

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY GROUP

Meeting Minutes

December 01, 2008

9:35 A.M. – 4:00 P.M.

Attendees: Kathleen Kilpatrick, Chair; Dr. Laurant Lee; Robert Nieweg (left at 12:15 p.m.); John Munick; Jeanne Zeidler; Alisa Bailey (left at 12:15 p.m.); Eleanor Krause (arrived at 10:40 a.m.)

Absent: 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; Jim Vaughan, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Meeting Agenda is attached.

Call to Order

Ms. Kilpatrick called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and welcomed Mr. Vaughan, guest speaker for the Economic Sustainability and Site Stewardship workshop, as well as invited participants.

HPAG Chairman Report/Discussion

Ms. Kilpatrick asked that all guest and consultants introduce themselves and sign in for the public record. Ms. Kilpatrick asked for approval of the September meetings minutes from the Advisory Group. Ms. Zeidler noted that there were typos in the minutes. The minutes were approved subject to corrections of these errors.

Ms. Kilpatrick report that the PA is in final draft and has been with the Army since around September 20, 2008 undergoing final legal review. She stated that the state anticipates having some feedback from the Army in the next week or so.

Ms. Kilpatrick mentioned that other subjects would be discussed in the afternoon session. She noted that the largest part of the afternoon agenda is the Preservation Standards, which is a key deliverable for the FMFADA and the Advisory Group. She said that the HPAG acts as the customer serving on behalf of the FMFADA for the creation of the Preservation Manual and Design Standards.

FMFADA Executive Director's Report

Mr. Armbruster reported that the Reuse Plan and the HUD Homeless applications were both submitted in late September. Mr. Armbruster visited Capitol Hill and connected with the Congressional Delegation and delivered copies of the Reuse Plan. He reported that as recommended by the Advisory Group and as the FMFADA moves forward, he has planted a seed about the need for Federal funding assistance.

Mr. Armbruster reported on meeting with the National Park Service (NPS) in September, with the intent of looking at various opportunities and options for a role for the National Park Service in the future of Fort Monroe. Mr. Armbruster remains excited about the potential for working with the NPS.

Mr. Armbruster explained that the FMFADA has endured a 10% budget cut. He stated that the consultant team would be kept in place, but that reductions were necessary in travel, meetings and that the Authority had to defer seeking a non-profit attorney. The Attorney General's office is seeking a pro-bono attorney to assist the FMFADA.

Mr. Armbruster also mentioned that the reuse planning process included formal delivery of the structure of the Technical Support Manual. The Technical Support Manual is the living backup document to the Reuse Plan. This manual will continue to be worked and updated. This has been presented to the FMFADA Board.

Included in the read ahead, Mr. Armbruster referred to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) information. The FMFADA learned in a meeting with the state head of FOIA a month ago that all HPAG meetings are public. The read ahead information outlines information regarding other policies and procedures.

Mr. Armbruster reported on meeting with Hampton Mayor Molly Ward, Congressman-elect Glenn Nye, Congressman Bobby Scott and Congressman Whitman, all of whom were very supportive. The FMFADA has been laying the ground work for a formal request for federal assistance.

The FMFADA has also initiated conversations with the department of the Army regarding the ownership and disposition of two parcels of land still in dispute.

Mr. Armbruster reported that the focus from now to the end of this fiscal year is to get the FMFADA management and governance structure in place. He said that they will also work on the business plan which is necessary as part of the transfer of title to the disputed property from the Army to the FMFADA.

Mention was made of a new publication on Fort Monroe from "Images of America." The publication features historic images of Fort Monroe from 1865 to present and is available at amazon.com.

Economic Sustainability, Social Relevance and Stewardship of Historic Sites Workshop Presentation by Jim Vaughan (see attached)

Ms. Kilpatrick introduced Mr. Vaughan as a leader across the country in efforts to catalyze conversations among museums and historic sites about sustainability for the future, particularly in light of the trends for visitation, donor support, and volunteerism. She noted that the HPAG has a broad mission, including advising the FMFADA about economic sustainability, interpretation and education as well as on preservation, and that these areas are all inextricably linked within good stewardship efforts and plans. She stated that the best thinking and a realistic look should drive planning for the future.

Mr. Vaughan stated that American historic sites offer unique opportunities for learning, for reflection, and for inspiration. But, in reality, many of American's historic sites are experiencing declining attendance, financial instability and poor stewardship because they are increasingly viewed by their

communities as irrelevant and unresponsive to the societal change around them. He also, said that historic sites can offer programs, services and experiences that are relevant to many of the most pressing issues of our day. Historic sites can and should be places to nurture the human spirit.

Mr. Vaughan urged the attendees to engage in the important work of historic site stewardship and to seriously consider the following findings and recommendations from the 2007 Kykuit Conference.

- Successful stewardship of the nation's historic sites requires financial sustainability. Sustainability begins with each historic site's engagement with its community and its willingness to change its structure, programs and services in response to the changing needs of that community.
- The long-accepted heritage tourism business model is not a sustainable business model for most historic sites.
- Serving the needs of the local community, (not the tourist audience), is the most valuable and most sustainable goal for most historic sites.
- Many professional standards and practices in the historic site field were borrowed from the museum community and, in practice, often deter creativity and sustainability at historic sites.
- New standards of stewardship for historic sites should be modeled to reflect the distinct nature of these places.
- Responsible site stewardship achieves a sustainable balance between the needs of the buildings, landscapes, collections, and the visiting public.
- Returning sites to private ownership with proper easements can be a positive means of assuring long term stewardship.
- The American Association for State and Local History (AASLH) Task Force on Standards should seek to establish and appropriate stewardship balance for the needs of buildings, landscapes, collections and the public.
- The AASLH Ethics Committee should prepare a positive statement to guide the transitioning of historic sites and returning them to private ownership.
- Foundations and granting agencies should refocus their philanthropy away from short term program support to grants that assist in building their capacity to sustain themselves for the long term, including General Operating Surplus (?) and endowment.
- Foundations should be supported in their efforts to terminate repeated "drip support" to historic sites and to focus their support on sites taking positive steps to achieve long term sustainability.

- The profession must develop new measures, beyond attendance, that document the quality of visitor engagement at site and the extent of community outreach beyond the bounds of historic sites.
- The historic site community must reaffirm the importance of these places for our nation's future and redefine our mission in terms of that future, rather than the past.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked the participants to turn their attention to three critical questions that should be of concern at Fort Monroe.

1. What are the common attributes of historic sites which are successful today and well prepared for a sustainable future?
 - Identification of community --may be large or small
 - Serve community vitality and reinvigoration--example, Cliveden
 - Establish and connection to community and goals--example, phoebus and Buckroe right at the gateway to Fort Monroe (Old Point Comfort)
 - Spirituality and the inspiration of places associated with heritage and ancestors
 - Diversity of offerings based on public need and input, resources, capacity
 - Strong Identity --Fort Monroe as a military village and a resort village.
 - Many partners and partnership
 - And eye toward contemporary uses and fit with the community, including modern buildings being removed – example Governors Island, NY
 - Allow for entrepreneurship
 - Allow for change as needs shift
2. In view of the uncertainty of heritage tourism related visitation as a venue and revenue generator, how can an historic site ensure that it provides a benefit to its surrounding local community and therefore establishes a reliable base of support?
 - Identify local groups and interested parties – example, Jamestown
 - Assesses needs and have process for ongoing public participation and input
 - Rely of a variety of technologies and method to reach out to public for input
 - Recognize special interests and preferences of constituents (including site experience)
 - Provide access and sense “ownership”
 - Provide recreational opportunities—build on these casual users as visitors
 - Reach wider stream of tourism and service
3. What are the risks to historic resources if its stewards fail to plan for its sustainable use?
 - Stewardship responsibilities are ongoing, and are limited by funding and capabilities and determined by priority setting
 - Deferred maintenance
 - Overreaching
 - Incomplete projects
 - Lose of access to tax credit financing
 - Loss of resource(s)
 - Loss of public support

- Missed opportunities and lost time and momentum (compare to the Presidio in San Francisco and Fort Hancock in New Jersey)

During the discussion it was noted that the Kykuit findings apply to Fort Monroe but require thinking on a different scale than is the case with the usual historic site. Ms. Kilpatrick noted that the Commonwealth was inheriting a city, and that the sustainability principles and strategies had particular relevance to the enormous challenge ahead, but that they had to be applied and integrated with a broad view and big thinking. She noted that Charleston and its leadership offered some models of how to apply the findings at such a scale and over the long-term.

[Mr. Nieweg and Ms. Bailey left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.]

Design Standards Discussion – Updated Presentation attached Presentation by Greg Rutledge

Greg Rutledge presented the advisory group with a revised outline for the Fort Monroe Historic Preservation Design Standards building inventory pages and a draft of the contents page and pictures with descriptions of the buildings.

Ms. Krause suggested there be an index of the buildings and that the pages include the type of building materials on the introduction page on a case by case basis. She also suggested that the document use the most recent names of the buildings in the headings and provide information on the evolution of the buildings over time. Finally, she suggested brighter colors, and Ms. Kilpatrick agreed noting that the quality of photos and graphics could be enhanced for better presentation.

Ms. Kilpatrick mentioned that the Design Standards are intended to preserve Fort Monroe. She noted that the information should also be user friendly. Ms. Kilpatrick asked that a conditions assessment be provided and suggested that the National Park Service system for rating condition be used as a model.

Ms. Zeidler asked how easy will this document be to update and how long is the life of this document?

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that it is very important in the narrative section to recognize that this document is an evolving one. It will change and is a snapshot in time. Thus she asked for the appropriate cautionary notes and narrative so that people understand that. She noted that the document will need to be updated after the Army's landscape and viewshed analysis and the new NHL listing. Also, she noted that the buildings will change as they are worked on, and this information will have to be recorded.

Ms. Kilpatrick expressed concern that use of the terms "what is important to preserve" and "key preservation issues" might falsely give the impression that these items were the only matters that bore attention by project sponsors or that attention to them meant preclearance of a project. She noted that our knowledge and understanding of the buildings may evolve and change with new information.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the outline does not seem to flow well, either logically or with regard to emphasis. She suggested that the National Historic Landmark description appear up front behind the introduction, then the PA material should follow and then the material about the Reuse Plan, for

example. She noted that the standards are essentially implementation strategies that flow from the foregoing. She asked for restructuring along these lines. Ms. Krause agreed.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated again that the emphasis needs to be clearly placed on preservation as the primary purpose of the Design Standards.

She suggested that check lists and charts be developed to make this document user friendly for maintenance people and partners or investors and the procedures easy to understand and follow.

Ms. Krause commended Mr. Rutledge on the great job that he has done with the Design Standards Outline and sections of the draft document.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked Mr. Bill Brookover to continue to participate with the HPAG and in particular to be a resource to the subcommittee on the standards chaired by Ms. Krause.

[Mr. Quarstein left the meeting at 2:20 p.m.]

Broader Discussion

Ms. Kilpatrick raised the subject of the draft RFP for the master interpretive planning process, noting that there are a number of pending questions that bear on the process and direction.

Ms. Zeidler asked about the status of the RFP and the suggestions that were sent after the September meeting. (*Editor's note: Ms. Zeidler along with Ms. Redford, Ms. Means and Ms. Bailey were recognized as members of the subcommittee for the RFP.*)

Mr. Armbruster stated that Mr. Gillespie is working on a rewrite of the RFP to integrate recommended changes of the HPAG and its subcommittee. He stated that management structure was not nailed down and that that along with the PA will influence the RFP process.

Ms. Kilpatrick responded that she thought there were some critical questions as yet unanswered that bear on the RFP process: Where do we want to be in 20 years? Who is our customer? Who is our community? What do the customer and community want in terms of services?

Ms. Krause agreed and asked about the status of a business plan and the exploration of governance.

Mr. Armbruster stated that he briefed the board on the steps that are being taken to flush out the management structure and business plan. He noted that the FMFADA has the authority to be the management, but needs the resources to be able to hire enough staff to help with the process. He mentioned that a request was sent to the governor asking \$3.1 million for staff and consultants in view of the need to have the capacity to take over the management of a small city. Mr. Armbruster stated that he hopes to add four additional positions to the FMFADA and to become an independent entity. Also, the FMFADA is under the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), and Mr. Armbruster noted the need to be established as a separate entity as was planned originally by the General Assembly.

Mr. Armbruster noted that these matters are his immediate focus. He stated that time is critical since it is now less than 33 months before the property is turned over to the Commonwealth. Mr. Armbruster stated that the Army is spending \$15 million each year to operate and manage Fort Monroe with a huge staff and that the FMFADA will operate and manage with a much smaller budget and staff.

Ms. Zeidler asked about the role of the HPAG in the larger job, and Mr. Armbruster stated that the HPAG has been given the task of providing advice and assistance on sustainability issues, historic preservation issues, interpretation and business planning. HPAG is the only group that the FMFADA has to assist with these many issues.

Mr. Armbruster also mentioned a recent presentation to the FMFADA by Terry Moore of the NPS about different roles NPS might play at Fort Monroe. He noted that the Secretary of Natural Resources and Chairman of the FMFADA Board Preston Bryant has asked the HPAG to take on the task of exploring NPS options more fully and fleshing out the possibilities. The HPAG will work with NPS and present an options document to the FMDADA for consideration.

Returning to the RFP question, Ms. Kilpatrick stated that there are critical questions pending as noted previously, and issues coming out of Mr. Vaughan's discussion that bear on the RFP: What does community mean? Who are we serving? What do they need or want? She said that these essential questions should be answered in order to interpret and open the property to the public wisely.

A discussion about ways to answer these questions followed, including some consideration of a possible retreat with the FMFADA Board. Mr. Dutton suggested that the RFP could be the vehicle. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that if the master interpretative planning process could be made broad and open enough to get at these questions she would be supportive of that. She noted that the current structure of the RFP really does not appear to explore these issues, but rather appears to start from a settled position. She noted that these same questions bear on business planning, marketing, etc., and that it all must be integrated and/or work in tandem.

Ms. Zeidler asked about the campus of museums concept.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the campus of museums idea goes back to the Civil War Symposium and it was a recommendation from the scholarly group. (*See attachment*). It was presented to the FMFADA but it was never formally endorsed.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the current RFP seems to be geared towards a history-based campus of museums concept exclusively and narrowly and how to get there and implement that vision only. She also stated that the HPAG has not received any information that this was endorsed by the FMFADA or that it has been proven by an analysis in the market, economics, etc.

Mr. Armbruster stated that the FMFADA is working to get the RFP in the proper order. He said that after listening to the presentation by Mr. Vaughan that there are some additional elements to consider. He also stated that there is interest from a number of potential museums. The interested museums are working to develop their vision and will be presenting their recommendations to the HPAG.

Ms. Krause stated that she was concerned that there are no additional plans to evaluate against the Civil War museum options.

Ms. Zeidler asked if the plan was to re-write the RFP so that it is much broader with an interpretive possibility.

Ms. Kilpatrick stressed that the history museums complex idea is an attractive one. However, she noted that the HPAG wants a broader look at the word “interpretive” to include recreational offerings, for example, and other non-history public offerings and possibilities, noting that the term is a museum term. She stressed that the Group wants and has called for already in formal recommendations an open planning process that looks at a full range of possibilities for engaging and serving the public and many partners, options for space allocation and phasing, and a meaningful role for the public throughout the planning process. She stressed also that the HPAG has formally asked for a meaningful role for the NPS, and a process closely integrated with economics and tourism studies.

Ms. Zeidler asked if the FMFADA was anticipating a recommendation from the HPAG concerning a role for NPS at Monroe.

Noting that the NPS role in the interpretative planning process was a separate issue from the question of a long-term role at for NPS at Fort Monroe, Ms. Kilpatrick responded to Ms. Zeidler’s question. She said that in discussing the matter of a study with Chairman Bryant she had committed that the group would explore the issues with NPS and present a factual options document to assist the FMFADA in making a decision about future relationships with NPS. Ms. Kilpatrick stated that she would like the HPAG to be a part of putting the issues on the table so that the FMFADA can make informed decisions. She noted that PA requires the FMFADA and the Commonwealth to consider fully potential roles for NPS and to make a decision in that regard.

Mr. Armbruster restated past events to set the record straight as follows: no one has voted on the recommendations of the museum complex from the Civil War Symposium and there has not been any additional information presented since the symposium in February 2008.

Ms. Zeidler asked about direction from the FMFADA Board.

Ms. Gilliam stated that the FMFADA Board has only had bits of presentations and the board has not taken any action. She also stated that there have been very little discussion because they have not had any material or analysis.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that her impression as an observer at the board meetings is that often the board will get a briefing and then take no formal action at that meeting, perhaps leaving both staff and others wondering what might be desired in the way of next step. She also said that the symposium was great and that it laid the ground work and directions for interpretation of Civil War History. Nonetheless, she expressed worry that that was not the only story to tell or opportunity to engage and serve the public at Fort Monroe that should be explored in a planning process. She acknowledged that there are willing partners to help form a Civil War history focus at Fort Monroe, but that the FMFADA has not endorsed that or that alone and that other directions and opportunities should be explored as well for a diversity of offerings.

Ms. Kilpatrick again referred to some fundamental questions that need to be resolved and steps and decisions taken to set the direction of the master interpretative plan or resolved within the planning process itself as suggested by Mr. Dutton. She expressed a sense that the RFP needs a major re-write to be open and comprehensive, and not implementation of a single concept, that a major component of the RFP needs to be public input and community outreach. She stated that a good interpretive master plan process should start from public input and community outreach, not a foregone conclusion.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that it would be desirable to have more engagement by the FMFADA in some of these critical issues and core questions. However, she said that in the absence of that kind of engagement, it was all the more important to have a broad and open planning process to help flesh out questions and answers about engaging and serving the public in a way that is sustainable.

Ms. Gilliam stated that the board receives material during the meeting, does not have committees and that there is no discussion outside of the meetings and also there is a time limit. She also said that there are several experts on the board but no one ever calls on them.

Ms. Kilpatrick suggested that it might be helpful to prepare a list for the FMFADA of questions that the advisory group thinks should be answered by the Board, the studies that need to be completed, and how these studies feed into each other.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that Ms. Gilliam raised a good point that the FMFADA may need a sub-committee structure to use the expertise that is already vested in individual members of the FMFADA.

Ms. Zeidler stated that the HPAG needs more direction from the FMFADA board.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that the RFP really involves the larger question of a vision for what will be created at Fort Monroe. She also stated that financial management, tourism promotions, the management structure and the issues of audience and community identify and needs all feed into how Monroe should be interpreted for the future. She concluded that all of these questions feed into how money should be spent toward interpretation.

Mr. Dutton suggested that this be done in three phases. The first step is to hire a consultant to do the concept planning. Second would be the development stage. The third stage would be fabrication and implementation. He also stated that maybe too much is trying to be done at one time.

Ms. Kilpatrick expressed concern with confidence in getting all these questions answered through a sequential approach unless the RFP is very open and the assignment to an excellent planner is broad.

Mr. Munick stated that the economic, vision and business plan should come from the FMFADA board.

Ms. Gilliam suggested that there be a workshop of options and recommendations that could be distributed to the FMFADA board from the next HPAG meeting.

Dr. Lee asked if the interpretive planning would be in place prior to the Army leaving. She also suggested that the internet be another avenue for interpretation.

[Ms. Zeidler left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.]

Mr. Armbruster stated that the board heard the voices of the public. He also stated that they charted a course specifically designed to accommodate those concerns.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that a strong message from today regarding the interpretative planning process is that as we plan for the future, we must work with all the resources at Monroe to create many ways in which the public will be engaged and served there. She stressed the need for many opportunities for public input in the process of planning. She also stated that public workshops should be hand-on and facilitated.

Public Comments

Mrs. Christine Gergely stated that having public input is a very good idea. She stated that one of the problems that the charrette had with the Hampton FADA was that the public ideas were not included when the proposal was written up. She also stated that the public has a big fear that they are not being listened to.

Mr. Mark Perreault stated that the public's view point is pretty well reflected in the Reuse Plan and the PA; the public would like a grand place at Fort Monroe. He also said that we [*Ed.: the public*] would like the NPS to be a part of Fort Monroe.

Ms. Krause asked Mr. Perreault how he defines "a grand public place."

Mr. Perreault stated that the public would like people living in the buildings, bed and breakfast lodgings, excellent visitors experience, offices, restaurants, non-profits, activities and does not want any land sold. They would like all land to be kept by the government authority.

Future Agendas and Action Items

There was some discussion among Ms. Kilpatrick and Ms. Gilliam about the possibility of a facilitated joint workshop with the FMFADA with an appropriate urban planner to discuss specific questions and directions. Other objectives for such a session would be to identify a broad to-do list in terms of the studies and other action items. After discussion, the group agreed that this would be useful but acknowledged some concerns with funding and staffing in response to Mr. Armbruster.

The HPAG and the National Park Service will work together to examine in detail options for an NPS role at Fort Monroe.

Ms. Kilpatrick stated that there need to be further discussions on who is the public and what does the community need.

Ms. Kilpatrick suggested the following possible items for the February HPAG meeting:

1. A presentation on planning models by Sam Martin.
2. An update on the Design Standards, including the recommendations made today.
3. A revised draft of the RFP pursuant to previous recommendations and to today's discussion.
4. A discussion/brainstorm of experts available to assist the HPAG and the FMFADA.

Next schedule meeting is February 2, 2009. The meeting will be held at Fort Monroe – exact location to be announced.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Respectfully submitted,
Crystal L. DeAngelis, Secretary to the HPAG