

# **HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY GROUP**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**June 1, 2009**

**10:30A.M. – 1:53 P.M.**

**Attendees:** Kathleen Kilpatrick, Chair; Eleanor Krause; Dr. Laurenett Lee; John Munick; Robert Nieweg; Dorothy Redford; Jeanne Zeidler

**Absent:** Alisa Bailey

**Others attending:** John Quarstein, FMFADA Commissioner; Bill Brookover, National Park Service (NPS); Greg Rutledge, Hanbury Evans Wright Vlattas + Company; Josh Gillespie, FMFADA Project Manager; Joan Baker, FMFADA Executive Assistant/HRD

Meeting agenda is attached.

### **Call to Order**

Following the roll call and a welcome, Ms. Kilpatrick began the meeting by calling for any corrections to the April meeting minutes. Mr. Rob Nieweg proposed an amendment on page 5 stating that he expressed several serious concerns about the museum concept presented by Dr. Cureton.

Ms. Kilpatrick called for a motion to approve the minutes, provided the corrections were incorporated. Mr. Munick motioned, and Dr. Lee seconded. All were in favor, the minutes were approved.

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

Ms. Kilpatrick reported that the Programmatic Agreement (PA) was signed by the Governor and the Advisory Council, the last required signature, making it effective as of April 27. She added that the formalizing of this agreement really starts the clock ticking on many issues that are deliverables of the agreement, to include the Design Standards, the development of educational materials, and the Commonwealth hiring a Fort Monroe Historic Preservation Officer (FMHPO). She stated that viewshed and landscape analysis must also be conducted by the Army very quickly, and that these need to intersect with the Design Standards. She stated the Army is having a meeting on the viewshed and landscape analysis this afternoon. Ms. Kilpatrick told Greg Rutledge it would be important for him to stay on top of these meetings.

Questions/comments: Ms. Krause asked about the Army's deadline for these studies. Ms. Kilpatrick stated she thought it was 12 months. She added that the HPAG-FMFADA task is phased, with regard to the Design Standards: first a good working draft, then integration of the

viewshed and landscape studies, public review and comment, create a final draft, adoption and implementation by property transfer. She said this process is dependent on receiving the Army's material and allows time for public comment.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the HPAG has already begun the process for educational planning with the Interpretive/educational plans particularly with the hiring of the Master Interpretive Planner which will be addressed later in the meeting.

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

Mr. Gillespie gave the following report on behalf of Bill Armbruster.

Mr. Gillespie said effective July 1 the FMFADA will become an independent operating fiscal agency. There are many items the FMFADA staff is working on, subject to approval of the Board. Specifically they are working on policies and procedures for accounting, payroll, human resources, procurement, health insurance and retirement plans that are handled by the current fiscal agent. He described the details of the fiscal policies and procedures the FMFADA would use effective July 1. He stated the FMFADA would be adding 3 new employees to include an office clerk, and two finance professionals. Mr. Gillespie stated that the FMFADA's main expenses are contract services, primarily consultants.

Mr. Gillespie stated that three working groups have been established. They are the following: the National Park Service Working Group, the Natural Resources Working Group, and the African American Culture Working Group. He added that African American Culture Working Group would be holding their first meeting today, and would be arriving towards the end of the Historic Preservation Advisory Group meeting so they may be formally introduced.

Mr. Gillespie said the FMFADA had put an RFP out for a governance and management consultant to help shape the transaction planning, organizational structure and Board structure. He stated that Robert Charles Lesser and Company (RCLCO) was selected and will be looking specifically at the areas of real estate, historic preservation and operation of public programs. He added that RCLCO worked with Governor's Island and Jekyll Island. Mr. Gillespie said a draft report should go out to the Board by the June 25<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

Mr. Gillespie reminded the HPAG members that the FMFADA had submitted an ambitious list of infrastructure projects to both Richmond and Washington in January. He stated we did not make the cut for this round of stimulus funding. He added that there was good news that Congressman Nye's office has requested \$9.2 million for Fort Monroe's water system, and hopes to see that advance quickly.

Mr. Gillespie stated that the FMFADA has been negotiating for municipal services with the City of Hampton, and hopes to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with them.

He continued to describe all the groups that the FMFADA is negotiating with for services to include:

- City of Hampton
- Newport News Waterworks (NNWW)
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
- Verizon/Cox

Mr. Gillespie also stated the FMFADA is involved in discussions with the Army on real estate.

Mr. Gillespie concluded by saying that the FMFADA has done many presentations, meetings and discussions with community, civic and professional organizations over the course of the last month. He also added that the RFP for the Interpretive Master Planner is out and advertised until June 11<sup>th</sup>. After June 11<sup>th</sup> he said we will be going through a selection process.

Questions/comments: Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Gillespie to remind the group of the selection process for the IMP and who is involved with it. Mr. Gillespie said he could not identify the personnel of the selection committee since he was not sure if we had to use the DHCD's procurement requirements. DHCD would require a selection committee which would require one member of the Board and two staff members. He stated that the Chairman of the Board would most likely identify someone on the Board to serve on the committee.

Recommendation: Ms. Kilpatrick recommended that the selection committee be broadened to include at least one member of the HPAG. She added that she thought there should be opportunities in the selection process for interviews of the short list, which might involve a larger group than the formal selection committee. She also stressed how important the IMP process is to setting the future for Fort Monroe, and that we should draw on some of the expertise found in the HPAG. The HPAG agreed with these recommendations.

Mr. Gillespie stated that he would pass that along to the Executive Director. Mr. Gillespie said during the interview process it may be possible for the selection committee to have professional input from observers who are not voting. He said the coordination and logistics of that is critical as June 11<sup>th</sup> approaches.

Ms. Redford asked Mr. Gillespie if it would be possible for the HPAG Chair to see the criteria for the scoring. Mr. Gillespie said "absolutely" and reminded the group that in the RFP for governance and management consultation there was a scoring format that was approved by DHCD. He added there is not always a clean mesh between what the agency wants and what the policy as interpreted by the procurement officer of DHCD.

Ms. Krause said there should be five people on the selection committee, with two members being from the HPAG.

Mr. Gillespie stated the Procurement Officer of DHCD did remove some proposals for the governance and management project that were considered by DHCD's policies to be unresponsive. Those were from applicants who did not submit a bottom dollar amount. Ms. Kilpatrick added that the procurement officer makes the first cut based not on substance, but for other reasons i.e., the timeliness of response, completed and signed documents, an adequate response, etc.

### **Natural Resources Working Group Report**

Ms. Kilpatrick gave a report from the Natural Resources Working Group (NRWG) in Jim Beard's absence. She reminded the HPAG of the purpose of the group to bring the right experts to the table to help assess the natural resources of Fort Monroe/Old Point Comfort and how those resources might be used for outdoor recreation and environmental education. She added the group is Co-chaired by Jim Beard from the Museum of Natural History and John Davy from the Department of Conservation and Recreation. The group is now focusing on getting familiar with Fort Monroe, particularly the northernmost natural end. She added that John Davy is working on creating a recreational plan which fits into the map, to include activities such as kayaking, canoeing, and trails. The group is also looking at what kinds of facilities, such as canoe storage, for example, would be necessary to support those activities. The member of the group from Game and Inland Fisheries is providing an inventory of species. She stated that the NRWG preliminary sense is not favorable to a road out of the northern end for, natural resource, recreational and safety reasons in what should be a family friendly area. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the group is meeting regularly and is staffed by Dutton and Associates. She added that she is very pleased with their progress.

Ms. Kilpatrick also reported that on May 19 she had the opportunity to bring Ann Jennings, Chris Moore and Libby Morris from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation to Fort Monroe. They toured the property to assess the natural resources in the northern end. Later that day they joined the NRWG for lunch and an informal meeting. She stated the Chesapeake Bay Foundation is very interested in exploring opportunities for restoration projects, especially in the northern end. Ms. Kilpatrick said she thinks the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and the NRWG have now established a connection and will work together in the future on common matters.

Questions/comments: Jeanne Zeidler asked Kathleen Kilpatrick for the timeline on the NRWG. Ms. Kilpatrick said they hope to have a draft report by the end of the summer, and that it will be presented to the HPAG for consideration.

Ms. Krause asked if there has been any communication with city government at Buckroe Beach in particular with respect to extending the road on the northern end. She added there might be a benefit to Buckroe in having a visitor center in Buckroe with walking access to Fort Monroe, and that Buckroe should be brought into the discussion. Mr. Quarstein stated that the land there is privately owned and it is a tight spot. Sam Martin, a member of the public group and resident of Buckroe, stated that there are many people in both the Buckroe Civic Association and Buckroe Improvement League that are interested in having a program connection to Fort Monroe. Ms. Kilpatrick acknowledged the benefit of that while drawing a distinction between a program link and a road, and stressed that there are many unanswered questions about impact of a road.

Ms. Redford stated that she is not clear on what the HPAG should expect in the NRWG report, what the deliverables are, and what we are going to have in a report since there was no discussion by the HPAG prior to the formation of the NRWG about its composition, charge, deliverables or timeline.. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she had not told the NPS Working Group what the report was to look like exactly, but instead charged them with a task -- creating a fact based report on potential options for relationships with the Park Service and the considerations associated with the various options. In the same way, she stated that the NRWG was given a charge to assess and inventory the resources, give a sense of what the educational and outdoor recreational opportunities might be, marry that up with data, such as from the Virginia Outdoor Plan, as to what people are interested in and value, and develop broad interpretive themes for natural and outdoor assets. She expects a report to the HPAG by the end of summer, with the HPAG expected to tweak the report. She would anticipate a joint presentation to the FMFADA Board and hoped this would be part of the information that would flow into the IMP.

Mayor Zeidler stated she thinks the NRWG is a great idea, but that the group needs to be careful that the group does not get ahead of the IMP. She agreed with Ms. Redford the HPAG should have been involved in the creation of this working group rather than learning about it after the fact. Ms. Redford also expressed concerns about this. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she thinks the group has a clear idea of what their charge was and that the information was intend to provide information for and feed into the IMP process as a working group of the HPAG.

### **National Park Service Working Group Update**

Mr. Nieweg stated the group is made up of Bob Harper and Catharine Gilliam (FMFADA Board), John Munick and Rob Nieweg (HPAG) and are staffed by Dutton and Associates. He stated their charge is to prepare a factual report which would go to the FMFADA describing the full range of options for NPS involvement at Fort Monroe. He stated they are not charged with making a recommendation as to which option the FMFADA should adopt. He said the NPSWG has established a framework for their report aided by Terry Moore, Bill Bolger and Bill Brookover of the NPS. He stated the group is now working on the most time consuming part of fleshing out that framework through June. They have a distinguished list of Park Service experts

and a set of nonprofit experts, and independent experts. He said incorporated in the list is John Reynolds, who is retired from the Park Service, but has a national perspective of the options that must be considered by the FMFADA. He said they will provide a draft report to the HPAG with opportunity for review of the report. He stated they also intend to provide a draft to the public so they may provide comments for consideration of the working group.

Questions/comments: Ms. Kilpatrick added that she envisions a joint presentation of the report to the FMFADA by the NPSWG and the HPAG.

Mayor Zeidler had to leave the meeting early due to a conflict and regretted that she could not participate in the discussion of the report from the Museum group. She commented that after reading the report it is clear that it is the product of the hard work of a number of people and contains many interesting ideas which warrant more consideration and discussion. She also said that she read the lengthy response to the report that Mr. Nieweg distributed recently by email and it also contains information and ideas that should be further investigated. Mayor Zeidler said that these documents should inform the Interpretive Master Plan process and continued examination of the concepts presented be incorporated into that project. She left the meeting at 11:30 am.

Mr. Nieweg concluded his report by saying the NPSWG has all the pieces in place and now has the obligation to pick up the pace, so they may provide an opportunity for comment and input. David Dutton stated the draft would be done by mid to late July, and that the interviews would be synthesized into the framework. Bill Brookover added that Terry Moore also wants to review the report before it is presented to the HPAG.

Ms. Kilpatrick strongly recommended that the NPS group develop a set of interview questions to be used following any open discussion with each interviewee. That way, she thought the NPSWG could have the benefit of whatever an interviewee might wish to share and cover all the same information with all interviewees. Mr. Nieweg responded that they would do that formally and use the questions consistently in the future. He said that they have a set of questions that David Dutton had done a good job of preparing before the talk with John Reynolds and that the questions helped open the discussion and follow the essential issues.

Mr. Munick said to keep in mind that there are many different combinations of working with the NPS. Ms. Kilpatrick asked if there were any common themes as far as implementation. David Dutton described two main ways to approach partnership: through Congress or through the Park Service. He stated each of these ways has different elements in terms of how long it takes and who is involved. He said right now they are involved in conversation with professionals from the Presidio Trust in San Francisco, Governors Island in New York, and Little Rock, Arkansas. He said they want to weigh the pros and cons of the different levels of involvement.

### **Museum concepts**

Ms. Kilpatrick directed the group toward the Museum Group's report that had been presented to them at the last meeting. She had asked the group to provide comments and hoped now to have an open discussion on this matter.

Mr. John Quarstein gave an update on the Museum group in the absence of Dr. Charles Cureton. Josh Gillespie reminded the group of the two page summary that they were emailed as a read ahead for the meeting from Dr. Cureton.

Mr. Quarstein said there were several other institutions that saw Fort Monroe as an interpretive opportunity. He stated Dr. Cureton wanted to look at what type of museums would want to be involved in the future of Fort Monroe. The following museums have expressed interest: the Virginia Museum of Natural History, the Hampton History Museum, and the Museum of the Confederacy. He stated other groups have expressed interest but have not yet gotten formally involved. He said they discussed many issues such as what they wanted to do, what type of buildings they should be in, should it be a cluster of museums, etc. Mr. Quarstein stated that the Army needs a clear commitment in order to consider keeping the Casemate Museum on Fort Monroe and that would need to include support from other institutions. He stated this group also feels strongly that certain buildings cannot be partially open to the public because of their historical importance [*Editor's note: This is assumed to mean w/limited security. Mr. Quarstein did not explain this further.*].

Questions/comments: Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she found the concept of a museum campus to be intriguing, while having concerns about the particulars. She noted that there were some very large questions. She compared it to a chicken and an egg situation with assumptions being made in the report about management, structure, financing, building uses, what institutions to include, etc, and that these reach to very critical issues for the FMFADA and the IMP process. Mr. Quarstein stated that the Army leaves in 2011, and that is why the Museum group wanted to "get out of the gate" with the planning process.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked the group to join in on the discussion, and stated that there are some core questions unanswered, like what does the public want, are these the right partners to provide that, and what will the public support in a financially sustainable way. She noted that the group of museums involved was self-selected. She stated the HPAG must be very conscious of core questions as yet unanswered, although she noted that we must also be very conscious of the legitimate interest in keeping the Casemate and its collections at Fort Monroe. She stated we need to move forward somehow on that front without getting ahead of ourselves on others.

She reminded the group, for example of the commitment of the Commonwealth and FMFADA in the PA to take no action that would preclude the use of Fort Monroe in whole or in part as a unit or affiliate of NPS until such time as the potential for such partnerships has been fully investigated. She asked Mr. Quarstein if the Museum group had talked to the Park Service and shared its concept to see if it was consistent with a partnership with the Park Service. Mr. Quarstein stated that he did not know if Dr. Cureton has interfaced with the Park Service at this point. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that until issues like this were understood, she did not think the HPAG was in a position to endorse the report as a whole.

Ms. Redford stated she had concerns and asked if it would be appropriate to postpone this discussion until the IMP is started. Ms. Krause agreed with that sentiment and wanted it deferred until the group has more information. Mr. Nieweg stated that he had concerns after the last meeting after reading the Museum group's report. Ms. Kilpatrick acknowledged those concerns,

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she had hoped the HPAG, while not endorsing the report, would refer it to the Interpretive Master Planning process for vetting out through that process. When asked specifically if the HPAG should endorse it to the FMFADA she responded not in view of the sense of the discussion and the questions and issues that needed to be ironed out.

Mr. Nieweg stated that he thought the Museum group would have the opportunity to hand their report to the expert consultant the FMFADA hires to do the Interpretive Master Plan. He stated that the HPAG should not get involved under the circumstances in anything that appeared to approve the material or officially hand it off to the FMFADA or the planner. Instead he recommended that the HPAG stay neutral and objective given the concerns.

Mr. Quarstein stated that the Army is concerned about the Casemate Museum. He asked how a museum like the Museum of Natural History that wants a presence on Fort Monroe should go about having that considered, who they should go to ---the Director of the FMFADA or to the HPAG? He stated we need to make sure that the Casemate Museum makes it through this transition and that the potential exists for the Army to remove the collection of artifacts at the Casemate Museum from Fort Monroe when the Army leaves in 2011. He stated the motivating factor behind the report was that Dr. Cureton wanted partners to help in maintaining the Casemate Museum.

Ms. Krause stated that now is not the time or place to work that out, particularly ahead of the start of the Interpretive Master Plan, and that the Casemate Museum will not be ignored in that process. Ms. Kilpatrick stated the difficulty with the museum report is that it rests on many big assumptions that are beyond the group to endorse and the available knowledge and data at this time. She noted that the need for careful investigation through the overall planning process and some weighty decisions by the FMFADA. She acknowledged that it is a difficult situation, but



noted that the consensus of the HPAG was to look to the IMP for a thorough vetting, including based on public input, close integration with financial and tourism data, etc. Mr. Quarstein said the Museum Group is extremely concerned the process will not be timely for the Casemate Museum.

Ms. Kilpatrick said she agreed with Mr. Quarstein that the situation is a catch-22 as previously noted in that the Army has said its willingness to leave materials depends on the presence of a qualified 501(c) 3, as well as an organization that has promise of success. Ms. Kilpatrick added that instead of building a whole superstructure and assumptions on the Army goal tied to a self-selecting group of “partners,” maybe Dr. Cureton should drop back and focus on how to keep the Army while the planning process goes on.

Mr. Quarstein stated it is a concept that could use further study and the institutions who want to participate all are willing to dedicate the resources to make it happen. Mr. Quarstein asked if Ms. Kilpatrick could formally send a copy of the HPAG member’s comments to Dr. Cureton so he may pass these on to the organizations in the Museum Group. Ms. Kilpatrick agreed while again suggesting that the group should segregate out conceptual ideas from assumptions about space and who other than the museums will have to pay what, etc. She said the intriguing concept is burdened and weighed down by many of those matters and questions, the answers to which are not known at this time. She said that these complications make the HPAG reluctant to endorse or appear to approve the entire package. Mr. Quarstein stated some of the financial information was included because various boards of these institutions are very interested in the dollars and cents.

**Motion.** Ms. Krause motioned that the HPAG would not endorse or take any action on the Museum Committee’s report, and that the May 28<sup>th</sup> letter of Rob Nieweg be forwarded to the Museum Committee. Dr. Lee stated she would also like to see those comments forwarded to the African American Working Group. Dr. Lee seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Kilpatrick welcomed and introduced the following members of the African American Cultural Working Group who had come into the room earlier and been present for the museum campus discussion:

- Dr. Laurennett Lee, Chair Curator of African American History at the Historical Society
- Vernon Courtney, Executive Director of the Hampton University Museum
- Christy Coleman, President of the American Civil War Center at Historic Tredegar
- Harvey Bakari, Head of the African American History Interpretation at Colonial Williamsburg

- Cassandra Newby-Alexander, Associate Professor of History at Norfolk State

Ms. Kilpatrick stated the African American story, in particular the Contraband history, at Fort Monroe is what sets the place apart as unique. She noted that the Contraband story is both essentially African American, and yet an essential American and human story as it speaks to freedom, liberty, citizenship, etc. She noted that sharing the history is not without challenges: no single identifiable group to look to or rely on, few artifacts, not a great deal of recognition of the contraband history, She said she hoped the scholars and practitioners who had agreed to serve on the working group would help set the direction.

Ms. Redford stated she is not clear what the AACWG's charge is. She said she thinks the HPAG will run into a similar situation of people not being clear on what their charge is and what their deliverables are. Ms. Kilpatrick said if Ms. Redford is talking about the problem that the HPAG is having with the Museum Committee, there are a couple of fundamental differences. She stated the Museum Committee is not a working group of the HPAG, that it was not given a charge, and that it is an effort that has gone much beyond developing a broad concept and themes. She noted that the AACWG is a working group of the HPAG and its efforts should be broad and conceptual in nature.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated she hopes the AACWG will articulate the fundamental issues of why the African American history is important, particularly the Contraband history; suggest broad interpretive themes; suggest methods that might be explored to interpret those themes; and suggest partners that might be brought to the table to assist, such as the Smithsonian.

Ms. Redford asked Ms. Kilpatrick if she would write and send the HPAG the charge of the AACWG. Ms. Kilpatrick agreed that she would write it up.

Ms. Coleman of the AACWG stated that she is not clear on the process and relationships. She added since the FMFADA is hiring a planner she is not sure how the AACWG's work fits in. She added that as a group they may come up with many recommendations and she wants to make sure she is clear on what the HPAG is asking. She mentioned the Museum Group as a similar professional group whose report was not being accepted by the HPAG.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the AACWG report would feed into the IMP process as an official component and effort of the HPAG. She drew a parallel with the Natural Resources Working Group and its efforts, which will flow into the IMP process. She stated that the museum group is not a sub group of the HPAG, they are working on their own and that they represent several self-selecting cultural institutions. Ms. Krause underscored that the Museum Group is not a group that the HPAG had brought together.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated the HPAG is asking the AACWG to look at a broader, more conceptual level in anticipation of a planner being hired and to help lay a foundation in that regard. The IMP is intended to be a public process, to involve outreach to the larger community, to look at the economics, and to really begin to glue together many of these different components- the African American history, natural resources and outdoor opportunities, other history-based themes, for example.

Dr. Lee added that we want to make sure that this is not just one African American story. Mr. Quarstein said there needs to be more research and the history needs to be pulled together so we are clear of what the history is and how to present it. Mr. Nieweg stated he agreed with Ms. Redford's request that the charge of the African American Culture Working Group be a written one. He stated it should be a six month process, and the deliverable would be a report from that working group to the HPAG.

By way of example of the scope of the task, Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the AACWG should identify what partners might be brought to the table, but wasn't expected to form those partnerships. Ms. Krause stated she hoped the report will identify all the issues and options that we think are important and prioritize them. It should not lock the IMP into specifics. We are looking for general guidance.

Mr. Gillespie stated that the FMFADA must consider the Museum campus proposal as a real estate proposal, since it proposes land and building uses. He stated right now the FMFADA does not have a process in place for real estate proposals, unsolicited or solicited.

David Dutton asked Mr. Gillespie if the IMP had a general schedule. Mr. Gillespie stated it is a one year term, but there is not a schedule as far as quarterly progress. He added there are expectations about laying out the methodology of the work plan. He said the first thing is to establish the work plan.

The AACWG relocated to Old Quarters 1 at 12:45 pm for their first meeting.

### **Design Standards**

Ms. Krause stated that she and Bill Brookover have been working very closely with Greg Rutledge on the Design Standards for rehabilitation and are very close to a completed draft. She stated they are also working on the working on the layout of the standards for new construction. She stated Greg will brief on the updated outline for the new construction portion of the Design Standards. She invited anyone in the group who wanted to participate to look at the document on Egnyte and that her committee would conduct a conference call Thursday morning June 4 at 9:30 am. She added they are also establishing place holders for the cultural landscape and viewshed

studies that are forthcoming. She said the management zones have been broken into subzones to deal more specifically with architectural character.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that in the materials on the procedures for project approval, it would be important to marry up the information provided with what is in the PA to ensure consistency.

Mr. Gillespie added that at the Board did endorse a real estate strategy at the last meeting, and that he would send that out to the HPAG.

Mr. Rutledge gave his presentation on the updates to the Design Standards, which he said may be accessed by HPAG members on the FMFADA's online storage site.

Questions/comments: Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Rutledge the following: "How would we deal upfront with a proposal for a large new building in a zone with limited opportunities for infill or new construction tied to replacing what was already there, for example, unless you establish upfront specifically where and how much can be built in that particular zone?" Ms. Krause responded that Part II and III of the Design Standards address each zone's development concepts and site constraints, including specifically where things can be built. Mr. Brookover added that where "missing teeth" opportunities for new infill have been identified specifically. Mr. Munick noted that the no build zones remain inside the moat and the batteries. Ms. Krause noted, however, that there may have to be modest additions, such as elevators, inside the moat.

Based on the discussion, Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she thinks the Design Standards are moving on the right track and thanked the team. In order to avoid conflict and to educate, she encouraged the development of an additional section or materials on green strategies that are acceptable in historic buildings.

Mr. Nieweg thanked Mr. Rutledge, Ms. Krause and Mr. Brookover for this "epic work." He asked whether a potential development company will be expected to read and fully understand this document. Mr. Rutledge stated he would like for them to do that, but they would have to be guided through the process, and that would be up to the FMHPO. There would be an initial proposal, the FMHPO would decide if it is an appropriate project for Fort Monroe. Ms. Krause added that the Table of Contents is very clear and will be easy for any potential developers to use. Ms. Redford asked if the review process was also included in the architectural review. Ms. Krause stated yes and described the process of how it would work: 1) the FMFADA reviews the real estate proposal, 2) the FMHPO reviews the preservation and archeological issues, and 3) then designs can be developed. Ms. Kilpatrick added that this would constitute a screen so people don't develop plans that cannot be approved. Mr. Nieweg said this kind of upfront education and outreach is the solution to avoiding conflict.

Ms. Krause added that she and Mr. Brookover have asked Mr. Rutledge to post a complete updated draft of the chapters in early July, so that at the August meeting everyone will have had an opportunity to look at it, and to email their comments. Mr. Brookover again invited all the HPAG members to participate in a conference call Thursday, June 4<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 am. Mr. Nieweg noted that the technical assistance on that call is provided by the NPS.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated when the Standards are complete or even in a solid draft form, a keys will be getting the Commonwealth and the FMFADA staff trained so that they have them in mind when dealing with proposals, and in encouraging proposals consistent with the vision and commitments and the larger picture instead of just saying yes or no on a case by case basis. Ms. Krause agreed that it will be critical to have meetings with the FMFADA staff and the FMHPO. She underscored the importance of a meeting with them to go through the process step by step. Mr. Gillespie stated the FMFADA staff and Commonwealth agencies have had internal discussions on that subject. Ms. Kilpatrick noted that the FMHPO does not have the authority without consultation to approve things that are inconsistent with the Design Standards or PA.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated the next meeting is on August 3<sup>rd</sup> and that she would like, in addition to reports on all the ongoing working groups and subcommittees, to have some time on the agenda for information about public activities at Fort Monroe like concerts, etc. Mr. Gillespie responded that there is a community calendar on the FMFADA website, and encouraged all to look at it. He asked what timeframe Ms. Kilpatrick had in mind, and she stated she would like a three month outlook and perhaps the next year, and that it would be good to talk about the opportunities that are coming up in the long term such as in connection with the Sesquicentennial of the Civil War in 2011.

Mr. Nieweg stated the NPS working group needs to report to the HPAG how their schedule fits in with the HPAG meeting schedule.

Mr. Gillespie said that as of July 1 the FMFADA, committees and advisory groups would be able to conduct electronic meetings, which was a legislative change. He added that staff has not yet worked out the mechanics, but will be doing so early in the new fiscal year.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Louis Guy, representing the Norfolk Historical Society. Mr. Guy was very complimentary of the work the HPAG has done and said it is headed in the right direction. He said he is glad to see the AACWG formed and noted that the larger story is the freedom story which is important to all Americans. He said he hoped that Ms. Gerri Hollins will have input in their future.

Mr. Sam Martin, representing Buckroe Citizens Group. Mr. Martin shared with the group his thoughts on a trip he made to Fort McClellan. He stated some of the problems faced at Fort

McClellan were related to concerns from potential businesses about the mothballing of buildings. He stated there also were many political concerns and disagreements. He advised the group to do the following: 1) continue with a well defined way ahead 2) address the need of transition money right after closure 3) avoid mothball.

Next scheduled meeting is Monday, August 3.  
The meeting was adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Joan Baker Executive Assistant to the FMFADA