

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY GROUP

Meeting Minutes

February 02, 2009

9:55 A.M. – 12:40 P.M.

Attendees: Kathleen Kilpatrick, Chair, Dr. Laurant Lee, Robert Nieweg, John Munick, Jeanne Zeidler, Eleanor Krause

Absent: Alisa Bailey, Dorothy Redford and Mary Means

Others Attending: Bill Armbruster, FMFADA Executive Director, Joshua Gillespie, FMFADA Project Manager, Trudy O'Reilly, FMFADA Communications Manager, Catharine Gilliam, FMFADA Commissioner, John Quarstein, FMFADA Commissioner, David Dutton, FMFADA Consultant; Greg Rutledge, Hanbury Evans; Samuel Martin and Tammie Organski, ECOS 360; Bill Brookover, NPS

Meeting Agenda is attached.

Call to Order

Ms. Kilpatrick called the meeting to order at 9:55 a.m. and took the roll. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that Mr. Brookover was in attendance as a result of her asking him to serve as a resource in assisting the HPAG with the Design Standards. Ms. Kilpatrick suggested that future minutes be submitted in a summary format as appropriate in order to speed distribution.

HPAG Chairman Report/Discussion

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that we are poised to have a final PA for signature. The Army's lawyers' rewrites have been received, resulting in some unilateral changes that were difficult for the Commonwealth, the National Park Service and other signatory parties to accept. There have been conversations with the Army to understand what their objectives were and the signatories were able to work out the issues verbally. As a result a new draft PA is expected to be ready by the end of this week.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that there have been questions about the General Assembly and budget. At this time it is early in the session and the budget decisions are usually not revealed until later. She also stated that Mr. Armbruster had the opportunity to meet with the legislative Appropriations Committee and he will share that information during his report [*Ed. Note: Mr. Armbruster attended the 23 January meeting of the House Appropriations Committee with Chairman Bryant as described below in the Executive Director's Report*]. Legislatively, there is nothing at this time floating about that impacts Fort Monroe. If there were any impacts it would likely come through the budgeting process as would similar impacts to Historic Resources. Implementing the PA and moving forward at Fort Monroe depends on the FMFADA, the SHPO and the Department of General Services having the means to meet the responsibilities at Fort Monroe. There is a need to convey this message to the General Assembly because we do not want to take on a big responsibility without the ability to perform.

Ms. Kilpatrick motioned for the approval of the December 1, 2008 minutes. Ms. Zeidler seconded the motion. All were in favor, the minutes were approved.

FMFADA Executive Director's Report

Mr. Armbruster stated that he submitted a budget of \$3.1 million to the governor's office. The actual amount in the governor's budget request is \$1.6 million. He also mentioned that he accompanied Chairman Bryant to meet with the House Appropriations Committee. Sec. Bryant's briefing was well received by the committee. Bill followed up with meetings with individual members or members of their Staff. He stated that his main message was the importance of Fort Monroe's closing date in September 2011. FMFADA's commitment is to be ready with interim leasing so that we can keep the buildings occupied and avoid taking over an inventory of empty/mothballed buildings.

Mr. Armbruster stated that he is going to Washington DC for meetings on Capitol Hill to discuss the \$96.5 million submission for infrastructure work that was submitted for the stimulus package. Included in the infrastructure work is wastewater system, completion of the flood control project, sand replenishment and related infrastructure work that is needed at Fort Monroe. Mr. Armbruster has appointments scheduled with Senator Webb and Congressmen Nye, Wittman and Scott. He is also pursuing an appointment with Senator Warner.

Mr. Armbruster mentioned that the RFP for the Management Strategy should be out this week FMFADA has the authority through legislation to be an implementing/managing body as well as a planning body. There is a need for a management structure that will take FMFADA through the long haul. The FMFADA has been reviewing models to assist with the management structure.

He also discussed the ownership of two parcels of land still in dispute between the Commonwealth and the Army. FMFADA and the Army have agreed to pursue an Economic Development Conveyance, which will avoid litigation and facilitate conveyance of all the parcels to the Commonwealth. This EDC may be a cost transfer.

Mr. Armbruster mentioned that in the next six months he plans to have the initial Design Standards completed around May/June, along with the Management recommendations for the Board, studies on the need for public safety and emergency services, the Economic Development Conveyance draft, and a draft environmental impact statement. He also mentioned that we are working with the City of Hampton towards a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for future services and security [*Ed. Note: security refers to public safety*].

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Armbruster if the HPAG group could provide any assistance.

Mr. Armbruster stated that he would appreciate HPAG support for both the Budget request as well as the Stimulus package to the General Assembly and to the Congressional delegation. Ms. Kilpatrick suggested the HPAG work with Mr. Armbruster and Mr. Gillespie on writing a letter to the Assembly. She also encouraged all stakeholders to write individual letters to key legislators. Mr. Nieweg moved the motion and Mr. Munick seconded. The Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Armbruster about the status of the museum stakeholders.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the museum stakeholders were not ready for this meeting. They are expected to be ready to speak to the HPAG at the next meeting April 6, 2009.

Ms. Kilpatrick mentioned that she has spoken to the Virginia Museum of Natural History and that they are interested in having a presence at Fort Monroe and focusing on the natural history and environmental resources.

Mr. Armbruster mentioned that he is continuing discussions with the Army in regards to the continued presence of the Casemate Museum at Fort Monroe.

Dr. Lee asked if the Museum of the Confederacy was still interested.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the Museum of the Confederacy, the Hampton History Museum, the Casemate Museum, the Virginia War Museum and the Virginia Museum of Natural History are all interested in a presence at Fort Monroe.

In response to a question about the centrality of the contraband story and the need for representation in the planning process, Mr. Quarstein said that Ms. Gerri Hollins has shown interest in having a Contraband Museum presence at Fort Monroe [*Ed. Note: Mr. Quarstein spoke as a member of the self-directed museum group*]. He stated that there is a section included for the Contraband Museum in the museum group's plan. Ms. Kilpatrick stressed again the importance of involving the stakeholders in discussions. Mr. Quarstein also stated that there is representation for museums and an interpretive plan that works off of visiting and touring historic displays.

Turning to Ms. Zeidler's report, Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the IMP RFP revisions should reflect a broad programmatic approach and not an institution specific one, looking beyond the self-identified stakeholders, particularly with regard to community input.

Ms. Zeidler provided her report and stated that the RFP for the Fort Monroe Long Range Interpretive Master Planning Coordinator has been revised to reflect the suggestions that were presented at the September 2008 HPAG meeting. She also stated that some of the suggestions made would require changes inconsistent with state procurement policy and those cannot be incorporated. Ms. Zeidler asked Mr. Gillespie to speak about some of the changes that were made. (*see draft attached*)

Mr. Gillespie stated that the statement of purpose was revised to reflect the broader scope and purpose. He noted that Ms. Gilliam had suggested that the document cite the sources for basic interpretive planning principles and asked if it would be worthwhile to include those documents as part of the RFP. He said that the principles are stated as part of the RFP, in a non-bulleted list and that the website link to the source documents is also included. He said that a large reference of the basic principles should be discussed further with the advisory group, specifically whether to attach the source documents to the RFP.

Ms. Kilpatrick recommended having bullets and links added to the specifics and basic principles in the RFP.

Ms. Zeidler motioned on behalf of the RFP committee to have the RFP sent out after the changes have been made. Ms. Krause seconded the motion. Ms. Kilpatrick called the question, which passed unanimously.

Design Standards Discussion – Updated Presentation by Greg Rutledge (*see attached*)

The following suggestions and/or concerns were made by the HPAG.

- Work on the narrative.
- Develop a check list and flow charts.
- The PA needs to come prior to the Reuse Plan.
- Primary, secondary and public spaces need to be addressed.
- Discussions with the Army regarding roofing systems and maintenance. This is critical for tax credit projects.
- Discussions with the NPS and the SHPO regarding tax credits.
- Encourage green principles as appropriate.
- HPAG review of all changes in a month. Before the April 6, 2009 HPAG meeting.

National Park Service Working Group

Ms. Kilpatrick addressed the study of potential roles for the NPS at Fort Monroe that was assigned to the HPAG by the FMFADA Board. The NPS presence at Fort Monroe is a critical issue for FMFADA and the public. Mr. Moore of the NPS presented a slide show at the January 6, 2009 FMFADA board meeting with a presentation. The presentation briefly described various models within the NPS for possible consideration at Fort Monroe. Mr. Moore identified relationships, partnerships, and ranges of NPS involvement from full scale to other creative affiliations.

Ms. Kilpatrick has asked Mr. Nieweg and Mr. Munick to serve along with Ms. Gilliam and Mr. Harper from the FMFADA Board on the NPS Working Group. Mr. Dutton is staffing this working group.

Ms. Kilpatrick gave the NPS group a charge to get started. She presented the group with an Evaluating Development Model – Draft Framework. (*See attached*)

- Use Mr. Moore's presentation as a starting point.
- Thorough factual presentation.
- Develop a factual basis for the FMFADA to discuss and make decisions going forward.
- The group will not make a formal recommendation. The basic facts for consideration should be presented to the HPAG at the April meeting.
- Communicate closely with the NPS.

In response to a question from Mr. Perrault in attendance, Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the working group's meeting will not be open to the public, but the product will be fully discussed at HPAG meetings.

Fort Monroe Technology Management Model Presentation

Samuel Martin and Tammie Organski, ECOS 360 (*see attached*)

Mr. Martin stated that their focus is sustainability solutions and long term management. He also stated that there are some major categories that need to be managed.

- Implementing the Reuse Plan
- Progress Reporting
- Public Participation
- Short/Long Term Planning
- Daily Operations

Mr. Martins mentioned that he is talking to the National Trust and the Army to obtain more information and introduce the concept of Technology Management.

Future Agenda

- Design Standards update
- NPS sub-committee report
- Report from the Stakeholders (Museums)
- RFP – Interpretive Master Planning update
- Fort Monroe funding status

Public Comments

Mrs. Gergely reiterated the importance of education about Fort Monroe to the elected officials and the public at large. She suggested writing individual elected officials to reinforce the funding requests in present and future.

Mr. Perreault listed two fundamental positions the Citizens for a Fort Monroe National Park (CFMNP) are advocating, as follows:

- Fort Monroe to be a grand public place
- Fort Monroe to be a unit of the National Park Service (NPS)

The CFMNP has advocated for a hybrid National Park Service (NPS) structure for affiliation and management of Fort Monroe. They look to the Presidio in San Francisco as a model but recognize it is not the only option. He stated the CFMNP desires to participate in the newly-formed NPS Working Group.

He further listed reasons in support of the position for a NPS unit:

- The public wants it
- It is the right thing to do because Fort Monroe is deserving of NPS designation, funding, and stewardship particularly given the scale of the property (contrasted with the private resource management of ‘individual building’ sites like Mount Vernon and Monticello)
- Designation as a unit of the NPS will leverage future federal funding (particularly in case of emergencies, like natural events such as major storms)
- The NPS moniker and “brown sign” are draws for tourists

On other issues:

- Timing – Fort Monroe interim management (including property and interpretive) should be the practice until the NPS comes here to manage those activities
- Political – When FMFADA becomes an advocate for Fort Monroe as a NPS unit, they will benefit from the groundwork laid by the CFMNP that contacted every delegate, representative, and senator on the value of a Fort Monroe National Park
- NPS Working Group – the CFMNP desires to participate in the discussions of the working group, at least at the end of the process if not during

Next scheduled meeting is April 6, 2009 at Fort Monroe, Virginia.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal L. DeAngelis, Secretary to the HPAG