

# **HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY GROUP**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**August 04, 2008**

**9:30 A.M. – 3:30 P.M.**

**Attendees:** Kathleen Kilpatrick, Lauren Lee, Rob Nieweg, Eleanor Krause, Alisa Bailey and John Munick.

**Absent:** Mary Means, Jeanne Zeidler and Dorothy Redford

**Others Attending:** FMFADA: Bill Armbruster, Executive Director and Conover Hunt, Deputy Director; Greg Rutledge, Hanbury Evans

Meeting Agenda attached.

### **Call to Order**

Ms. Kilpatrick called the meeting to order and opened by asking for any discussion that may be necessary in connection with the March and June minutes. It was noted that the date in the header of the March minutes needed to be corrected but otherwise the March and June minutes were approved. The group recommended that we continue with the detailed minutes because they are very helpful.

Mr. Armbruster introduced Crystal L. DeAngelis as the new person taking minutes and providing support for the Historic Preservation Advisory Group (HPAG). Members introduced themselves.

### **HPAG Chairman Report/Discussion**

Ms. Kilpatrick reviewed the responsibilities of the HPAG in order to help set some priorities for the future. These broad responsibilities are laid out in the MOA between the Commonwealth and FMFADA, and Ms. Kilpatrick read from that document: “The Board shall establish a Historic Preservation Advisory Group to assist in guiding the development of a financially self sustaining stewardship plan for the long term management and use of historic assets at Fort Monroe. This will be for the benefit of the citizens of the Commonwealth and the United States. It is anticipated that the stewardship plan will include the development of treatment and maintenance standards for resources or categories of resources, design guidelines and standards for new construction, visitor orientation and educational programs, related marketing plans, and any business plans for the long term management for the publicly accessible historic assets.”

Ms. Kilpatrick noted that to date the Advisory Group has focused on two foundational components, the Programmatic Agreement and the Reuse Plan, which are nearing the completion of development and moving towards the implementation stage. She noted as well two things that are just getting underway: the Interpretive Planning Process and the Preservation Manual and Design Standards. These two efforts will also be foundational particularly for visitor orientation, educational programming, related marketing plans, and to the overall business plans for the long term management plan. She asked the members to discuss how they wanted to begin to consider and address the business plans aspect of their responsibilities in order to support the FMFADA.

With regard to orientation, education and marketing, Ms. Bailey stated that we need to have the development of the product before we can talk about those components and that the approach should be regional type in nature. She said as well that there needs to be some assumptions about partners.

Ms. Krause inquired about the recommendation from one of the last meetings regarding encouraging some immediate activity on Fort Monroe.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the FMFADA is working with the Garrison Commander to get more activities. Fort Monroe is having concerts now that are open to the public, working on a better promotion of the Casemate Museum, and utilizing some of the trails and beaches. Ms. Kilpatrick also indicated that she would be discussing this subject further along in today's agenda.

Ms. Bailey offered to come to Fort Monroe and work with Mr. Armbruster to ensure that all of the opportunities of Virginia Tourism are at Fort Monroe. The Casemate is scheduled to be pictured in the 2009 travel guide.

Returning to Ms. Kilpatrick question, Mr. Nieweg noted that the framers of the MOA language opened with economically self sustainment and stressed that we should not get too far before weighing in on that or letting the matter get lost.

Ms. Kilpatrick agreed with Mr. Nieweg and suggested as a starting point a thorough presentation from FMFADA and/ or its consultants in order to provide a common understanding of the data and a basis for meaningful discussion by the HPAG. She noted that the group would want to assist the FMFADA and particularly its staff in this area. She noted a continuing concern that the long term nature of the challenge head may not be fully appreciated as evidences by a misimpression that the task of the FMFADA is essentially done with the completion of the Reuse Plan.

Ms. Kilpatrick reported on agreement with Mr. Armbruster on a protocol for meetings of the HPAG and follow up. She noted that an annual meeting schedule has been established and asked the members to please plan accordingly. She acknowledged that some members preferred closed meetings to facilitate discussion but noted that that desire would need to be balanced with the interest of others, particularly board members, in attending the HPAG meetings. She reported that best efforts will be made as per the following goals: a minimum of three weeks notice will be given prior to a change in the schedule of any meeting; review/discussion materials will be distributed at least one week in advance of a meeting; phone participation will be pursued as possible and needed; materials should be brought to meetings to save time and trees; minutes will be completed within a week after a meeting for review, a formal report will forwards to the FMFADA a week after the minutes are completed, each agenda will provide a report of reactions and actions taken by the FMFADA as a result of the recommendations from HPAG and be ordered so that the members have ample opportunity to discuss matters among themselves, not just hear reports. She stressed the understanding that the HPAG is advisory to the FMFADA and not staff.

### **Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Armbruster reported that he met with the Governor, who had read the Reuse Plan, liked it and stated that he would not change anything. The Governor is planning to go to Fort Monroe on August 20, 2008 for a formal signing ceremony at The Chamberlin.

The FMFADA Board approved the HUD Homeless application in the amount of \$691K. The Reuse Plan and the HUD Homeless application need to be submitted to DOD by the end of August 2008.

Mr. Armbruster reported that the FMFADA needs a governance structure and that task is a principal focus of the next year. Mr. Armbruster has spoken with Steve Owens from the Attorney General's Office on what the FMFADA can and cannot do. The FMFADA has full authority and is a legal entity. How it is structured is the challenge. There will be a meeting with Secretary Bryant, some of the other cabinet members and Steve Owens to discuss a variety of scenarios and possible structures that will encompass some type of partnerships with FMFADA, perhaps to involve development, marketing and public private ventures. He reported that the FMFADA is hiring a project manager within the next month. The FMFADA will work hard to get the ball rolling on what governance structure and an implementation strategy. Mr. Armbruster acknowledged significant financial challenges ahead. The current budget is under \$2 mil now and may realistically need to double in the next fiscal year. He stated that the FMFADA is working closely with the City of Hampton.

Ms. Kilpatrick stressed the importance of state and federal rehabilitation tax credits as tools to attract private investment for the future of Fort Monroe. She asked that as any working group is formed to consider governance and structural arrangements, that the group include expertise from the legal community in how tax credit deals must be handled in order not to foreclose their use by mistake. Mr. Armbruster agreed with this request.

### **FMFADA Report/Discussion**

Mr. Armbruster spoke about the recommendations that were submitted to the FMFADA board by the HPAG. During the public comment, the FMFADA was inundated with comments (137) and changes. The FMFADA did overlay the management zones from the PA with the land use zones. This was a great fix that brought fourth some clarity. It modified the language to eliminate specific plans of use for specific buildings. The technical manual is the substance of the Reuse plan and it is a working document. The PA is progressing submission to the Army this month. Good news is that the project should be economically sustainable. The challenge is that the cost is going to be significant. The fear is that 2011 comes and the Army closes the doors and there are a significant number of vacant buildings. We need to try and avoid this from happening. By 2016 we should see a positive cash flow.

Ms. Krause thanked Mr. Armbruster and his staff for addressing the most critical concerns with the Reuse plan, the overlay zones and the concern over identifying specific uses for specific buildings. These changes make the Plan work hand in hand with the PA and reflect that it is a working document.

Mr. Nieweg stated that the Reuse Plan is much transformed from the original plan and that not enough note has been made of that. He stated further that it is now a vision plan and gave credit to both Mr. Armbruster and Ms. Hunt for their leadership. He also indicated that this transformation was an

indication of how successful the PA had been in trying the Reuse planning to good preservation and acknowledged Ms. Kilpatrick for her leadership in the PA process.

Mr. Armbruster updated the group on the NPS Reconnaissance Study stating that it deferred a recommendation of a further in-depth study pending review of the Reuse Plan. Significantly, the report does not anticipate that a full study would find it feasible for all of the 570 acres to become part of the NPS or event that all of the fortress could feasibly be managed or operated by NPS. Mr. Armbruster stressed the need for NPS to have a roll in Fort Monroe in the future and noted that changes were made in the Reuse Plan to encourage more proactive involvement with the NPS.

### **Master Interpretative Planning Process**

**(See attached presentation)**

Speaking about public input, Ms. Bailey stated that it should be remembered that not all the tourists are physically at Monroe and that those who travel to and visit should be considered.

In response to a question about data gathering, Ms. Bailey stated that she is not a fan of focus groups as a tool because they tend to provide what you think you want to hear. She also stressed the need to anticipate changes in the market place over a five to ten year plan. For this reason, she stressed public input and that this research would have to ongoing every other year.

Mr. Armbruster brought up a survey that will be done by Old Dominion. Ms. Hunt stated that we may be able to drop questions into that survey. This will save money.

Ms. Bailey mentioned a tool used in connection with Jamestown that involves a national panel that surveys the public every month and that you are able to add in five questions resulting in date that cost approximately \$3,000 as opposed to a \$100,000 survey.

Ms. Hunt stated that future interpretive programs will be a focus of the second part of the planning and that now is when you see who comes to the table and at what time. She noted that this is the most expensive part of the plan. These are personal services, non-personal services, partnerships, library and collecting, staffing, business plan and implementation plan.

Ms. Bailey stated that the tourism and marketing person should be the same person and noted that it will be a challenge to determine the “brand.” She indicated that the brand will be the whole experience.

Ms. Hunt stressed the importance of having leadership from the beginning in connection with public programming. She noted a concern about having enough money to maintain the historic assets and that this could cause them to try and make money on everything. She stated that you cannot make a profit on public programs and that we will need to set some things aside for the public programs that will cost the parent program some money.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she would like to have ecotourism/recreational opportunities added to the planning process in addition to a focus on history, and that there are resources and opportunities at Fort

Monroe to support this. She noted the importance of following up on the HPAG recommendations from the last meeting.

Ms. Hunt stated that the recommendation was that the NPS plays a significant roll and that there was a follow up letter sent to Terry Moore seeking involvement by the NPS. She agreed with the notion of getting the public involved with Fort Monroe as soon as possible, even before we take it over.

Ms. Hunt said that she thought building allocations should come at the end of the planning process, after themes and programs are locked in. The questions become, where are we going to tell these stories? Where are we going to put visitor's services? How are we going to move tourists if we do not want parking inside the moat? All of these questions will need to be evaluated in terms of cost. This is when the space allocations will come up because it is a part of the business plan. The programs will need to be placed where the public tells you it needs to be. The interpretive plan and the business plan blend together.

Ms. Krause stated we need to establish parameters for space needs and locations.

Ms. Bailey stated that the research has to drive the interpretive plan on all levels and that this also drives development. It is a wide spread, taking the tourism foot print into customer service and training of non-museum people. There customer experience research needs to indicate what kind of places you want, where people want to stay, do you want camping and/or do you need a small B&B. She stressed the need for a customer service component in the education and training. All of the front line needs to be trained.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that we need to ensure that Phoebus is closely involved in the planning process. She asked about the time frame for the RFP?

Ms. Hunt stated that we have two years from date of signatures to do the interpretive plan.

Ms. Krause suggested that there be a draft of the RFP for review by the HPAG.

Ms. Hunt confirmed that she will move on a draft of the RFP and send it to the HPAG prior to the next meeting for review and comments. She said she would also send a copy to the NPS for review and comments, and that she will work on advertising it nationally.

Turning to the question of stakeholders, Ms. Hunt indicated that they will come in at appropriate times and assist with finding various academic scholars that should be brought to the table to assist in the process. They would also make their interpretive plans available to us to ensure we are not duplicating anything.

Dr. Lee stated that we do not want to assign a privileged status or perceived status in the planning process to the museums that have expressed interest.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the academic symposium in January 2008 placed a focus on the Civil War and the Contraband story. He noted that there is also considerable interest from the Casemate and the

Museum of the Confederacy in being partners. He stated that these organizations are all part of the same story.

Ms. Kilpatrick said that interpreting the Civil War was important, but not by any means the only story to be told at Fort Monroe, noting that the symposium was given a defined task and questions: how to tell the Civil War history of Fort Monroe.

Mr. Armbruster noted that he had received a letter from the Virginia Museum of Natural History expressing an interest in being a partner.

Mr. Nieweg stated that he is very sensitive to the notion of any of the museums having a privileged status. The only way the master interpretive plan is going to be defensible long term if it does not start with the notion that any solution is preordained. He said this is a key issue.

Mr. Nieweg stated that the Museum of the Confederacy sets off alarm bells, and not just in Virginia. He noted that one of the conclusions of the Civil War Symposium was that the Contraband story should be uniquely told.

Mr. Armbruster stated the Contraband Society, the Casemate and the Museum of the Confederacy had had discussions. He also noted that the Contraband Society has some significant names from the Confederacy's old families, including Robert E. Lee. He stated that the dilemma is how to keep any single organization in discussion without giving them most favored status.

Dr. Lee stated that she thinks that the discussion needs to be broadened to include other entities. Although the Contraband Society and the Museum of the Confederacy may be in sync with each other, will the public see that? How would this play to visitors?

Ms. Bailey stated that there needs to be a balance for potential partners to be part of the process but not to the exclusion of other potential partners.

The group did not recommend the establishment of a museum working group under the direct aegis of the FMFADA, but instead recommended that Mr. Armbruster advise interested museums of their integral and important involvement at various points in the interpretative master planning process. In this way, it was agreed that institutions would have a stake and forum for their interests to be heard and responded to, and yet the problem of expectations and special status would be minimized.

#### Working Lunch

Mr. Armbruster mentioned during the break that FMFADA had hired Gerri Hollins to assist with the Contraband story.

#### **Preservation Manual and Design Standards Presentation/Discussion**

Ms. Kilpatrick introduced Greg Rutledge and reminded members that they had previously discussed the question of whether there should be two separate consultants working on historic versus new buildings and that the HPAG has agreed that one consultant would be fine.

Mr. Rutledge referred to a rough draft of how the standards could be organized. **(See handout attached.)**

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the PMDS would have to develop requirements for everything: new construction, infill, and treatment of historic buildings, including maintenance.

As to organization of the document, she stated that it would be helpful to have a general overview of the history of the place, and the resources that contribute to the NHL District combined with detail on each building to include the issues that they may have. She stated that a significant issue with any contributing building will be defining features and primary spaces versus secondary spaces? This information will be critical to facilitating rehab work and knowing how the Secretary of Interior's Standard will be applied to a particular building.

She stated further that having some samples of manuals and standards from other places would be helpful to the task at hand. She raised concerns with enforcement and aligning the manual with the governing structure down the road.

Mr. Nieweg mentioned that we needed to make the standards clear so that lay people can understand them.

Ms. Kilpatrick had printed out some of the components from Governors Island manual and shared these with the HPAG. She noted that the Governors Island manual included a summary sheet for every building and how useful such a sheet would be both to managers and potential investors because it pre-identified features and intact spaces and summarized building needs.

Ms. Krause supported the importance of having individual building documents that would be easy to understand. She thought this information should include a notation of the character defining elements.

Ms. Krause stated that there may be some resources that should be restored rather than rehabilitated, but that mandating that at this point may be inappropriate at this time. She noted as well that preservation standards are intended to maintain a resource: not restoring it but not letting it get any worse. She stated that we will need to have a discussion about the Endicott Batteries and how they should be treated.

Ms. Krause stated that most projects in the future will fall under the definition of rehabilitation, while certain resources or certain parts of resources may rise to a level of restoration treatment being appropriate. Therefore, she said, that will be something that should be laid out.

Ms. Kilpatrick agreed with Ms. Krause, stating that we will need some flexibility with restoration standards and that it will be only the rare building that will require treatment under a restoration standard.

Mr. Nieweg stated the one of the goals of the standards is to facilitate the tax credits for Reuse. A related goal is the desire to streamline approval process and eliminate unnecessary delay.

Mr. Rutledge stated that some of the buildings on Fort Monroe have been maintained, updated and modified throughout in the 1980's.

Ms. Krause felt that categorizing the buildings as has been done at other military posts would be useful and that exercises would dovetail with the treatment options and set priority for resources.

Ms. Kilpatrick noted that categorizing resources was an appropriate strategy for management and of a working military base in order to facilitate primary mission, but that Fort Monroe was now a very different matter since the property was being turned over and in light of the preservation mandate going forward. Furthermore, she stated that essentially the PA provided categories for Fort Monroe already: contributing, non-contribution and individually listed or eligible. Beyond those categories, she said we must consider defining features and primary versus secondary spaces. Ms. Krause agreed with this and Mr. Rutledge said he would use those categories.

Ms. Kilpatrick mentioned mothballing and Mr. Rutledge acknowledged that we would need to address mothballing, stabilization and conservation. He said that there will have to be an in-depth discussion of the batteries. He stated his opinion that the batteries should be stabilized as is.

Mr. Nieweg stated that in the case of the batteries we should ensure that their condition doesn't fall below a certain standard and that if we don't say now that these batteries must be treated to a minimum standard then they will not be treated at all. Further, he stated that if that were to happen we will lose a big part of Monroe.

Ms. Kilpatrick reminded the group that one of the strategies of the PA was to create a separate zone for the batteries and that with the requirements for assessments, mothballing, stabilization and conservation come into play.

Ms. Krause agreed with the wisdom of having a zone for the batteries. She wondered if that would allow for different treatment of individual batteries: could you rehab one, stabilize others?

Ms. Krause stated the understanding that there will be no new construction inside the moat.

Mr. Nieweg stated that the Wherry Quarter will need substantial discussion with respect to new construction and development.

Mr. Rutledge stated that the Design Standards draft goes out to all of the Public, NSP and the Advisory Council. Design Standards are subject to the final approval of the SHPO.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Rutledge to attend the September 03, 2008 meeting. The request was made to send out an amended/expanded outline of the PMDS. She also requested samples and suggested that he review Section III of the PA.

### **Broader Opportunities Discussion**

Mr. Armbruster recognized the importance of having Fort Monroe open to the public and reported that the Army is having concerts every Thursday night and Fort Monroe is now open to fishing again. Mr. Armbruster is also working with the Hamptons Visitors Bureau to include Fort Monroe on their iPod tour.



Mr. Munick stated that the Chamberlin has opened up for brunch on Sundays again. They had 100 people for the first opening. They are also looking at other avenues to open up the Chamberlin.

Ms. Kilpatrick recommended forming a group to work with Mr. Armbruster to develop a calendar of activities and events with an eye to keeping Fort Monroe before the public. She noted that Mr. Quarstein had shown an interest in working on this. She stated that the development of trails needs to be a high priority with a focus on both history and recreation.

Ms. Kilpatrick offered the involvement of staff in DHR's Newport News office. She also suggested that local colleges and universities would be a good source of assistance on projects, marketing, brochures, etc.—that colleges are often looking for substantive projects of this nature and that DHR has had a great experience drawing on such resources. Dr. Lee mentioned Old Dominion, Hampton University or Norfolk State as potential participants.

Mr. Armbruster mentioned that Phoebus will need to be a part of the calendar of events along with Fort Monroe. He stated that the Army is not opening the beaches to the public because there are not any life guards, but that picnics on the beach are allowed.

Ms. Kilpatrick shared that the Governor has announced that 2009 will be the year of energy and natural resources. The designation will give a organizing them consistent with previous years (educations, transportation, for example) to build special events, legislation and the budget around.

She noted that the Governor is really big on sustainability and national resources and stated that she has Fort Monroe be considered as the site for the development of a Virginia Center Natural Resources and sustainability in light of its wealth of diverse historic and natural resources, unique ecology, access to the bay, an estuary, a marina, etc.. The concept would involve a center for education, research, think tanks, public and private agencies to operate. The initiative could begin with summer programs that could be institutionalized and built on in the future. She suggested a goal would be a governor's school that focused on natural resources, noting that we have such schools for politics and arts but no such focus on the environment. She noted the enormous intellectual resources in the region ranging from colleges and universities to Colonial Williamsburg, the military, etc. This discussion brought the question back around to the need for ecotourism and education to be an integral part of the interpretive planning process.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked what everyone thought about the concept and developing it further, including sharing it with some key players.

Ms. Krause and Mr. Nieweg thought this was an excellent concept and great opportunity.

### **Annual Report Discussion**

Mr. Munick stated that David Dutton did a very good job on the annual report outline and the group agreed that it should proceed.

### **Future Agenda**

Next HPAG meeting is September 03, 2008 at The Chamberlin, Fort Monroe.

Ms. Kilpatrick would like to begin the next meeting with a focus on the self sustaining and economic aspects and begin to get into those steps that are relative to the development of business plans.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked that BAE be available as a presenter.

Ms. Kilpatrick will bring her expanded chart on needs, deliverables and operational management needs.

Mr. Armbruster stated that there will be a draft RFP for the Interpretive Master Plan for review.

Mr. Nieweg stated the he would like to understand the competing numbers given that the Army has said the operational cost are \$15 million annually and the consultants have indicated for \$4 million. He also inquired about the roll of the Virginia and the Federal Tax Credits in the economic picture.

Ms. Kilpatrick added that the NPS had altogether different numbers from both he Army and BAE and suggested that BAE explore this with NPS.

Mr. Armbruster noted that the larger marketing picture should encompass Old Point Comfort and that in telling the story of Fort Monroe, that is what Fort Monroe was called.

Mr. Munick mentioned that Mr. Quarstein has several interesting historical pictures of Old Point Comfort.

Dr. Lee stated that she thinks Old Point Comfort should be brought in from an African American historical prospective because it was where the first Africans landed in America, moving that history beyond the Civil War.

Dr. Lee also recommends that we should explore the possibility of an affiliation with the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History to interpret the contraband story.

Ms. Kilpatrick suggested in closing that the HPAG agenda for September might need 45 minutes to 1 hour on the Master Interpretive Plan (Conover Hunt), 45 minutes to 1 hour with Greg Rutledge on the Design Standards, and that the balance of the agenda should be devoted to BAE and the economic picture.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,  
Crystal L. DeAngelis,  
Secretary to the HPAG