

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY GROUP
Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2008

Attendees: Mary Means (member), Lauranett Lee (member), Kathleen Kilpatrick (member), John Munick (member), Eleanor Krause (member), Rob Nieweg (member), and Richard Lewis (member).

Absent: Jeanne Zeidler (member) and Dorothy Redford (member).

Also in attendance: Bill Armbruster (FMFADA staff), Conover Hunt (FMFADA staff), David Dutton (consultant to FMFADA), Mary Ruffin Hanbury (invited presenter), S. Waite Rawls, III (invited presenter), Dr. Charles Cureton (invited presenter), John Quarstein (FMFADA Commissioner and invited presenter), Rex Ellis (FMFADA Commissioner), Catharine Gilliam (FMFADA Commissioner).

Meeting Agenda is attached.

Call to Order

At 9:15 a.m. Bill Armbruster called the meeting to order and welcomed the participants. He said that as this is a public meeting, public comments would be taken. Participants introduced themselves. It was noted that Jeanne Zeidler was expected to join the group later in the morning and that a new member, Dorothy Redford will attend the next meeting.

Mr. Armbruster reported that the NPS study has been delivered and briefly summarized the NPS' conclusions. He then stated that the timeline for the Reuse Plan is as follows:

- Closure of public comment period June 15;
- Adoption of the Reuse Plan by FMFADA end of June;
- Transmission of Reuse Plan to Governor for approval in July; and
- Transmission of Reuse Plan to DoD in August.

Mr. Armbruster stated that programmatic agreement, another important document was on schedule to be signed by August and that the HUD Homeless application is online and available for comment.

Mr. Armbruster went on to say that the charge of the group is to help guide the development of a self-sustaining stewardship plan. In accordance with the FMFADA's Bylaws, he anticipates that it will include the development of treatment and maintenance standards for resources or categories of resources, design guidelines and standards for any new construction, visitor orientation and educational programs, related marketing plans, and a business plan for long term management of the publicly accessible historic assets.

Mr. Armbruster then introduced Kathleen Kilpatrick who he asked to serve as the acting Chair of the committee. Ms. Kilpatrick welcomed the meeting participants. She reiterated the group's charge with specific emphasis on how the group might want to organize to support the FMFADA and the work ahead. Ms. Kilpatrick said that the following were key issues to discuss: Programmatic Agreement, Reuse Plan, and Interpretive planning. She said that the group needs to develop an organizational concept. She recommended that the group divide by tasks so that individuals could take the lead on select issues and other task forces as related to their respective expertise and in this way be the groups "liaison" in a meaningful way. She said that by dividing based on skill sets, the group could accomplish a lot more.

Eleanor Krause agreed with Ms. Kilpatrick's suggestion.

Mary Means said she is a good synthesizer who likes to review data and look at the big picture.

Ms. Kilpatrick reiterated that this approach will help with progress between meetings and facilitate discussions as a group on the larger picture but not substitute for that. She then introduced David Dutton who briefed the group on the PA.

PA: Discussion

Mr. Dutton reviewed the structure of the PA with particular focus on the roles of the Army, Commonwealth, and FMFADA. He summarized the major deliverables for each entity and the ongoing review process for projects undertaken after the Army departs. Mr. Dutton explained that the PA is currently available for public comment until July 7 and that the Army will be holding public meetings in Hampton, Richmond, and Washington D.C. in the next week to solicit further public input on the PA. He indicated that the current schedule is following receipt of public comment the Army will revise the document accordingly and prepare for it for signature, which should occur mid-August.

Ms. Kilpatrick reviewed the PA's zone and treatment strategy and stressed the importance of detailed design guidelines pursuant to the treatments as critical to the successful implementation of the PA. She then asked if there were additional questions or comments on the PA.

Eleanor Krause indicated her concern about Zone D. She asked if reference could be made to the change in the TRADOC area vs. the Historic Village area. She indicated that there is a distinct difference in the architecture, scale, and use of facilities in this area versus the rest of the McNair, Ingall's Road architecture.

Mary Means asked if the design guidelines could address this issue.

Ms. Krause asked if there was a way to acknowledge more flexibility.

Ms. Kilpatrick felt that that would be accomplished in the design guidelines but invited her to provide suggested language.

Rob Nieweg pointed out the difference between the PA management zones and Reuse Plan zones.

Ms. Krause said that the Reuse Plan ultimately will be easier to implement if PA zones and Reuse Plan zones are the same.

Mr. Armbruster explained the differences in the PA vs. Reuse Plan zones and intent of the two.

Ms. Krause said the management zones in PA appear to be well defined. She did point out that new infill construction is a gray area, particularly in the Historic Village area and that rehabilitation and minor additions are things that will likely occur and need to be addressed in a meaningful and balanced manner. Ms. Krause stated that the Secretary's Standards should be referenced, as well as ensure that these issues are addressed more fully in the design guidelines.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked that the group provide any comments they have on the PA either to her or David Dutton by June 23, 2008.

Reuse Plan Discussion

Mr. Armbruster reviewed handouts summarizing the current working draft of the Reuse Plan and the economic impact strategy. He reminded members that comments are due by June 15. Mr. Armbruster said that the Reuse Plan is intended to be the official plan of LRA, required by BRAC and that the HUD homeless application is a companion document. The revised Reuse Plan has three parts: Executive Summary, Reuse Plan, and a Technical Manual. He explained that the Reuse Plan itself is a concept/bubble plan and that in development of the revised plan Dover Kohl tried to follow PA zones as closely as possible. Mr. Armbruster indicated that the primary intent of the Reuse Plan was to capture and be true to the five planning essentials adopted by the FMFADA. He reiterated that at this time the document needs to be a 30,000 feet document and that the details will come. He went on to say that there will be changes to the document as a result of input from the community.

In his summary of the Reuse Plan, Mr. Armbruster said that there would be no major new buildings in the Moat area and that the focus of the Historic Village area will be adaptive reuse. He pointed out that there will be opportunities for new construction in the North Gate area. Mr. Armbruster discussed the entry area and how to establish it. He went on to discuss the Wherry Housing area stating that in the near term, the existing structures would be utilized and that the long term plan is not set yet as they are waiting for economics. So for the moment, the Wherry Housing area is listed as TBD. Mr. Armbruster said that the remainder will function as park and recreation areas with beach and other recreational opportunities, etc. He indicated that the challenges involve

transportation and road networks and developing a more user friendly parking/tourism program and infrastructure.

Ms. Means said that the Reuse Plan reads as silos. She said that economics, use etc. need to be integrated. Ms. Means suggested that the group should consider the circulation plan; look more strategically at parking; and that this information needs to be considered in the business plan.

Mr. Quarstein asked where will the visitors park.

Ms. Kilpatrick explained that parking is an issue that needs to be addressed creatively and sensitively. She stated that under a prior Section 106 and tax credit project, the Chamberlain has approval to build a parking structure and she summarized the details of that review but indicated that the Chamberlain's parking structure could only be but so large without negatively impacting both the projects' tax credits and the zone as outlined in the PA. Therefore it should not be viewed as a single solution to all parking needs.

Mr. Ellis pointed out that we are on the verge of a new view of transportation and asked about alternate means of getting around (e.g., bikes and battery operated vehicles.)

Mr. Quarstein said that Fort Monroe has great historical link with public transportation – specifically water and rail.

Ms. Means asked if there is anything in the plan that would preclude development of a multi model HUB.

Mr. Armbruster said that the plan did not preclude exploration of such an approach. All agreed that this was an important issue that needs full consideration.

Mr. Nieweg questioned which version of plan they should comment on – the version on the web or what they have in hand.

Ms. Hunt explained the discrepancies between the dates of the documents in their packets and those posted in the website. She said that as the sections of the plan are revised and approved they are put on the website that members should comment on those sections that are signed off on and posted on web.

Mr. Nieweg said that there is a need to have FMFADA's and NPS's economic models rationalized. He said that we need to understand what the number is to maintain the facility and why new development is necessary and the rational.

Mr. Armbruster said that this information is beginning to emerge in the June 6 economic study just handed out.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that we would come back to the Reuse Plan but need to move to the Interpretive Plan discussion as some presenters needed to leave the meeting early.

Interpretive/Education Discussion

Ms. Hunt said that the PA requires the FMFADA to develop an interpretive and educational Plan. Staff recommends the NPS Interpretive Master Plan model, designed for historic sites. She summarized the handout and reiterated that the plan would be content driven and audience focused. She said that core team would lead and get input from scholars, stakeholders, and resource specialists.

Ms. Hunt discussed planning process, which would have goals, objectives, strategies, and priorities (see handout). She offered the NPS Goliad Interpretive Master Plan in Texas as an example, which has multiple owners and sites. Ms. Hunt said that the lead planner would be a contractor and that there would also be an NPS member(s), preservationists, marketing, tourism, and educational planners on the team. She said the plan embraces museums, educational programs and special events and would take approximately 12-18 months to complete. Ms Hunt said that the cost for the master plan would be \$150,000 - \$300,000 and that the FMFADA needs a nonprofit to identify funding sources and raise the necessary dollars to undertake and complete the plan. She then asked what are the criteria for participating agencies/organizations at the site.

Ms. Kilpatrick said she likes the planning model, the interpretation aspects, particularly the NPS involvement given the potential for a role for NPS for the future. She also pointed out that the planning process should explore space options: small, medium and large.

Ms. Hunt added that the plan will be driven by content and implemented according to what can be afforded.

Mr. Quarstein said that interpretation is paramount. Certain buildings and the Fort are central to interpretation of Fort Monroe and we need to know how this impacts bigger economic picture. What are the interpretive economics?

Ms. Krause said that she did not disagree but that we also need to look at a variety of uses inside Fort.

Mr. Quarstein said that certain buildings must be set aside for interpretation (i.e. Quarters 1, Chapel of the Centurion, etc.).

Ms. Kilpatrick said that she did not disagree but that the statement by ERA that Building 5 should be a museum seemed premature given the related planning and decision-making processes, including the interpretive master planning. She said that use should not be stated as a decided fact under the circumstances in the Reuse Plan right now.

Ms. Means said that a non-profit needed to raise money not necessarily run interpretive programming. She added that the interpretive plan cannot be divorced from the circulation plan. She wants to see the scope that will be given – specifically how the FMFADA is describing the task to be completed.

Ms. Hunt pointed out that the group is being asked if they support the proposed methodology.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that we all want a plan done quickly and generally like the methods proposed but need further clarification about a substantive role of for NPS, interconnection with economics, options for space allocation at different levels, and strong public input.

Ms. Means said regarding public input the curatorial model is probably not right and maybe a community model is best looking at “community” both in the immediate and the wider regional sense. She also said that a different planning team is needed to find out what the community wants for use. The group needs to engage Phoebus particularly.

Ms. Gilliam reminded the group of the NPS study and that the NPS will look at the completed Reuse Plan before making a final decision. She said the development of any interpretive plan must not preclude a role for the NPS and we need to court them to get their participation.

Mr. Nieweg voiced his conditional comfort with the methodology given the conditions Ms. Kilpatrick had outlined but questioned whether the project was going to be handled by a consultant under contract to the FMFADA.

Ms. Hunt answered yes.

Ms. Krause requested information on the square footage for buildings at Fort Monroe to better understand opportunities.

Mr. Nieweg asked why a non-profit? What is its role?

Ms. Hunt explained that the non-profit’s role is to raise money and to assist with planning.

The group requested the opportunity to review the RFP for the interpretive planning process and stressed again the conditions stated earlier.

Break

Presentations by Museums Interested in Partnering w/ the FMFADA

Ms. Kilpatrick introduced Dr. Charles Cureton with the Army History Center.

Army History Center – Dr. Charles Cureton

Mr. Cureton said that questions he will raise are intended to get answers which will help to understand potential opportunities from the museum perspective. He said that his viewpoint is from the museum profession. He added that the museum planning needs to start now to allow sufficient time for completion. He said that the big picture of the FMFADA is not contrary to the museum needs.

Mr. Cureton then outlined concerns that need to be addressed in order to determine to what degree to commit. Resources are scarce – need to minimize movement of artifacts. Any facility must meet museum and curatorial standards and any gallery design process must be iterative, which can get emotional.

Mr. Cureton stated that an inside the fortress museum campus is a real possibility and a number of organizations have expressed interest that have strong collections in Civil War. The Contraband story, however, is not well represented with artifacts and this is a need to be addressed.

Mr. Cureton for the Army to loan artifacts, they will look for an interpretive plan that is solid, well thought out, intellectual, honest, and able to reach large audience. He also said the Army will want to know who the managing entity is, its resources, and staff and the earlier they are defined the better.

Mr. Cureton addressed the issue of space. He said that co-location is beneficial. It creates synergy. Buildings 5, 10, and 39 are potential sites for a museum campus. He also said that the Casemate would continue as a site to interpret the Casemates, Jefferson Davis, etc. Mr. Cureton said that Fort Monroe is a viable site that will interest larger organizations. He indicated that it is important to have space to grow. Mr. Cureton said the Army remains committed to the project, are impressed with what they have seen thus far, and are encouraged that it can happen.

Ms. Lee asked if the Civil War story and the Contraband story are separate.

Mr. Cureton said that was a design question. He said that you cannot tell one without the other. He said that Fort Monroe is so unique – the contraband decision sets Fort Monroe apart from other seacoast fortifications. Fort Monroe can capitalize on this unique history that goes beyond the Civil War and is a social issue.

Mr. Quarstein pointed out that Quarters 1 and Chapel of the Centurion are also important in Contraband story/interpretation.

Ms. Means said this can be a site of very dynamic programming. She said that an absence of artifacts does not mean an absence of story.

Ms. Lee added that documents surrounding the Contraband decision are plentiful.

Mr. Nieweg asked how the Army views its needs in light of the planning model and schedule on the table.

Mr. Cureton responded that that needs to be looked at closely. The sooner the Army understands the operating organization the better. How much risk are they going to have to assume with loans?

Mr. Munick asked Mr. Cureton if he had seen the PA language concerning the Casemate.

Mr. Cureton said that he had. He went on to say that the Casemate is not full of Fort Monroe artifacts and that in fact there are more coastal artillery artifacts than Fort Monroe specific material. The Army is looking at centralizing storage at museum HUBs. This will eliminate multiple locations for the storage of collections but not access to material related to a particular site.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Cureton and Ms. Hunt to look at the PA deliverables, their schedule and sequence to make sure that they are in sync and to provide any comments.

Museum of Confederacy – Mr. Waite Rawls, President and CEO

Mr. Rawls said that MOC is in the middle of planning for a four site museum system. Some of the lessons they have learned include the need to think first of your audience. Who are they? What are their stories? How do you tell them and how do you link them together? At Fort Monroe, linkage is important. The planning process is integral to getting major funding (i.e. NEH grants). The sooner you get started the better. You will need to do a lot of market research, and focus groups. Mr. Rawls also said that you will need good historians and education experts.

Mr. Rawls stated that any K-12 education programming will need to adhere to the Commonwealth's Standards of Learning or you will not receive any funding. He said that education is beyond K-12 and includes lifelong learners, etc. You will also need design professionals and marketing professionals.

Mr. Rawls indicated that he takes issue with ERA statement that the tourism pool for Fort Monroe is regional. He believes that the market is greater because the story is a national story. He said you will need good technology and pointed to the War Rooms in London as an example. The MOC uses Ed Hun (sp?) and also works with Ed Ayers. He said that the public will not sit through introduction videos anymore. He said that the biggest question is who is the audience and what is the demand for the story. Mr. Rawls also said that freedom is a big part of the MOC story that they would want to tell at Fort Monroe in addition to the Confederate Navy and its role, and the occupation of southern site.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Rawls what he and the MOC need.

Mr. Rawls said that the MOC is not yet committed to Fort Monroe. He said that the FMFADA needs to commit to a thorough interpretive planning process and that the MOC needs to be a substantive participant in that process. The MOC needs to see the governance structure and the resources. The program needs to be comprehensive to draw 150,000- 200,000 visitors annually. The MOC brings artifacts and market draw and experience in dealing with Civil War stories and issues. Mr. Rawls did express concern about politicians on FMFADA and their ability to deal with historical issues.

Mr. Ellis said that the connection of the Confederacy with slavery has been dividing line forever. Why is Fort Monroe going to be successful?

Mr. Rawls said the he doesn't know the answer but that Fort Monroe is the best place and time to bring the stories together. You already have certain aspects of the story told at Colonial Williamsburg, Monticello and Mt. Vernon. Fort Monroe, however, is the ideal spot to talk about emancipation of slaves.

Hampton Museum – Mr. John Quarstein

Mr. Quarstein said that Hampton is currently looking at long range plans for its historic resources and that the Hampton Museum is interested in Old Quarters #1 and are willing to partner with organizations as appropriate. He said that tourism starts at Old Point Comfort. He also said that transportation is important. The City is ready to work with FMFADA and others.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Quarstein what the City needs.

Mr. Quarstein said that the City wants to be part of the planning process and the set up of the non-profit. He said that trails (historic and natural) need to be developed sooner rather than later. He said that the upcoming Civil War Sesquicentennial is an opportunity. Mr. Quarstein also said that the City needs to understand the financials and how staff will be shared.

Ms. Hunt asked Mr. Quarstein what collections the City has that may be brought to Fort Monroe.

Mr. Quarstein said they have material from the Battle of Big Bethel, as well as artifacts related to the social history of Old Point Comfort, Phoebus and Buckroe. He said he is on the board of the Virginia War Memorial Museum and that they have extensive materials not on display that may possibly be loaned to Fort Monroe. Mr. Quarstein said that creating a partnership is the way to go. He mentioned connecting with beach tourism. He said that Hampton sees an original place here.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked if City would relocate its museum to Fort Monroe.

Mr. Quarstein indicated that locating a branch of the museum was a possibility. He mentioned the Hampton History Center has visitation of approximately 15,000. It opened four (4) years ago although it has been around in some form since the 1950s. It is

operated by the City and its own non-profit. He said that Hampton also manages Fort Wool and is pursuing grant opportunities for synergies between the various sites. The City is very committed to Fort Wool. He said that buildings like Old Quarters #1 need some kind of sponsor.

Mr. Rawls pointed out that the African American story lacks artifacts and asked if Hampton has materials. He mentioned the Freedman's Bureau records.

Mr. Quarstein said there is some archaeological evidence of contraband camps that the City has and that there are also missionary records that have historical data.

Ms. Kilpatrick referred to Ms. Means' comment about transportation and reminded the group of the need to do something different that is not auto-centric.

Mr. Quarstein said that a non-profit is needed to get funding. He said that the clock is ticking and that the group needs to move as soon as the Army leaves. He said that T-21 grants are a great opportunity.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that Governor's Island is a good example of the need to be ready to welcome the public ASAP and not to wait for the interpretative planning process but to focus immediately on getting folks out and enjoying the property.

She said that the FMADA needs to look at early infrastructure needs as suggested in the visit to Fort Hancock and Governor's Island, and that the development of trails should be a top infrastructure and recreational and public access priority linking as well to education and transportation planning.

Mr. Quarstein reiterated that the trails need to be worked on now and expressed his willingness to take a lead on this aspect.

Ms. Means added that if the group wants something by Civil War Sesquicentennial that POD-cast tours could be a quick fix.

Mr. Quarstein said that a dedicated and safe way to interpret the site is needed.

Ms. Hunt said that Civil War symposium recommendations are in the member's folders and that one of the recommendations is to make a significant outreach to the community. She said that staff is currently working with the Contraband Society to get their stories. Ms. Hunt stated that they will have a curatorial researcher to assist with artifact identification and are estimating \$39,000 for two positions to assist with this effort. She also state that they are estimating \$100,000 for interpretive master planning.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Ms. Lee about VHS artifacts and Ms. Lee said that all VHS Civil War artifacts will go on display with their 150th program exhibition.

Ms. Hunt added that the Museum of Natural History is interested in a programmatic role. She also said that they have talked to the Mariner's Museum and they are only interested in a marketing role.

Mr. Ellis asked if there had been any consideration for space for traveling exhibitions. He also asked about what kinds of overtures had been extended to the Hampton University Museum.

Mr. Armbruster said he wasn't aware of any yet but he agreed to work on it. Mr. Ellis offered his help. Mr. Armbruster also mentioned that William & Mary made a presentation to FMFADA about partnering on CW 150th.

Ms. Kilpatrick said given the natural resources present there are opportunities for natural resource partners, i.e. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, VIMS, VMRC, etc.

Ms. Hunt said that a virtual war museum concept was also presented to FMFADA and may be another partner opportunity. She said that re: natural resources partnerships, it was her understanding from the Commonwealth that any such discussions will be on hold until the Reuse Plan is complete.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that the FMADA and group needs to look at all options for sustainability and partners.

Tourism Discussion

Mr. Armbruster said that the ERA tourism report is in draft form and estimates 225,000 – 275,000 potential for mixed visitation (beach and cultural). He said that ERA has identified potential themes and they feel there is great potential for tourism. He mentioned that the Casemate gets about 40,000 visitors per year w/o aggressive marketing.

Mr. Quarstein said that the Casemate had visitation as high as 69,000-70,000 with 8,000-9,000 school children prior to 9/11.

Mr. Armbruster also said that the marina expansion was identified as a real opportunity. He added that the hospitality theme is important. He mentioned the Sanderling model, the recreation of Hygeia Hotel and joint marketing with Colonial Williamsburg, Yorktown, and Jamestown (the historic quadrangle.)

Mr. Quarstein pointed out that health, hospitality, and history were early 20th century marketing pitches.

Mr. Nieweg asked if the 225,000 – 270,000 is based on a museum build out. Ms. Hunt said that the figures are based on the Casemate and recreational tourism only. She said they would jump start visitation with beach and recreation opportunities and phase in the heritage component.

Mr. Lewis said that the Virginia Tourism Corporation would view Fort Monroe as part of a larger package. He suggested marketing not just to history buffs but also to families. You need to know what the story is worth.

Ms. Hunt also clarified that the figures do not represent special events.

Mr. Nieweg said that part of the planning is to get people out to Fort Monroe (i.e., what would it take to get them out there? Does it have to be history related?)

Ms. Kilpatrick again said that folks need to work on many planes. We need some opportunities now while others are being developed. She also said that recommendations for planning and implementation functions are needed before 2011. We need to get people in here now via events, trails, etc.

Ms. Krause said that not everything needs to be interpretive. Ms. Lee added that one way is celebration of Juneteenth.

Mr. Nieweg voiced concern about the model presented. He said that groups that presented today want to be involved but there is a risk of foreclosing options if we pursue specific partners.

Ms. Means said she was unclear about outreach to regional museums. One approach is to have the program rooted in Fort Monroe and run by someone. Another is for institutions to open branches which bring management issues.

Ms. Hunt said interpretive themes need to be developed and that institutions have to contribute to the themes.

Ms. Means asked about the arts. She gave the Torpedo Factory as an example.

Mr. Ellis said that you need to be careful how balance synergy, opportunity, and integrity. You need to know what you want to be so that you do not end of what you don't want to be. He said that from the moment we open the doors, we will be creating a brand. We need to know what the brand is so it can be communicated to the public.

Mr. Lewis added that the media and public's first impressions are key. We have one chance. Ms. Means said that the Reuse Plan is not the brand. It just meets the requirement.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that comments need to be sent to Bill Armbruster. She asked for specific attention to be paid to what is missing-natural resource opportunities, outdoor recreation, etc.

She said that a vision statement may be needed that places the Reuse Plan in an appropriate context.

Design Guidelines

Ms. Kilpatrick introduced Mary Ruffin Hanbury who presented on behalf of Hanbury Evans Architects re: development of the design guidelines.

Ms. Hanbury said she was standing in for Greg Rutledge. She asked the group what they were interested in and not interested in re: design guidelines.

Ms. Means indicated that in her opinion urban design guidelines would be more appropriate for Fort Monroe.

Mr. Dutton explained that the design guidelines are envisioned as a single document addressing both maintenance and rehabilitation of existing buildings and facilities and new construction (citing, scale, materials, etc.). He stated that the PA provided the general framework and parameters for the treatment of resources, but that the design guidelines were the detail needed to successfully implement the provisions of the PA.

Ms. Kilpatrick said she is concerned about enforcement of the design guidelines, particularly since Hampton will not be able to do zoning.

Ms. Means said that we need to think about our vision so that we can execute toward something. She reiterated the urban design guideline model as something to consider.

Ms. Kilpatrick pointed out that Fort Monroe already has a character and sense of place and that this must always be considered.

Ms. Krause said that she is not as interested in treatments of existing buildings and facilities but rather in new construction. She went on to say that there is a need to balance character and good design. In the historic village, she said, treatment is more important. In the Wherry Housing area on the other hand, there should be more freedom in materials choices. She recommended a focus on specific areas accordingly.

Mr. Nieweg remarked that standards need to be interpreted and illustrated for lay people.

Ms. Kilpatrick added that a large effort needs to be on new and infill construction.

Ms. Krause said that new standards do not supplant the Secretary's Standards.

Ms. Hanbury suggested that good communication is needed to ensure that local interpretations are accepted at all levels.

Ms. Means mentioned urban design and what is visible from the public realm. She asked how you develop a form without a function.

Ms. Hunt remarked that we should deal with treatments first and then work on guidelines for new construction.

Ms. Means said that she does not like rigid control of significant interior spaces.

Ms. Kilpatrick added that we are not talking about restoration standards.

Ms. Krause said that we cannot rely on tax credit reviews. She then asked why is everything being referred to as rental.

Mr. Munick responded that his understanding was the land will be held by the Commonwealth and that individuals can purchase buildings. He then asked if interior standards will be building by building.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that any guidance for interiors would not be rigid but based on what is intact or not, character defining or not, and primary vs. secondary, etc.

Ms. Krause said that the design guidelines should deal with significant interior spaces, materials, and/or features. She stressed that the design standards and the PA need to be consistent.

Mr. Nieweg pointed out that a draft is needed in 12 months, not a final document. He also said that zones for the standards need to be same as PA.

Ms. Means said that the SOW is key. She said that she wants to review the SOW before it is released and will help. She still thinks the Reuse Plan and PA zones need to be in sync.

Ms. Krause agreed and added that it will be easier in the future if they were the same.

The group recommends that the zones for the Reuse Plan be changed to be consistent with the treatment zones established by the PA.

Mr. Nieweg said that he thought it was reasonable for the Wherry Housing area to be left TBD. He asked if there is a place in the Reuse Plan where more detail can be included on the process for how consensus will be reached for the Wherry Housing area in the future.

Ms. Hunt said that is was already in the document but that they would look at ways to make it clearer.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked if there is a way to illustrate the zone for the Wherry Housing area in the Reuse Plan in such a way that it is consistent with the PA zones but still captures the point Dover Kohl is trying to make re: use. She suggested keeping the colors and boundaries the same as the PA zones and perhaps using hatching to delineate changes in

use. Ms. Kilpatrick also reiterated her concern re: the entry gate area and how this area will be reviewed specifically as it relates to road alignments and traffic patterns.

Ms. Krause agreed that a change in alignments was not desirable and that the Reuse Plan should illustrate that a traffic issue exists and will need to be reworked in the future. What's shown may or may not reflect the future.

Mr. Nieweg said that since it is a concept document, how do we deal with those areas where we get into too much detail? Can the group make recommendations that detail where not needed is taken out?

Ms. Krause suggested that Dover Kohl add more hedge to the document. She said the planning essentials are a good tool to measure against.

Ms. Kilpatrick added that the introduction needs to have a clearer sense of vision.

Ms Krause said that it needs to reinforce what the document is intended to do and what it is not.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that this Reuse Plan should be read in an accurate context – that it is not a development plan but conceptual for the HUD and DOD screening purposes and a starting point. She stressed that the development of Monroe will evolve through time as needs and market realities are proven out. She worried that the reuse plan narrative as it reads now fed a perception that the task was over instead of just beginning.

Ms. Means said the introduction can and should clarify reuse vs. redevelopment.

The group suggested the following recommendations for the Reuse Plan:

- 1. Eliminate references to specific uses for sites.**
- 2. Zones of PA should mesh with Reuse Plan zones.**
- 3. Introduction should describe what the plan is and isn't.**
- 4. Introduction should make it clear the redevelopment will evolve over a long period of time and that the plan is a working document.**
- 5. References to transportation, parking and road framework is being reviewed and may change.**

Ms. Kilpatrick asked whether the group should endorse the interpretive plan model as presented or make recommendations.

Ms. Means responded that she is comfortable with the model but does not like the public participation aspects as presented.

Mr. Armbruster stated that any public participation process needs to integrate the NPS into the core planning team. The NPS should not be lumped in with the general public.

Mr. Quarstein asked who should be on the core planning group.

Ms. Krause commented that the process should be open to all.

Open discussion followed re: the museum representatives with members of the HPAG expressing concerns that they could unduly influence the planning process and would not necessarily represent the views of others.

Mr. Ellis said that if the idea of a museum is a reality then the museum representatives should be on the committee but based on what he has heard and knows as of today, he is not prepared to make recommendation.

Ms. Means suggested that one approach might be to include in first phase of the planning process interviews of experts to determine who should be on the core team.

Ms. Hunt asked about the impact of forming a non-profit.

Ms. Kilpatrick said she was prepared to recommend conceptually formation of a non-profit but not endorse any governance structure or specific relationships with other organizations. The HPAG has not had time to review governance documents.

The group confirmed the following list of recommendations for the Interpretive Master Plan.

- 1. Heavy and upfront role of NPS in process.**
- 2. Immediate and meaningful public outreach (emphasis on gathering local and regional public input -- what does the community want)**
- 3. Identification of options for small, medium and large allocation of space short term, mid term, and long term to include space allocations. Options and implementation schedule should consider economic realities at key points in time.**
- 4. Identification of audience and stories data.**
- 5. Planning that integrates economic and transportation data.**
- 6. Recommend that a task force begin planning events now along with implementing a trails system as being also a top priority infrastructure need (implementation). Expedite #6. [Mr. Quarstein volunteers to lead this effort.]**
- 7. HPAG wants to see RFP before it goes out.**

All members of the HPAG also agreed with recommending formation of a non-profit but not endorsing a specific governance structure or particular partnerships.

Future Meetings

Ms. Kilpatrick noted willingness of members to meet more than four times per year. A schedule needs to be proposed.

Mr. Armbruster recommended meeting more often than quarterly – possibly every two months.

Ms. Krause asked to have all available data before taking next steps to update Reuse Plan.

Ms. Hunt asked about overnight meetings.

Ms. Krause suggested meeting in July and August and then moving to every other month. Ms. Kilpatrick suggested July was perhaps more critical given what is due in August and that staff would send out some dates toward the end of June.

Mr. Armbruster said he would prefer Fort Monroe as the meeting location.

Mr. Nieweg proposed Ms. Kilpatrick as the Standing Chair. All agreed.

FMFADA & HPAG Annual Report Discussion

Ms. Kilpatrick suggested that the FMFADA annual report and the HPAG report be consolidated. She said that the recommendations of the HPAG will be made to FMFADA in writing.

Mr. Armbruster asked Mr. Dutton if he would assist staff with preparation of the annual report.

Mr. Dutton agreed.

Public Comment

Ms. Kilpatrick opened up the meeting to public comment.

Public comment was provided by the following individuals: Steve Corneliussen and H.O. Malone

Steve Corneliussen said he liked the dialogue that he heard at the meeting. He represents Citizens for a Fort Monroe National Park and that he and Gerri Holland will be part of discussion through op eds. They will substantially follow the discussion and would like to be part of discussion in the future, not just the gallery.

H.O. Malone stated that state law requires looking at the national park option. He said the NPS is on hold and is not out of the question. He recommended putting someone from NPS on HPAG. He summarized recent editorials (he highlighted excerpts from the Virginian Pilot) stating don't let this opportunity slip by. He said that future challenges include meeting the potential of the site and the need for the NPS to be partner and cites the Presidio. Mr. Malone said the NPS needs to be involved to tell the stories.

Mr. Rawls added that the Civil War Sesquicentennial Commission meets with FMFADA tomorrow. He recommended that the FMFADA ask for the following:

1. Announce they want to be on the calendar of events for May, 2011
2. Get on calendar for traveling exhibits
3. Request \$500,000 to develop an African American interpretive plan at Fort Monroe.

Mr. Rawls said that the Civil War Sesquicentennial Commissions is about inclusion and diversity and that this conversation needs to be had at Fort Monroe.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.