historic Preservation Office
- Monument Lab
- Monumental Task Committee (MTC)
- Mr. Ernest Blevins
- And apologies if I mispronounce anyone's name. Mr. Gene Kizer - Charleston Athenaeum Press
- Mr. David McCallister
- Mr. Ted Ehmann
- National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)
- National Park Service - George Washington Memorial Parkway
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
- I'm not exactly sure how to pronounce this, Policialite, apologies
- Preservation Virginia
- Save Southern Heritage
- Sons of Confederate Veterans
- Southern Legal Resource Center

We have several sons of confederate veterans who have opted to represent themselves

- Maryland Division
  - Beaufort Plowboys, SCV Camp 2128
  - N.B. Forest Camp #3
  - Virginia Division
  - Tennessee Division
  - Friends of Judah P. Benjamin
  - South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
  - Southern Legal Resource Center
  - Southern Poverty Law Center
  - The American Jewish Historical Society
  - The Organization of American Historians
  - The Society for the Preservation of Jewish Civil War History
  - The Virginia Council
  - U.S. Army Center for Military History
  - United Daughters of the Confederacy
  - Veterans Defending Arlington
  - Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
  - Virginia Department of Historic Resources
  - Virginia Military Institute
  - New Jersey Flaggers
- We have Virginia on there twice. Well they are very important.
- Virginia Department of Historic Resources
  - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

So those are all of the organizations we are tracking. Obviously if you represent an organization that's not on that list, please enter that information into the chat so we are tracking it. And as you can see we'll be using the chat quite a bit today. So, as Col. Wiker has already mentioned, please we'll try to keep it organized and efficient in there since we will need that to pull information as we go through, as we go through this process today. Well, thank you all very much for being in attendance.

I appreciate everyone taking time today to join us for this consulting party meeting. You have been invited to this meeting as potential consulting parties so ANMC can consult with those individuals and organizations that have a stake in the process and outcome of the Confederate Memorial Removal Project. We are soliciting thoughts, ideas, and suggestions to properly analyze and move through each step of the Section 106 process. We will eventually seek comments regarding potential mitigations for the development of an agreement document such as a Programmatic Agreement or a Memorandum of Agreement. Our purpose of this meeting is strictly dedicated to discussions regarding the identification of historic properties. As that is the step we currently are in.

I first want to go over the criteria one is required to meet to be a consulting party. This criteria has been developed with guidance from the National Historic Preservation Act. And this set of criteria is outlined on this slide. To be a consulting party, one must have proven legal interest or a relationship to the project or affected property. An example of this would be an owner, donor, or creator of affected property. You might also have a proven economic interest or relationship to the project or affected property - such as evidence of direct financial impact related to the removal. You might have, you might represent a historic preservation interest as an organization or individual. You might be a subject matter expert or an official representative of public interest group in historic or cultural

resource preservation. Examples might be a historic expert in public, an expert in public memorials or Confederate memorials, cemeteries and grave sites, an expert in public art, an expert on the sculptor, in this case, Moses Ezekial, an expert on African American history, on Jewish-American history, or on historic and cultural landscapes. You might represent a local historical society commission or local preservation group. Finally the last criteria one could qualify under is as any party including applicants, licensees, or permittees, that may have responsibilities under an agreement, they must also be invited to participate, in order to reach the agreement. So please understand that consulting parties can be added or removed by ANMC throughout the entire Section 106 process. Currently, the agency will consider all written requests from individuals and organizations asking to participate as consulting parties.

The Section 106 process allows for the entry of new consulting parties throughout the process, if the agency, State Historic Preservation Office, in this case, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, the DHR, and in some cases, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, if they agree. If there's not agreement, parties may seek the ACHP's opinion on the above. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** For the purposes of Section 106, there are three types of consulting parties: entitled, invited, and concurring.

It is important to know where you and your organization stands during the process in developing an agreement. Most of you will fall within the concurring consulting party status.

As part of the Section 106 Process, we have those groups that are entitled to participate as consulting parties. This includes the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Offices, and Federally-Recognized Tribes. These groups have the sole authority to execute, amend or terminate any agreement between the parties. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** The second type of consulting party are the Invited Signatories. These parties have the same rights to seeking amendment or termination of an agreement document as other signatories. These parties include:

- Local governments
- Applicants for federal funds, licenses, permits, and/or other approvals
- Individual or organization directly adversely affected, or
- Any party that assumes a responsibility under an agreement document.

I must note that not all consulting parties will be invited to be signatories to an agreement document. I must also note that refusal of an invited signatory to sign does not prevent the agreement from taking effect. Next slide.

The third type of consulting party is the concurring consulting party. These do not have the rights of signatories and include all other consulting parties.

These parties have participated in the Section 106 process and may be invited to sign the document as concurring parties. Their approval is not needed to execute, amend, or terminate an agreement document. Signing as a concurring

party is primarily a way to express agreement with the contents of the document and acceptance of the outcome of the process. As consulting parties, we are looking to all of you, for you to share your views; review documentation to support consultation, offer ideas, and consider possible solutions for the outcome of this project. However, ANMC is not obligated to carry out the preferences and recommendations of invited consulting parties. Next slide.

As most of you know, the proposed project is for the removal of a monument that commemorates the Confederate States of America from Arlington National Cemetery. ANMC, the agency, is mandated by Congress to remove the bronze elements of the Memorial by January 1, 2024. The granite base and foundation will remain in place to minimize the risk of inadvertent disturbance to graves.

There are no remains under the memorial and the remains of those buried near or in the section will be protected and will not be relocated.

ANMC understands that the removal of the Confederate Memorial must be conducted in a manner that ensures the safety of the people who work at and visit the cemetery, while also protecting surrounding graves and monuments. The entire process, including disposition, must occur according to applicable laws, policies, and regulations.

If you wish to know more about the specific details of the Memorial itself, please visit our website, which is listed on the slide. And refer to the other documents that were sent to you in various links in your invite to this meeting. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** ANMC is currently executing a coordinated NEPA and NHPA compliance effort, to ensure our federal agency meets the requirements of all applicable laws, policies, and regulations.

Before undertaking a federal action, all federal agencies, including the Army, must ensure compliance with NEPA, also known as the National Environmental Policy Act. This ensures that all federal agencies explore reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, that potential impacts to the environment are thoroughly analyzed, and that the public has an opportunity to provide input.

ANMC is analyzing the environmental impacts that could result from implementing the proposed action or any reasonable alternatives. The agency does this by developing an Environmental Impact Statement, also referred to as an EIS, for the project. In this case, the impacts are related to:

- The decision to remove the bronze elements,
- the disassembly of the bronze elements from the stone base, and
- the storage of the bronze elements

We are currently in the process of preparing a draft EIS. We are soliciting comments and discussion from the consulting parties with regards to potential impacts to historic properties on the disassembly and storage. These discussions will feed into the preparation of the EIS as well as any potential mitigations under Section 106.

The Army must comply with the NEPA and NHPA requirements prior to any determination being made as to a final disposition of the monument, including the possibility of transfer to a third party such as Virginia Military Institute. While we are aware of Gov. Younkin's interest in the possible transfer of the Memorial to a third party such as the Virginia Military Institute, the focus of today's discussion needs to center on the identification of historic properties. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** ANMC has determined that the proposed monument removal is a federal undertaking with the potential to cause adverse effects on historic properties, and therefore has begun the Section 106 process.

The first step was for ANMC to initiate the Section 106 process with the Virginia stage historic preservation, otherwise known as the Department of Historic Resources or DHR.

In this step we began identifying potential consulting parties and engaged the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The ACHP, the Federal Agency, responsible for historic preservation issues for assistance with the section 106 process. ANMC then issued an invitation to those consulting parties and the public through social media, our website and local news outlets. This occurred with the NOI on August 4th. ANMC also initiated the next steps, the identification of historic properties. And we are. This meeting represents one of the final steps in it, concluding one of the final actions, we need to conclude that step, the identification of historic properties. We are starting to think about the next step, which is the assessment of effects.

The fourth and final step in the section 106 process displayed on this slide is the resolution of effects. In this final step. The agency and consulting parties find that there are, if we find there are adverse effects to historic properties, then the agency and consulting parties must work together to reach agreement on a resolution. To do this, the agency must explore measures to avoid, mitigate, minimize effects to historic properties, and reach agreement with the State preservation officer, and in this case the ACHP.

If they agree on how to resolve the effects, they then formalize this in an MOA, a memorandum of agreement, or perhaps a programmatic agreement, a PA. An executed and implemented MOA or PA are legally binding agreements that contain the stipulations and mitigations the Federal agency must carry out, in order to proceed with the project undertaking.

Throughout the entire section 106 process, the Federal agency must consider public views and concerns about historic preservation issues for more information on this project, or to provide a written comment. Please visit our website, or send your comment to the commemorative works email.

The results of our section 106 process are an important component, also the NEPA and NEPA EIS. The process will feed information on impacts to cultural resources into that environmental impact statement. And that is why we are working on these two compliance efforts in conjunction. Next Slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** So we are currently in the second step of the section 106 process, the identification of historic properties. And we're looking to move on to the third step, assessment of effects.

First, one must understand what a historic property is for us to discuss this. Historic properties are only those properties, either listed or eligible to the National register of historic places, in this case. To identify all historic properties within the area of potential effect, otherwise known as the APE. The agency develops this in concurrence with the State historic Preservation office. In this case the DHR. The APE is the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations to the character or use of historic properties. This includes the location where the project may be visible and or audible.

Our original APE was concurred on upon by the DHR. However, during the scoping period we've received comments requesting that the APE be re-examined. And so Arlington National Cemetery has taken those into consideration and we have decided to expand the APE to a wider area. So we've determined that there's essentially two APE's, one for direct effects and one for indirect effects. This slide shows the original APE, which really covers the direct effects to historic properties. Examples would include removal, physical destruction, or alteration of a property from its historic location. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** this slide shows the APE of the larger APE we are now considering, which includes the boundaries of the entire Arlington National Cemetery Historic district.

This includes some direct but mostly indirect effects. It includes visual atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant or historic features, and the removal of a contributing property from the historic district.

So I'll give you some quick examples of what indirect effects might be. These might be atmospheric effects if we were building something like a new incinerator. Audible impacts would be noise from construction, or in the cases of where an airports being built, it might be the noise from flight paths. Visual effects would be changes to view sheds. When you add or remove something, an example would be when cell towers can be seen from many miles away.

So in our case, the proposed removal of the Confederate memorial would result in the removal of a cultural resource from within the historic district. This would change the use and design in Section sixteen where the memorial sits. However, the removal of the memorial would not change the overall use and integrity of the ANC Historic district. Next slide.

**Caitlin Smith:** All historic properties within an adjacent to the APE that may be affected by the undertaking, must be identified in this step of the section 106 process. Historic properties within and adjacent to the APE, include the Arlington National Cemetery Historic District, the Arlington House Historic District, Fort Myer Historic District, and the Confederate Memorial.

VDHR, our State Historic Preservation Office, recently concurred that the Confederate Memorial is individually eligible to the National Register of Historic Places.

In addition, there are historic structures and features that contribute to these historic districts, which are located within or adjacent to the APE.



The indirect effects, historic properties within the area of indirect effects include contributing features and structures within the viewshed of the proposed undertaking, and this slide provides this list of properties that are visible to and from the Confederate memorial.

There are no known archaeological resources within the APE, and the project does not include any ground disturbance. Next slide, please.

**Caitlin Smith:** So, at this time I would like to solicit your comments on this step of the section 106 process. Before anyone raises a hand, please let me go over the instructions and our specific questions to the group. And so, if you still have your hand up from earlier if you can take those down that'll help us. We'll need those. We'll need that feature available when we start calling on individuals and organizations.

So, when it is, time of when we call on you, if you wish to provide a comment, please follow the process on the slide, which is that all attendees should keep their microphone and camera off until they are called on to speak. All parties will have the same amount of time to speak.

We ask that only one representative from your organization provides an oral comment. Due to the high number of attendees, we do not have available time to permit everyone to speak. However, everyone is allowed to leave comments in the chat box. If you have one spokesperson, and they would like to cede the remainder of their time to another subject matter expert they may, but Your organization will not receive additional time to speak.

Each speaker will have approximately one minute for their response. Then we will need to move on to the next consulting party.

In the zoom meeting controls you will be clicking on the raised hand icon. I've seen most of you have already figured that out. When your name is called. You're going to come off mute and turn on your camera. If you have it, state your full name and organization and provide your response to the question.

Once you've finished your response or your one minute has expired, you will be placed back on mute.

If a party has no comment on a topic, please pass when you were called on.

If you called in directly from your phone to join this meeting, you will need to Press Star nine to virtually raise your hand, and that will let the meeting host know where to find you.

And again everyone can choose to write your response in the chat box rather than providing an oral comment.

Again, we ask that you please be courteous and respectful of others opinions and statements. All voices are equally valued. Please respect the personal truths of others. We're going to set aside judgments and assumptions. Our meeting aims to receive a input from a diverse group of interested parties, each with their own valuable perspective.

At this time Mr. Buller, our Associate Deputy General Counsel for the Department of the Army Office of the General Council would like to say a few words. Mr. Buller.

**Justin Buller:** Good afternoon to everybody. My name is Justin Buller. I am from the Army General Council's office, and I've been asked to offer a couple of clarifying comments with regards to the purpose for today's meeting. Very specifically, the purpose of this meeting is not to discuss opposition to or the belief in favor of removal of the monument. That decision was made nearly a year ago by Congress. They have mandated the Department of Offence to take this action, and this is a nondiscretionary action by the Department of Defense. Therefore, still it the purpose of this meeting will not be served by you, stating your opposition to or support for removal.

And, further, the purpose of this meeting is not to determine disposition of the memorial. As something in the future, that may be a point of one of these meetings. But at this time is not the point. I appreciate everybody's time and attendance in this meeting. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you, Mr. Buller. Next slide. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Our first question to the consulting parties is, we'll first we'll take a quick poll. We'll let you test that on raised hand feature first. We'll see if we can get raised hands for organizations and individuals who concur with the APE or the list of historic properties you can raise your hand.

Thank you.

You can also enter your concurrence in the chat. So we'll give a moment to collect those.

Thank you, and then we can take those hands down.

Thank you. So, if you can take those hands down. Great, Okay.

If you do not concur with the APE or the list of historic properties, you'd like to raise your hands or you can enter your non-concurrence in the chat.

Thank you, noting your comments on the chat.

So this is our first and we'll, I'm going to leave that up for a second so we can get a snapshot of non-concurrence.

So this is the first question that we are putting before the group, whether you do or do not concur with the APE or list of historic properties. How would you or your organization redefine the APE, or which historic properties do you feel must be included in our analysis of effects?

Please remember, the APE includes direct effects and indirect effects, and indirect effects may be atmospheric, audible, or visible.

We will give everyone a chance in a moment to speak.

But presumably we would preserve most of the time for organizations that do not agree with the APE or the identification of historic properties, so they can explain their non-concurrence.

Remember that only one spokesperson who may provide verbal comments per consulting party for the sake of time, and that we're currently going to have a one minute time limit for your response.

Alright, And, uh, so do we still have our non-concurring parties up.

**Caitlin Smith:** Let me see the best way for me to call on individuals. I think the easiest way for me to do it is actually a roll call. Or actually, I see four hands up. That seem accurate? There were seven earlier. Okay. So, if you can put your hands up again for those who do not concur. I see eight. Okay. All right. So I will, trying to view the eight. Okay.

**Caitlin Smith:** Going to then call on each of those individuals who have their hands up one at a time. And I'm seeing eight individuals. If when you, when I call on you, if you can unmute and again, please identify yourself and your organization, and then you'll have more minute to provide your comment.

Again, apologies, if I mispronounce names, feel free to correct me. The first hand up I see is Wade, Alfred, you can come off mute.

Wayde Alford: I think the APE Is everywhere that Section Sixteen can be viewed from, and that's better about it for my opinion.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you. I'm sorry. Can you identify who you represent to all.

Wayde Alford: Guardians of American history

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you, sir, Appreciate it. Thank you for that comment. And then the second hand I see up is Vincent Balducci. You can come off mute.

**Vincent Balducci:** Yes, Vincent Balducci from New Jersey Flaggers, and a quick comment is that the area of permitted effects APE has yet to be finally determined, and that is, the army has not considered the memorial itself as a contributing resource to a broader monument core and part of the Washington Monumental Corridor Master Plan, as explained in the defend Arlington comments. As explained the views from Mount Vernon through the capital must be included in the NPHA area of potential effects. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you very much for your comment. Uh. The next hand, I see is Gene Kaiser Junior. You can come off mute. Mr. Kaiser.

**Gene Kizer Jr:** Can you hear me. Okay, great. Um, I think the APE is much too small that it should include the entire Washington Monumental Corridor Master Plan. And also our Ernie Blevins, a scholar of ah monuments of this period, said that the Confederate Memorial is really the headstone of the entire Confederacy. So, really the APE is really the entire country, the entire South at least. So, and I'd also like to make the comment that we didn't really have a lot of time to prepare our comments with only, you know a few hours of notice. I would love to have submitted a written comment, but the time period was only three hours from the notification. So, that's my comment.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. The next hand I see is William Mason.

**William Mason:** Can you hear me?

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes

**William Mason:** my name is William Mason. I'm the Vice president of the Monumental Task Committee. We're a nonprofit organization in South Louisiana that preserves and maintains all monuments, statues in this area. I'm also a retired US Army Lieutenant Colonel, with twenty eight years of service. The APE should include, to be thorough, not only any memorial or monument in Arlington National Cemetery, but all monuments and memorials nationwide to include the entire country everywhere because if it's good for one area, it should be good for everything.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Thank you for your comment and your service. The next hand I see is Ann Maclean.

**Ann McLean:** Hi. Can you hear me?

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes,

**Ann McLean:** um, thank you for the opportunity to speak. The APE should include everything that was in the Macmillan Olmsted plan. It should be much wider with George Washington National Parkway. This was all part of a complete program. To memorialize the healing and the reconciliation of the United States after the war between the States had finished, and after the Spanish-american war, so that this area needs to be expanded. And that's my comment.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you. And can you please state who you represent?

**Ann McLean:** yes, I represent the Virginia Council.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you.

**Ann McLean:** Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** The next hand is David Mcallister.

**David McCallister:** Hi I'm David Mcallister, with the friends of Judah P. Benjamin and I agree with the previous speakers that the area of potential effect is really much broader at the minimum, including the entire United States, because this particular memorial ties together all the other memorials at national parks, especially battlefields. Anything that has to do with the war between the States, and it actually has a world wide effect, because it affects the perception of Jewish artists worldwide. That's why Judah P. Benjamin friends are is particularly interesting.

You know, a A focus of the national attention was the vision of Mckinley when he initiated this entire project. APE is much broader than just the circumference of Arlington National Cemetery. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Next Jenny Wadowski.

**Jinny Widowski:** hi my name is Jenny Woodowski, I'm President of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. At this time I believe that this should be the APE should include all areas. As this was a monument to bring our country together after the war. It was to bring healing and peace, and at this point in time we need to put this on the historical registry in 1907 the daughters

took on this project that was approved by four Presidents along with the Arlington National Cemetery every step of the way to build this and to put this in this section, and I believe that we need to have more time on this, and to be able to look at it so that we can continue what President Mckinley started back then. So please take in our our words, and I hope that we hear some positive things.

Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Next up Edward Phillips.

**H. Edward Phillips III:** Hello! This is H. Edward Phillips. I am the national public affairs officer of sons of Confederate veterans, and I do believe that the APE should be expanded, and the rationale for that is in Section sixteen. Where the monument resides, the reconciliation memorial, there are Confederate Service members, veterans, who are American veterans. They represent each and every Confederate State or former Confederate State. I should say. So to me logically, even on the memorial itself, it names and lists each one of those States. think those State SHPOs should be involved. I believe we haven't had any commentary from them. It's one of those, it's going to impact there, you know, residents, their citizens, because their citizens are people who descend from some of the men who are buried in Section Sixteen, and some of the spouses as well. So, I think, to just narrowly define it and keep it limited to ANC itself is too small of an area, because I think this impact each one of these states has a quote-unquote dog in the hunt. They should be able to come here and provide commentary and try to help move the ball forward.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. Thank you. Next, Kirk Lyons. Kirk Lyons. I can come back to you.

**Kirk D. Lyons:** Ah, I'm out. Okay, Great Kirk D Lyons of the Southern Legal resource center. I'm a director. Um The APE should be broadened. This the Confederate reconciliation memorial is of national and international importance. Moses Ezekiel was the first in internationally acclaimed, Um Jewish American sculptor, of the late nineteenth Century. This is his masterpiece. It's an art treasure. If the Nazis had demolished this during World War II they'd have been prosecuted in Neuremburg as a episode of cultural genocide. So this, monument needs to be protected. To remove it would be to desecrate four hundred graves, and it's certainly the headstone of Moses Ezekiel, and should not be root for that. Remember that reason which is was beyond the mandate of the National Defense authorization, naming Commission's recommendations.

So, also this is putting the cart before the horse. This process should have been going on before Secretary Austin made his decision, his so-called nondiscretionary decision. It is a discretionary decision. There are reasons that it should not be taken down. And this process is is an example of one of those reasons. This should have been done before his decision, not after. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Mark Buchanan.

**Mark Buchanan:** I'm, All uh, can you hear me now?

**Mark Buchanan:** Thank you for the opportunity. Secretary Austin directed the DoD to adopt the naming commission's recommendations before the decision to

do the NEPA process. And this environmental impact statement must consider the political motives that came along with all of this. Decisions made us on political motives of the day and have a significant impact on the historic cultural environment of our American people. Arlington is where this monument belongs. Where it stands and what it represents cannot be adequately replicated in any other location. It creates a dangerous precedent. That's why the APE needs to be expanded, because this will have an effect on the fact of moving ah future monuments from Federal lands. I'm currently out in South Dakota right now, and there are people there who fought and killed federal troops out here, and their monument is located on the battlefield right next to the National Monument. There a little bit more. This could affect that location as well. Leave the reconciliation monumental alone.

Deal with the real issues facing our country. Don't, allow a temporary political agenda to ruin our precious national treasures there, or a little big horn, or any other place across the United States.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. So, I see one more hand for the non-concurrence Uh, James shillinglaw.

**James Shillinglaw:** Can you hear me? I'm not used to this kind of A platform. My name is James Shillinglaw. I'm a save Southern heritage. I'm one of the founding members uh twenty year Navy veteran, and I do not occur with this. I think the time schedule is very quick for such an historic monument, you know, and even if you for or against it, we need more time to work with this, you know I don't really agree with VMI getting it, Because, VMI has nothing to do with this monument. Um, I think if you're going to do anything where they give it back to the Sons of Confederate veterans. But i'm sure i'm a life member of Sons of Confederate veterans. I'm sure they would agree to keep it in place.

I think it's a very historical monument. I don't think it has any kind of impact where it's at.

We've always been told take the Confederate monuments out of public view. Put them in the cemetery where the soldiers are, and that's exactly where this monument is, and the platform of save southern heritage is, the monument should be with the Confederate soldiers exactly where it's at. And now we're against this timeline that you've put us on. We would like to extend more timeline, or have more dialogue, or understand more of this APE that you come up with and we have no understanding of who it's supposed to impact anyways. If there's a victim of this monument, we would love to meet this person.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. I see John Coffindaffer. Lieutenant Colonel John Coffindaffer.

**Caitlin Smith:** It looks like you're un-muted. Oh, no, you're on mute again, Sir, are you able to speak otherwise, I'll come back to you. I'm going to move on for a second and come back to you, James Shillinglaw. I'm sorry we already spoke to you. If you can take your hand down my apologies, trying to keep up.

**Caitlin Smith:** Lieutenant Colonel Coffindaffer. It looks like you're un-muted. But I'm not hearing you. Going to move on again. If you're having technical issues and want to enter your question or comment in the chat, we can try to assist you. The next hand I see is LM Siegel.

**IM Siegel:** Can you hear me? Thank you for recognizing me to speak today. I'm going to speak, but personally, not as the group today. I'm having a really hard time controlling my emotions. Being part of a Jewish family, I am shocked, horrified by what i'm seeing in this country, we're having uniformed officers saying that they were mandated to do something. Which is, that is not true. It's just not true. This is a grave marker. It marks five hundred graves and the artist. This is a scary time in our country, when the uniformed officers would be trying to enact such an illegal law with such widespread worldwide consequences. How do you narrow anti-semitism down to a mile a circular square mile with a little rectangles sticking out of it? I'm just hope. I'm horrified. And how come no one has heard about this. You've given us less than four hours to respond with comments.

Ah, this is this is Gestapo tactics without any so civil restraint happening. This is scary very scary. I'm horrified. I can't really say anything else other than this is shocking. It's shocking.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Thank you, Team. Yes. So I hear that, Karen Bennett, you have your hand raised. Would you like to speak?

**Karen Bennett:** Yeah, thank you, Caitlin, this is Karen Bennett. I'm speaking on behalf of the Defend Arlington um due to the one-minute time limit. I'm not going to um speak to the substance of what's going on here. But i'm going to address the the um procedural deficiencies that i'm seeing. I do a lot of EIS and a lot of National Historic Preservation Act work in my practice. I have never seen a process conducted in this way. You Um.

Eight thousand or more comments were submitted on September for the September second deadline, a number of those addressed the in the the size of the APE, and suggested that there provided good information, credible information about historic resources that are potentially there.

The army could not have possibly considered all of those comments, and responded with a revised APE and list of historic resources that you've identified by September 20. Notwithstanding, you're taking a vote on concur or not concur based on something we've never seen before. You presented this to us just now today. You're telling us you revise the APE based on some public comments. And and and now you're asking us to vote. That is absolutely procedurally incorrect under both of these statutes, that you would even suggest something like that at a meeting like this.

Um, We had three hours to submit written comments, and we had none of this information. So I'm going to suggest that we're not done here with step one and that to move forward Um with step two is completely um outside the context of what the regulations would require.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment, Miss Bennett. Sorry, but your minute is up. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Lieutenant Colonel, were we able to figure out your issues with the microphone. Excellent! I can hear you.

**12565710541:** Thank you for your time. Lt. John Kaufman, of the United States Air Force retired, veterans defending Arlington. Sorry, we strenuously object to the army's attempt to fast track the required rate for reviews, and this being one of them, it has anyone reached out to the other nations because I have had several citizens from other countries contact me on Facebook and say

what the heck is going on here. One was a Canadian reached out to me, and there is a Canadian Confederate soldier buried in the shadow of the Reconciliation Memorial. A Polish man, you know. came as far as way as Poland. I had a Polish man contact me and said, What the heck are you all doing? And um! The big thing is that that we haven't onto a fully encompassing everyone out there on the APE, you know, to define it there. On this chart we haven't, this is not given full respect to who it affects, and it affects everybody out there, especially in regards to the Jewish community what has been done on the outreach on this. I'd have to say a lot of nothing. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment.

So, those are all the raised hands I've seen. We wanted to make sure we got to those. I believe we still have time. So I'm going to ask that anyone else who would like to comment on the APE or the list of historic properties. If you can raise your hand at this time, we'll make sure we get to those other individuals.

So I'm pausing to see if anyone else would like to comment on the APE or the list of historic properties. So far, I'm seeing no other raised hands. I see one. Edwin Kennedy.

**Edwin Kennedy:** Yeah. So, this is Lieutenant Colonel retired Edwin Kennedy. Can you hear me?

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes

**Edwin Kennedy:** yeah, Just like to make a couple of comments. First of all, twenty nine years in uniform. Beginning during Vietnam. I have never experienced this kind of behavior in our country until recently, and what I find disgusting is that false premises keep being parroted. For example, this does not commemorate the Confederate States of America. It commemorates the soldiers who are dead and buried there. So, we got to get past parroting false premises because they become truths to some people.

What's going to happen in a few years when people say we want to get rid of Union Army memorials, because the army was segregated from 1863 until 1948. Officially, that's racism. So, what about all those monuments that are to the Union army, and I can only name about three on my fingers of those dedicated to black soldiers in in the war. What about all the ones with the white faces on them? To the Racist Union army? This is going to be the same problem in just a few years we'll get into this frenzy of shark eating blood in the water. Someone's going to say black lives matter we'll say those are racist they need to come down. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. So, before I move on to another topic again, anyone who would like to speak on the APE or list of historic properties concurring, non-concurring. If you have a comment, and with like one minute to speak, please raise your hand now before I move on to our next topic. All right, seeing nothing, we'll go to our next.

So, as has been stated, we have not moved beyond identification of historic properties. This meeting is an important step in concluding and determining what the appropriate APE and list of historic properties is. We are starting to think about and develop our finding of adverse effects. We do believe that there are adverse effects.



Adverse effects, as they are defined in the regulations state that adverse effects, or when an undertaking may alter directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property, the qualifier for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the properties, location, design, setting materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

One of the things we must look at are the potential effects to all historic properties identified in the prior section 106 step, and determine if the undertaking will have any effects on these properties.

So, today we will seek comments from you, the consulting parties on the assessment of effects to historic properties.

Do you believe that there are effects to historic properties that have been previously identified, in addition to the Confederate memorial on the Arlington National Cemetery Historic district.

At this time, we were only seeking comments on effects of the disassembly and storage of the bronze elements of the memorial.

If you would like to provide comments on potential effects to historic properties please raise your hands at this time, and I will call on you.

Remember, we're asking for only one spokesperson to provide oral comments per consulting party.

And remember that if you're on the phone you need to hit Star nine or pound nine to raise your hand.

All right. I see some hands raised. So I'm going to start going down the list. First, I see Gene Kaiser.

**Gene Kizer Jr.** Can you hear me? Yes, okay. I just like to say if the confederate memorial is demolished or removed from Arlington National Cemetery it will absolutely destroy Arlington National cemetery as our nation's most sacred burial ground. If ANC destroys a hundred and nine-year-old monument to peace and reconciliation you know the the NDAA from 2021 Elizabeth Warren's amendment. It does not require the confederate memorial to be removed. I know your your material that you have on the website states that, but that is not true. The NDAA does not even mention Congress did not even mention the Confederate memorial. What Congress did was set up the Naming Commission, and they submitted reports, and the Naming Commission's report on the Confederate memorial is not true. It's a fraud, in fact, it's like a historical fraud. It does not even mention the reconciliation theme that came about by numerous presidents. All the memorial reefs were sent to the Confederate Memorial, Barack Obama sent a Memorial Reef. He was certainly not commemorating the Confederacy. If you remove the Confederate Memorial and leave five hundred graves and concentric circles around it. You desecrate all those grades and all those States that those people came from as at least fifteen, maybe eighteen,

**Caitlin Smith:** Sir, my apologies, but your time is up.

**Gene Kizer Jr:** Okay. Thank you for hearing me.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you. Thank you for your comment. Next hand, I see is Ann Mclean.

**Ann McLean:** Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm from the Virginia Council, which is a preservation group in Virginia. If this is removed, this actually diminishes the importance of the main, the monument to the Spanish-American war, which was a precedent for the circularity that is seen in this design by Moses Ezekiel. That was derived from the monument to the Spanish-American war. And to remove this they talk to each other. All of these sculptures, in, whether it is kind of connected to the Memorial Bridge, which was a huge band aid between Virginia and the Lincoln Memorial. Whether it is the GW Parkway. All of these talk to each other, and this is built off of the tomb to the unknown soldiers also, which is, as you've walked, probably around to see how close it is to this. This to remove this is just complete folly, and no one with the title of preservationist should ever, ever want to remove bronze elements of such a high skill and quality as well. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. And again I do appreciate when when you open up your mic if you name. Thank you. Your organization, since everyone is not familiar with everyone in this meeting.

The next hand I see is Vincent Balducci.

**Vincent Balducci:** Hey, Y'all Vincent Balducci from New Jersey Flagggers. I am the President. And, this is coming right from the heart, because again I wish that we would have had a little bit more notice to speak on this one thing that really just disgusting with this is that this is in a cemetery, and to other people's comments. When this whole stuff started, the thing was okay. Move everything to a cemetery. What does this say to other veterans that are buried at the cemetery? You know we've seen time and time again where it starts with one monument, and it leads down to the graves. We've had three Confederate generals be dug up this last year in various States. We never thought that would happen. My ancestor is buried in Arlington - General [inaudible] Joe Wheeler. Do I have to worry about his memorial being removed. Next, because he proudly wore the gray, and not to mention that this monument in this high quality art, it's irreplaceable. It will be destroyed from removal, and you also have graves that will be impacted by the removal process to where it cannot be effectively replaced, and that's coming from the heart again, very disgusted in this. Thank you for Y'all's time, and God bless Dixie!

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. The next hand I see is Wayde Alford. Wade Alford.

**Wayde Alford:** Okay, I'd just like to ask who's going to speak for those dead veterans buried in their circles that decided to be buried around that monument. We can't ask them. This is unmitigable. This is crazy. I don't appreciate your timeline. That's all I got to say.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. Judith Ezekiel.

**Judith Ezekiel:** Can you hear me?

**Judith Ezekiel:** Yes, yes, Hi, I'm a professor of history and co-initiator of a letter of forty two relatives of Moses Ezekiel, signed in 2017, asking for the removal of the monument. I think that it will have a positive effect for many reasons, among them the fact that the um, the statue promotes false narratives,

several forces, false narratives, among them the myth of the Black Confederate soldier. Removing the monument, no one's talking about destroying it at this point, Um would be a positive um. It would have a positive impact. It would also to make it much better, a much better atmosphere for African American families visiting the cemetery. Most. of the signers, I think all of the signers were Jewish. There's no way that this is an anti-semitic act. The fact that Ezekiel was a that Moses was a famous Jewish sculptor does not authorize promoting false narratives and supporting Jim Crow America. The way that the monument does. So, I think, removing it will have a positive impact, not a negative impact. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. William Mason.

**William Mason:** Can you hear me?

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes, we can see you.

**William Mason:** I'm with William Mason, vice President of a monumental Task committee down here in South Louisiana. I believe wholeheartedly, this will have a very negative effect on all historic properties, because the whole concept of judging yesterday's events on today's standards is a very slippery slope that has no logical end. We could, therefore, on the basis that their view politicians are using to remove this monument, we could connect the dots out to various other monuments around the country, including the one the gentleman earlier stated in South Dakota to the Indians, and I am personally involved at the local level with the VFW American Legion. Every veterans group in this area, we're contemplating a new monument so veterans that are very good friends of ours who didn't come back from Afghanistan and Iraq. We don't want to embark on an endeavor. That's a lot of work up a monument to today's heroes. If years from now a politician is going to say we fought for oil or some other reason, and then have that monument of memorial removed.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. David McCallister.

**David McCallister:** Oh, hello, can you hear me? Yes, I'm trying to start the video, but it says the host had stopped it.

I'm David McCallister, friends of Judith P. Benjamin. Adverse effects. Removal is removal. It is axiomatic that removal is an adverse effect, and it is, in fact, unmitigable. This monument was designed and constructed for that place, and only for that place. It is a slippery slope to remove anything bronze, you know, ultimately. This memorial may never see the light of day again. If it's put in storage like in the end of the first Indiana Jones movie, some sort of big warehouse somewhere. It will lessen the inventory or catalog of public art and brutalize culture through iconoclasm. This monument is in and of itself a great example of American Renaissance style. Its loss is an unmitigable cultural and artistic loss to the entire nation of a serious level.

It does form the link between all other memorials. The battleship Maine, the underknown soldier, even the Washington and Lincoln memorials of Jefferson Memorials in Washington City itself even the Martin Luther King Memorial and the Mall is linked to this particular memorial without it. None of these have any relevance.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you, sir. Thank you for your comment. Jenny Wadowski.

**Jinny Widowski:** Jenny Wadowski, United Daughters of the Confederacy. We are not endorsing, forgetting of our past, we want to celebrate the nation's healing and building upon unification. This is a piece of artwork that tells our history, and tells a story. We cannot go and say that this will not have an adverse effect when history is history, and all sides need to be told from the start to the end, and we need to teach from it. This is a very unique piece of artwork, and it would be sad to see it go into storage, because then that is going to lead us down a path of history never took place which it did. It's also having an adverse effect on that circle and all the graves that surround that monument. It will have a negative impact when right now that was built to bring peace and healing. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Lieutenant Colonel John Coffindaffer.

12565710541: Hi, This is Lt. Col Coffindaffer, and can you hear me?

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes, we can.

12565710541: So. I've attended several of these meetings. I have attended all of them, and the words that I've heard used not only by the attendees, but also by the government ANC staff is iconic Arlington, the nation's most hallowed and sacred ground. Iconic is this: what we do to our iconic and in most sacred and Hallowed ground in America. Is this what we do? We remove things because of presentism. The legislation was created by the Naming Commission specifically excluded grave markers. This is indeed a grave marker. It's a marker not only symbolic of the five hundred graves around it, but of all the unknown areas in which American soldiers were buried throughout America. This is just the first step we know that grave space is of a premium at Arlington. Is this just the first step we're going to get rid of that. And then we're going to relocate those Confederate graves to their appropriate States in Alabama, for example, there's thirty six graves around the reconciliation memorial. Are they going to come back to Alabama so we can free up some real estate there. What is going on? This is totally ridiculous.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Your time is up. The next name I see is H. Edward Phillips.

**H. Edward Phillips III:** Thank you again, Miss Smith. H. Edward Phillips on behalf of the sons of Confederate veterans in relation to Arlington and elements of Arlington. First, we have to remember that this memorial is a contributing element to the placement of Arlington on the historic register. It itself could be on the historic register, and in particular, when you look at the tomb of the Civil War unknowns, which is a vault, a burial vault that houses or contains the remains of two thousand one hundred and forty four soldiers of the war, both US and Confederate, they are intermingled in a grave. And the thing is, once we start going down this road and looking at classifications, of course it's going to impact these historic properties because it goes back to what Lieutenant General Lieutenant Colonel Gerald Torrance had said in November eighth as part of the Advisory Committee meeting for Arlington. He Basically, said, it's insidious to move this. You have to have this element in place to tell the story of the Civil War. And the last point I've got is that there's also a marker that contextualizes the monument. And if people want to read the contextualization, they can read what the Government thinks about this monument. But again, I think it unduly impacts ANC and in particular the Civil War unknown soldier, soldiers vault or burial chamber.

**Caitlin Smith:** Sir, thank you for your comment. The next hand I see is Kirk Lyons.

**Kirk D. Lyons:** Thank you. My name is Kirk D. Lyons. I'm a director of the Southern legal Resource Center. If you remove this monument, you will damage it. It's not a matter of whether or not you will damage it. It's a matter of how much you will damage it. You will damage it if you try to move a monument erected 1914 anywhere. To remove it, to demolish, it would be a crime against humanity. A crime against art. And it would be a violation of the United Nations charter on human rights, and probably a violation of the genocide Convention, which, unfortunately, the United States has never signed. If you take this down, you desecrate a grave, you take away the headstone of Moses Ezekiel, and four hundred plus other veterans that are buried there. This should not be done, and you should leave it alone. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comments. Edwin Kennedy.

**Edwin Kennedy:** This is Lieutenant Colonel Ed Kennedy, I'm retired army officer. Spent nineteen years teaching graduate studies at the US Army Command in General Staff College. I'm a certified military historian, taught the Civil War core curriculum and electives. For twenty-five years I've been giving talks on black Confederate soldiers. And I like to dissuade people that there is a myth, it is a fact that they existed. We get back to the false premise, people say, Well, there's a black enslaved mammy on the monument. False. We don't know if she's enslaved or not. No one knows that. There were thousands of free blacks in the South. How do we know that that person is enslaved or not? So, the premise is wrong. So, the argument is to take the monument down, because racism is wrong. I wish somebody would ask Al Arnold back. He came to one of the first meetings and spoke. Al is Black. He's very proud of his black ancestor, who served as an orderly for General Robert E. Lee. He's published three different books on this topic,

**Caitlin Smith:** sir.

**Edwin Kennedy:** Yes?

**Caitlin Smith:** my apologies. Your minute is..

**Edwin Kennedy:** Thank you. It's fast.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment.

**LM Siegel:** Ah, yes, thank you for calling on me. I again I'm so upset um by a previous speaker's comments that I am having trouble trying to organize my thoughts and to speak. I'm very concerned about a hidden agenda um, and for these false narratives. Frederick Douglas refuted a statement that was made by saying, It is now pretty well established there. At the present moment are many colored men in the Confederate army. What I think the true objection to some people of this memorial is that depicts men and women in traditional roles, and amplifies what Frederick Douglas said. There were capos in concentration camps, too. This cemetery would not even be here but for the war that came to our nation that this memorial pays homage to, and that President Mckinley said, It's time to get past. There is no way you can remove this memorial and not destroy Arlington's National Cemetery. Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Ma'am, thank you. Your minute is up. Just a reminder to the to the group, if you can, we want to make sure we're accepting comments related to this case of adverse effects, or if you had comments on the APE or historic properties that were not addressed earlier. We are not discussing whether or not the memorial should be removed.

**Caitlin Smith:** Ah, I see. Ah, two more hands, Mr. James Shillinglaw.

**James Shillinglaw:** Yes, I'm. Here. Can you hear me? Okay,

**Caitlin Smith:** Yes, thank you.

**James Shillinglaw:** I'm an historian, too. So this modern technology kind of confuses me. Well, the first thing I want to say, I just don't understand why this We're even having this conversation about the monument. I know we're not supposed to argue, or stay, or whatever. I just don't know why this came onto the national dialogue because it's the Arlington National Cemetery. This is a monument, really a marker marking the Confederate graves. The statue self is about, you know the soldiers. It's not about the Confederacy, or you know this stuff. You know, I just don't see how this even is being talked about today. But besides the point, some people are saying it might be offensive to other people, but if you remove it, you could breed racism as if you know the soldiers descendants and these people see their monuments come down, they might breed racism in their soul. So if you keep it up, you're kind of keeping racial tensions at bay. Ah, that's one issue to kind of I understand, too, that's what Charlottesville was all about. That's the reason why his money was started coming down short as pose a protest to keep the Confederate monument up. That's what it was all about. But I will say, yeah, I wish we could go back to understanding why this even came onto the list of removal. Somebody should explain that.

**Caitlin Smith:** apologies. Your minute is up. Thank you for your comment. I see one more hand, Clark, Mercer. Clark Mercer.

**Clark Mercer:** My hand was up accidentally. My apologies

**Caitlin Smith:** thank you. And then, Mr. Shillinglaw, while your hand went back up. But I believe you've already had your minute.

**Caitlin Smith:** Karen Bennett. You have a minute.

**Karen Bennett:** Thank you Caitlin. Karen Bennett for Defend Arlington. Um again. I concur with a number of the comments here, but I'm going to focus on the substance of the comments. But I'm a focus on procedural um deficiencies that I see, and that will um really jeopardize the decision that the Army eventually ultimately makes in this case. We should not be talking about effects. Yes, of course, we think there are effects to historic properties, and in our comments on September 2nd, we named a number of provided um a a great deal of additional information that the Army is required to evaluate and consider. We've not, we don't believe any of that has been done. So right now, having this discussion is premature. You need to take a step back. Look at the Advisory Council on historic preservations guidelines, and guidance as to the four-step process that we're marching through.

**Karen Bennett:** Thank you.

**Caitlin Smith:** Thank you for your comment. Yes, your minute is up. Okay. So, I see no more hands. Again, if the group has comments on the APE, the historic properties, or as we are starting to think about effects, those are the comments we are looking for today. Also, if you have questions on the process, or how to get in touch with us, how to offer your comments, you can put those in the chat.

I am seeing no more hands. So, if we go to our next slide. So, again our agency, ANMC, continues to consult with the DHR on the current step, identification of historic properties. That is where we are at today. That's what you're seeing on this slide. That is not concluded, yet, and your input helps us greatly as we work towards that. We will hold subsequent meetings with the consulting parties to discuss if there are adverse effects, and if there are, how to resolve them in future. We will also, as noted earlier in the meeting, there are different levels of consulting parties. We will be holding meetings with smaller groups, the entitled and the invited signatories, to have further discussions regarding the resolution of any potential adverse effects. When we get to that point and when we begin the preparation of an agreement document between ANMC, DHR, ACHP and the other consulting parties. Next slide.

**Andrew Wiker:** we appreciate your participation in today's consulting parties meetings and your comments. I'd ask that you please visit the project website to access additional information, and we will remain in contact with you through email providing information as it becomes available, and to continue working through the section 106 process.

Please continue to email us at [ANC-Commemorative-works@army.mil](mailto:ANC-Commemorative-works@army.mil). to provide additional thoughts or suggestions.

We thank you for your time this afternoon, and we'll leave the slide up so you can, if you would like to copy down the email or the web address. Thank you.