

**FORT MONROE**  
**FEDERAL AREA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**  
**December 14, 2007 ~ Meeting Minutes**

The Fort Monroe Federal Area Development Authority (FMFADA) meeting, held at the Veterans Conference Room in the Rupert Sergeant Building in Hampton, was called to order at 1:06 p.m.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

**A. Roll Call**

Present:

Dick Zorn for Secretary Viola Baskerville, Secretary Preston Bryant, Robert Crouch, Dr. Rex Ellis, Delegate Tom Gear, Catharine Gilliam, Alleyn Harned for Secretary Patrick Gottschalk, Delegate Phil Hamilton, Dr. Wayne Lett, Robert Scott, Tommy Thompson, David Von Moll for Secretary Jody Wagner.

Interim Executive Director, Conover Hunt, Hampton City Council Liaison Joe Spencer, and Bob Edwards for Army Liaison Colonel Jason Evans were also present.

Dr. Alvin Bryant participated in the meeting by phone.

Absent:

Mr. Robert Harper, Dr. Kanata Jackson, Senator Mamie Locke, John Quarstein, Senator Marty Williams, and Dr. Charlie Sapp.

Secretary Bryant announced that since some Board members were running late, they would hold off on adopting minutes until they had enough members present for a quorum of twelve.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Bryant stated the Authority would hear comments from the public. Dr. H.O. Malone decided to hold his comments until the end of the meeting. (see Appendix I)

**III. REPORTS & BRIEFINGS**

**A. Remarks by Interim Executive Director Conover Hunt**

1. Financial Report – Ms. Hunt gave a financial report to the Board (see Appendix II). Ms. Hunt stated that we are 45.33% through the first quarter budget as of November 30th, indicating that we have expenditures that have remained low. She added that she would be emailing a written report from the Army listing the cost for maintenance and utilities for the key buildings at Fort Monroe. She said that the report is a good baseline estimate of costs, with the average annual utility costs for 64 buildings is about \$3.5 million or \$5 p/sq. ft. average. The annual maintenance cost is \$620K. Ms. Hunt said it would cost approximately \$4.2 million per year to run key buildings. This figure does not include restoration costs the last 5 years on those buildings, in which the Army has spent about \$7.5 million. She said we do not yet have figures for street and other infrastructure maintenance, but will be getting those figures shortly. She thanked the Army for being cooperative on getting the figures to us.

Mr. Zorn asked if they knew if the deferred maintenance figures were included in the numbers. Ms. Hunt stated that deferred maintenance is not included. Bob Edwards added that Hurricane Isabel took care of most of the deferred maintenance costs, and that the biggest deferred maintenance area in the short term may be the HVAC. Since most of the utilities have been replaced there is not much deferred maintenance. Mr. Zorn asked if there is an annual figure for deferred maintenance in the future. Mr. Edwards said he could get that figure computed if the

Board wants it. Ms. Hunt added that these figures give the Board a foundation upon which to ask more detailed and pertinent questions, and thanked Mr. Edwards for putting the list together.

Mr. Thompson stated that as a developer he questions the \$600K for the annual maintenance of the buildings. He stated that in his experience they use \$200K-\$300K for single apartment group maintenance, and that he would like to see more detail on those figures. Ms. Hunt asked for any other comments and stated that these numbers were just a beginning.

## 2. NPS Recon Study –

Ms. Hunt said that the National Park Service's first site visit was on December 6&7<sup>th</sup>. The high points of the initial visit were: there is very little the Park Service can discuss with the FMFADA until the reconnaissance study is complete. That report will determine if there is a next phase, which can only be conducted if Congress approves the cost of about \$300,000 to \$500,000. The NPS explained to Ms. Hunt that their primary interest is not in real estate development, but in preservation, interpretation and public education of natural and cultural resources. She stated that she explained to the Park Service about the FMFADA timeline, and if there is another study that we may establish open communication with them so that the FMFADA can continue to plan for a future time when they might become affiliated. The NPS recommended the Board look at Governor's Island in NY harbor as a closer model than the Presidio. It is owned by a state economic development authority, is being developed through public and private partnerships, and the NPS is a partner in that development. Ms. Hunt said the Park Service representatives said that it would be possible at a future date for them to address the Board on the various models they use in establishing affiliations with historic site partners.

Secretary Bryant asked if any members of the Board who were at the NPS Public meeting would like to comment. Mr. Thompson agreed that if the Park Service decides to come in and relieve us of financial obligations that the Board needs to think long and hard about it. He said he thinks the Board should take advantage of any of the Park Service's advice on various models. He thinks the Park Service will participate in some manner, but based on what the Park Service said he did not think they had the millions required. With the number of applications they have had in the past year, very few have been taken into full Park Service operations. He said it is clear to him that ultimately Fort Monroe belongs to the Commonwealth and that the Board would have to come up with some innovative and solid ways to keep the Fort operational. He said after attending the NPS public meeting he thinks there is some hope for assistance, but that there is no certainty of financial rescue from what the Fort is facing. He ended by saying it would take very powerful political influence, more than just the state for Congress to vote on the Fort being a total ward of the national government.

Ms. Gilliam added that she thought the NPS public meeting was an excellent meeting and was grateful for so many members of the community speaking out. She stated that the Park Service team was top notch and thinks they will provide us with information that will be extremely useful. She added that she is going to refrain from taking a position on whether there is a role for the National Park Service until we review the initial report and analysis.

3. Symposium – Ms. Hunt reported on the Civil War Symposium the FMFADA is organizing. She reminded the Board that the Civil War was not the only theme at Fort Monroe. She added that the Symposium will take place January 2 & 3, with the panel presenting their recommendations to the FMFADA Board at the next Board meeting on January 4<sup>th</sup> at the Bay Breeze Community Center. (see Appendix III). She ended by saying she felt edified that the scholars attending the Symposium recognize what an asset we have at Fort Monroe.

4. NEPA requirements: - Ms. Hunt said she attended a meeting with the NEPA consultants from the Army on the requirements to fulfill the environmental study involved in the BRAC closure. She summarized the meeting as follows: the Army needs to decide whether to do a full Environmental Impact Statement or an Environmental Assessment. She stated the consultants studied Scenario III from the original Draft Reuse plan, which tripped some of the thresholds that were taken from the environmental assessment, which is the simpler type of analysis as opposed to a full EIS. Ms. Hunt said she explained to the NEPA consultants that the FMFADA Board was looking more to Scenario I which looks at less new construction. She said the NEPA consultants are now going to do a study of Scenario I, and have been asked to include tourism. She said they are now having regular meetings with NEPA, and that they have asked Julie Carver, our environmental specialist, to be the liaison between the NEPA and FMFADA. She said although the NEPA was put on hold, the early stages of the process can begin. She stated that we will feed them information as it is approved by the FMFADA Board. She said the process will be balanced and based on good communications. The study will be done in a timely manner, certainly before the Army leaves in 2011. She stated that the present schedule calls for a mid 2009 completion.

Ms. Hunt concluded by asking if there were any questions about NEPA? Dr. Lett said he is concerned that the Army consultants are leaning towards an EA as opposed to an EIS, and that the FMFADA has not made a firm decision on which process would be proposed. He asked at the NEPA meeting if it would be helpful for the FMFADA to vote to express their preference whether it was an EIS or an EA. Dr. Lett said the NEPA consultants said no, that they are just looking at thresholds and a vote from the FMFADA would not make a difference to their recommendation. Dr. Lett advised the Board that at some point the FMFADA may want to take a position because of the economics involved; we may not be able to borrow money in the future if we don't have an EIS. Dr. Lett said in his opinion the NEPA consultants are leaning towards an EA if we don't have a large build out of the facility. He added regardless of what we end up with the FMFADA is going to have to have an EIS if at any point in the future the FMFADA wants to borrow funds to operate Fort Monroe in the future. Ms. Hunt thanked Dr. Lett and Dr. Bryant for attending the NEPA meeting and asking very pertinent questions. Secretary Bryant stated that whether an EA or EIS, we need to remember that the final discussions are between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Army, and not the FMFADA. Ms. Hunt stated they asked the NEPA consultants about the screening the Army had done, and how many of the agencies besides the Army and their consultants had weighed in for an EA versus an EIS. She stated that both the Department of Historic Resources and Environmental Quality expressed strong desire for a full EIS. She asked if Secretary Bryant could advise the Board when it should lend its support. She said they had 180 comments, and none were for the EA, but they do the study based on thresholds, and they strictly adhere to their rules.

Delegate Gear asked if the land had to be in pristine condition after the cleanup and who decides what is pristine? Chairman Bryant referred the question to Secretary Zorn who replied "pristine" would not be the proper word, and said that the agencies would advise the administration as to whether thresholds were met. Secretary Zorn added that it is not possible to have it pristine, there will have to be decisions made during the process. Delegate Gear asked again who would make the ultimate decision as to whether it is clean enough, the Commonwealth or the Army? Secretary Bryant replied the Commonwealth and that DEQ is the advising agency to the Governor who accepts land by way of the Secretary of Administration. Secretary Bryant asked if there were any more comments. Hearing none Ms. Hunt moved to the next item on the agenda.

5. Visioning Tourism Meeting – Ms. Hunt described a meeting of the Tourism Visioning Team led by Alisa Bailey of Virginia Tourism Corporation, made up of top tourism professionals statewide. She said in the meeting they discussed what visions we might have for tourism at Fort Monroe. Ms. Hunt said the meeting was an epiphany for her. She stated the group of tourism professionals gave great ideas on how tourism should be done at Fort Monroe (see Appendix IV). Ms. Hunt stated that the budget that was done in July included \$40K for a tourism study during this fiscal year. She said the Tourism team strongly advised the FMFADA to do a fully fledged tourism study costing \$150 to \$200K. With the right study, the Board could fully sketch out all the economic potentials that exist with tourism. She stated the team said the Board looks at Fort Monroe as one cultural entity, but it really is a town with different kinds of tourism involved. Ms. Hunt read off a list of the various ideas that the tourism professionals suggested, including T-shirt shops and even a Haunted House. Ms. Hunt made a very strong recommendation to the Board that the investment in tourism would be one of the best investments they can make. Since the FMFADA has not staffed up as planned, we have sufficient surplus funds in the existing operating budget to pay for a more detailed study. She said we will also seek additional support from the office of OEA that has already given the FMFADA a grant. Ms. Hunt said she has sent a request asking if we can make an adjusted and approved budget, and submit those new figures with grant requests that will go in at the end of this month. Ms. Hunt stated that although she had not discussed this request in advance to the Chairman, she recommended that this is something worth discussing.

Delegate Gear, chairman of the Consultants Subcommittee, asked the board to approve a combined \$16,500 honoraria for the 11 scholars participating in the Civil War Symposium. He also said the Tourism Study has been approved, but asked the Board to approve a study that is much larger than Ms. Hunt had conceived what was needed. Chairman Bryant asked if other Board members had any comment on this discussion. Mr. Thompson asked how much money will they need above what is already at our disposal to do a Fort Monroe Tourism study. Ms. Hunt replied "Nothing, that the money is all budgeted." She explained that is because we haven't spent the money on staff as planned, and because the new draft reuse plan won't be approved until the summer of 2008. That money won't be in the same fiscal year's budget. Mr. Thompson asked "Don't you need authority to move money from one pot to the other?" Ms. Hunt replied that she believed when they approved the budget the Board gave the authority to the Chairman in consultation with the Interim Executive Director. Ms. Hunt said in this case it is a great deal of money, and that was why she was bringing it up now. Chairman Bryant added that they would not move that kind of money around without having a Board discussion to get general consensus, even though the By Laws may say

otherwise. He stated that what Ms. Hunt was saying is the \$150K - \$200K we do have in the budget if the Board agrees to change priorities. Ms. Hunt said first we change the budget, then we go and seek additional funds. Ms. Hunt stated that we are a learning curve organization, and that if we had the visioning meeting a year ago the tourism study would be done.

Secretary Bryant said if we wanted to launch the study we would need to do RFP's, and what the timing of that would be. Ms. Hunt said we need to have preliminary results by March or April, and the NEPA concurred with that. Ms. Hunt stated even preliminary estimates on tourism numbers could trip some more thresholds for an EIS. NEPA anticipates it will in terms of air quality and traffic. She added the estimated numbers on tourism would definitely affect the economic sustainability of Fort Monroe. Chairman Bryant asked whether they would need a completed study, by spring. Ms. Hunt said no, we would hire a firm capable of giving us a sophisticated full court study, rather than hiring a small firm. Ms. Hunt said they could pull statistics early on that would heavily influence the NEPA timeline. Ms. Hunt said by March or April we could ask to have some preliminary statistics available that we could send off to NEPA, and that those numbers would help the Board to have some economic numbers to deal with. Ms. Hunt told the Board that she would like to send out an RFP before Christmas.

Ms. Hunt added the tourism study could take up to 15 months which would impact the budget in 2009. She added that we have plenty of leeway in this year's budget to absorb the cost, and that she did not know if the cost would be over \$150K. Chairman Bryant asked the Board to discuss the tourism study now, about the money being moved around, and asked if anyone had serious objections. Mr. Thompson moved that the Chairman have the authority to implement a tourism study for the economic development of Fort Monroe as directed by him and those who he selects to assist him and that he could approve any or all of the funds that were suggested. Dr. Lett seconded the motion. Chairman Bryant said if the vote goes positively that there will be email communication and that they would not take action without keeping the Board informed.

Ms. Gilliam stated that this would have huge implications, and that she had serious reservations about moving too rapidly. She said that Fort Monroe is not your average site as far as historic preservation implications. As a minimum she would like to be involved in discussion and review and comment on any draft Request for Proposals. Mr. Scott added that just because we send out an RFP, it does not mean you have to engage in it, and that we would have to see the process first. He stated that he did not see any downside in at least putting out the RFP and seeing what comes back. Ms. Hunt added that the RFP would have strong reference to Historic Preservation experience with the vendor. She stated that the tourism study is not just heritage tourism, it would be all forms of tourism. She said that she likes to be careful when dealing with an historic site; we hire vendors who have dealt with and are sensitive to the unique needs of a historic site. Once we get a market analysis we will have a better idea of what we are dealing with.

Dr. Rex Ellis asked what we would require from the vendor in terms of results, are we asking them to provide us with an economic business plan that would some way qualify what kind of revenue we could expect? Ms. Hunt said you take your vision, then define what your vision is, then each one of those elements is subjected to a market analysis. When you get that done you decide what is the public going to do and what the private sector is going to do? This will give a baseline for one of the main goals which is public access, and fits directly into that goal. Ms. Hunt added that she had dropped this on the Board because the Tourism meeting was just two days prior, but would like the Board to make a decision on this.

Chairman Bryant said that although Mr. Thompson's motion was unexpected, the more he thought about it, he realized that with the holidays and the General Assembly that time was an issue. He said based on everyone's schedule and if they had to make decisions it would be good to have that empowerment now. Mr. Thompson agreed that they should look into the tourism study now, and that whatever the company comes up with is not necessarily what the FMFADA would want to do. Mr. Ellis stated that he would like to be involved in the conversation as well, and that since Fort Monroe is so unique, that any examination would have to consider its uniqueness. He said he did not know of any other institution that would be an apples to apples comparison, in terms of tourism. Ms. Hunt stated that we have a two page list of qualified national vendors that the tourism professionals prepared. She said we need to get someone from our own group to customize the RFP's to make it exactly what we need.

Chairman Bryant stated that while the By Laws empower the Chairperson to move money around within the budget that is fine for small dollar amounts to meet every day expenses. It is less comfortable for the chairperson to move around larger amounts of six figures without the Board's consensus. Mr. Thompsons motioned to recognize that the Chairperson have the ability to move money around to initiate the Tourism study. Dr. Lett seconded. He added that this will give the Board an opportunity to define the scope of work, get sample RFP's, get Board feedback &

perhaps do more discussions on the financial part of it. Delegate Hamilton said he had a problem with the motion as it gave the Chair the authority to move around an unlimited amount of money. Mr. Hamilton asked that the motion be amended by putting a cap to the figure not to exceed, and to discuss what that amount should be.

Chairman Bryant stated that Ms. Hunt said we have the money. We have at least \$40K in grants, if the tourism study was \$150K -200K the balance would be \$100 - \$150K accounting for the \$40K we already have. Mr. Hamilton suggested the motion be amended with a cap not to exceed \$150K. Chairman Bryant called for a vote on the motion as amended. A roll call vote was taken to pass the motion to allow Chairman Bryant to move money around within the budget not to exceed \$150K in order to possibly initiate a tourism study which resulted as follows:

Aye: P. Bryant, Crouch, Ellis, Gear, Harned (for Gottschalk), Hamilton, Lett, Scott, Thompson, Timberlake (for Wagner), Zorn for Baskerville.

Nay: C. Gilliam

Absent: Harper, Jackson, Locke, Quarstein, Williams.

The motion passed 11-1.

As Chairperson of the Consultant Subcommittee Delegate Gear made a motion requesting \$16,500.00 as honorarium money for the Civil War Symposium. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thompson. Mr. Scott asked if the \$16,500.00 was part of the \$40K to be used for tourism. Ms. Hunt replied that it was not part of that money, and that the tourism money is a separate line item. She said we have a consultant professional services fund for unforeseen expenses. She said it was set up that way because when they set up the budget since they did not really know where they were going on the Reuse Plan. The money for the honorariums would come out of that fund that has \$60K in it. Secretary Bryant asked if there was any further discussion, hearing none he moved for a vote. The motion was passed unanimously.

Delegate Gear asked Conover Hunt why John Quarstein wasn't being paid for the Symposium even though he was a participant? Ms. Hunt stated that Mr. Quarstein is a member of this board and it would be a conflict of interest. Delegate Gear stated to the Chairman that brings up his point as to whether Mr. Quarstein's being a member of the FMFADA Board is a conflict of interest. Mr. Gear said even though the Chairman is writing a letter to the Attorney General, he thinks he already has the answer as to whether Mr. Quarstein's working as a consultant for the City of Hampton and being on the FMFADA Board is a conflict of interest. Chairman Bryant said they will defer this issue to the Attorney General and that the letter has already been written; and we are awaiting an answer. Mr. Thompson told the Chair that since Mr. Quarstein works as a contractor for the City of Hampton for the Hampton History Museum, that he would not be paid for the Symposium either way whether he was on the FMFADA Board or not.

## **B. Approval of Minutes**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Chairman Bryant stated that we do have a quorum at this point and asked if there were any additional corrections or additions to the minutes. Hearing none, he called for approval. Preston Bryant moved to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded and approved.

6. Nominations to the Historic Preservation Advisory Group – Ms. Hunt asked the Board to recognize the three potential candidates for the Historic Preservation Group (see Appendix V). They are Alisa Bailey (President of Virginia Tourism Corporation, Dr. Luranett Lee, Curator of African American History of the Virginia Historical Society, and John Munick former CEO of Drucker & Falk Real Estate. The Historic Preservations Advisory Group is a nine member group with two statutory appointments, one from Historic Resources Department and one from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 4 made by the Governor, and 3 made by the FMFADA. She stated Ms. Gilliam, Dr. Ellis, John Quarstein, and Kathleen Kilpatrick were all involved in previous discussions about the appointees. The Governor has announced 3 of his 4 appointments: Mary Means, Eleanor Krause, and the Honorable Jeanne Zeidler. She said Kathleen Kilpatrick will represent the Department of Historic Resources, and the Governor's fourth appointment is pending. Ms. Hunt said she has not heard who the National Trust for Historic Preservation will appoint. Ms. Hunt said that if the Board approves the 3 candidates that are being recommended today, that it is essential to convene a meeting of this group of 7 as soon as possible. She added that we don't want the Programmatic Agreement to be approved before the Historic Preservation Group meets, since they have great expertise and value they can bring to our planning efforts.

Chairman Bryant asked if there was a motion in regards to the 3 proposed members? Delegate Phil Hamilton made the motion to accept Alisa Bailey, Dr. Laurennett Lee and John Munick as the FMFADA's three appointees to the

Historic Preservation Advisory Group. Dr. Lett seconded the motion. Chairman Bryant asked if there were any additional comments on this from the Board. Hearing none the motion was passed unanimously.

### **C. Remarks by Catharine Gilliam**

Ms. Gilliam stated that she was appointed to the FMFADA Board to represent the Historic Preservation perspective. She said she wanted to express her view on historic preservation and the need for great input from fellow board members and the public. She said we need to have more conversations among not only the Board members, but experts beyond the Board. She added that Fort Monroe is a nationally historic and nationally important property and that there are people all over the US who can give expertise and perspective that can help in future planning. She stated there are two areas that she is concerned about. The first is the 106 Process in which she hopes everyone recognizes that the FMFADA is a key player in the 106 Process. She added that generally the 106 Process has gone very well and will provide a useful set of guidelines with respect to our future planning. She stated that the 106 is not the plan, and it is not the shared vision for the future of Fort Monroe. She stated they have to begin more discussions and involve as many experts as possible.

Ms. Gilliam said her second concern was the Historic Preservation Advisory Group. She said according to the FMFADA By Laws they are charged with an enormous responsibility. She added that these volunteers cannot accomplish all of this, and that the Board must be more deliberate in pursuing their objectives and working with the Committee to achieve them. Ms. Gilliam said she wanted to speak today because she is frustrated when she reads in the press that Fort Monroe will end up being one of two opposing options: that Fort Monroe will “end up plastered with condos” versus a full preservation alternative. She said she does not believe there is any consideration of development as has been portrayed. She stated that she is concerned about the tourism study because she does not feel the Board has deliberated enough, and that we have to be very careful to do this correctly. She said one benefit she has from a career in historic preservation is that she sees many projects that seemed impossible to resolve, where great national resources were at stake. By pulling together, those resources were saved, and are incredible economic assets to their communities. She added with a quote that she has found very useful: “I encourage you and your fellow committee members to ask yourselves this question, which will be more honored 100 years from now?” She ended by saying she thinks we all need to continually ask the 100 year question and marshal their resources, and our best creative thinking to achieve that.

Chairman Bryant restated Ms. Gilliam’s concerns. He added that the Governor has said what we are doing here is important, and that we get one shot at it, and we cannot go back and undo it.

### **D. Potential Uses in Historic Buildings**

Margaret Flippen of Dover Kohl and Greg Rutledge of Hanbury Evans gave a presentation on the potential uses of historic buildings (see Appendix VI). Mr. Rutledge began by saying that he was glad the Board recognized that Fort Monroe is a town, and that he has used the 100 year question as a basis for his own philosophy as a preservation architect. Mr. Rutledge stated that almost every building on Fort Monroe except for residential quarters have an adaptive reuse in some form or fashion. Ms. Flippen added that the Draft Reuse plan encompasses the proposed reuse of 170 existing buildings.

Mr. Gear said he read an article 3 -5 years ago that all the office buildings on Fort Monroe were going hi-tech. Mr. Rutledge said that was true and all the office buildings have hi tech wiring. Mr. Zorn asked if the 222 existing residential units referred to in his presentation included Wherry Housing. Mr. Rutledge said that did not include Wherry Housing. Ms. Flippen said if you included Wherry Housing and the White Elephants that were torn down, it would be an additional 220 units.

Ms. Hunt asked if the reuse of existing construction would reduce the footprint of new construction in the areas that are targeted for some development. Mr. Rutledge estimated that if most of the buildings were created into housing of some sort it may a total of 600 units inside existing structures. He also added the floor plans are well defined to be anywhere from 1600-2400 square feet which is very generous. Dr. Ellis said that he assumed when it came to the tourism study that both Hanbury Evans and Dover Kohl would be heavily involved as well.

### **E. Preliminary Scenarios, Land Issues**

Chairman Bryant said in the November meeting there was much discussion as far as ownership, ground leases, joint ventures, etc. He introduced Steve Owens from the OAG who is working on these issues.

Mr. Owens said the OAG is continuing to look at real estate issues of which two are on everyone's mind. First is the ownership issue. He stated the Army realizes the importance of getting to the OAG on that topic and will be doing so. The other issue is the Commonwealth's ability to accept property with environmental contamination. Mr. Owens said at the next meeting he will give a presentation with more details. He added another issue is once you get the property what do you do with it? That issue will involve conveyances, and brings a host of other questions. Will it retain a reverter right, do you lease the space, are there long term ground leases, can you do office space leases, and are all those options available in all the ownership scenarios? He said they are looking at all those various issues and will report on these the next meeting.

Preston Bryant added that while these issues are issues for the Commonwealth they do at least influence the Board's thinking as we are charged with looking at revenue yields.

#### **IV. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Chairman called for any additional public comments. (See Appendix I)

#### **V. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Chairman Bryant stated the Authority needed to go into Executive Session and asked that those who remain for the Executive Session include voting members of the Board and their designees. Additionally he asked Nikki Rovner, Marc Follmer and Steve Owens to remain in the room. Therefore, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711, he called for a motion to convene in closed session for the purpose of discussion and consideration of perspective candidates for employment. He further moved that the following individuals be present at the closed session: Nikki Rovner, Marc Follmer, and Steve Owens as their attendance will aid the Board in its discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

CERTIFY EXECUTIVE SESSION: Chairman Bryant entertained a motion that pursuant to Section 2.2-3711, the Authority only engaged in those discussions that are allowed in that code section. Chairman Bryant called for the vote, which passed unanimously.

#### **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

Delegate Gear asked if anyone on the Authority would object to letting the Delegates and the Senators on the Board have a designee for the next session? Chairman Bryant said that would be a matter for the General Assembly to decide. The Chairman said the administration would have to look how it is written. Delegate Gear said he would like to change the By-Laws to allow the Delegates and Senators to be allowed to send a designee for a meeting, if they cannot attend. Chairman Bryant stated that the Governor did make it clear to the 5 State appointees that he expected them to attend every meeting unless it was absolutely impossible. Delegate Hamilton added that because of the legislative session Delegate Gear and he could not attend the next meeting.

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Bryant announced the next meeting on January 4<sup>th</sup> at the Bay Breeze Community Center on Fort Monroe.

Chairman Bryant asked for any other new business to come before the Authority. Hearing none he thanked the Authority members and the consultants for their time and adjourned the meeting at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

---

The Honorable Mamie E. Locke  
Secretary/Treasurer

MEL/jfb

## **APPENDIXES**

### **APPENDIX I – PUBLIC COMMENT:**

#### **H.O. Malone – Representing: Citizens for a Fort Monroe National Park**

Mr. Malone stated that according to the Daily Press, the closing costs of Fort Monroe have escalated to \$288 million. A very large part of that number is what it will cost to clean it up. He said we can save the tax payers money if we made Fort Monroe a park that did not have to be cleaned up to the same level to develop it and put many new buildings there. Mr. Malone reminded the Authority that the NPS study that was done in 2006 shows that a National Park had a payoff of 4-1 on the average in terms of the amount of money that is generated to the amount of money the Park Service puts into it. He added there are three types of partnerships with the NPS. One example is a private foundation like Colonial Williamsburg, but that would need someone like John D. Rockefeller to provide transition money to get it started. Another is a municipal or state partnership like Governors Island which is not going too well. Dr. Malone said we need to look at the Presidio model of a partnership with the Park Service, as it is doing economically well and is right on track for self sufficiency. The Presidio however, received a substantial infusion of federal cash for transition. He added where would that money come from for Fort Monroe? His final statement was why are Virginians so anxious to let Uncle Sam off the hook?

#### **Sam Martin – Representing: Buckroe Civic Association**

Mr. Martin commended the FMFADA Board for allowing the public to speak before and after the meeting. He said the Board needs to keep in mind that the Reuse Plan is the public's plan and should not be the FMFADA's plan. He said the FMFADA needs to develop a public outreach plan that will include, local, regional, state and national levels. He said we must identify opportunities for the public to input, and decide how to handle their input.

### **APPENDIX II – Financial Report**

### **APPENDIX III – Civil War Symposium Agenda**

### **APPENDIX IV – Tourism Chart**

### **APPENDIX V – Historic Preservation Advisory Group**

### **APPENDIX VI – Potential for Existing Building Reuse**