

Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary #18
Monmouth County Eastern Branch Library, 1001 Route 35, Shrewsbury NJ
September 18, 2015

Superintendent Jennifer T. Nersesian, the Designated Federal Official for the Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:10 A.M.

Nersesian introduced Stacie Smith, a facilitator hired to run this particular meeting. Smith, she noted, was strongly recommended by National Park Service (NPS) facilitator Robert Fisher, who worked with the committee on its first several meetings in 2013. Smith mentioned that she has worked with NPS before and is a professional neutral facilitator. Her goal is to assist in having an orderly, useful, productive, and constructive meeting. She noted that the committee's operating procedures detail expectations for meetings. Smith reiterated that meetings should be respectful, concise, constructive, and participatory.

Smith took the Committee through the agenda.

- Nersesian noted that the mothballing discussion scheduled for 11:15 AM would not occur, as Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator Pete McCarthy was unable to attend.
- The Committee will discuss its Charter and Operating Procedures, which might need some updating and refreshing.
- Smith will note those who wish to comment and write down the order.
- The Committee members introduced themselves. This included several new members: James Krauss, Anthony Mercantante, Katherine Stevenson, Jeffrey Tyler, Michael Walsh. (New member Stephanie Miller, the mayor of Middletown, was not present.) Inadvertently, onlookers also introduced themselves. One member, Guy Hembling, spoke up passionately for repair of buildings without delay.

Smith thanked everyone for introductions and was glad everyone has a brief sense of resources we all bring to the table.

For new members and also to remind longstanding members how much the Committee had accomplished, Glaser and Welch gave a presentation about what the Committee has been doing over the past two years. Slides will be posted on the website.

Glaser wanted everyone to know there were many efforts to brainstorm prior to formation of Committee. Superintendent Linda Canzanelli, Nersesian's predecessor, was very helpful in how the Committee was formed. It came out of recognition that we wanted the community to participate with the park to identify use of buildings located on Fort Hancock. We wanted it to be inclusive and, if you look around the table, this is exactly the kind of formation we wanted to see. We were asked by the park to look at future uses of Fort Hancock. We've had 17 meetings to date. Each of those meetings generated the kinds of participation and interaction that we wanted in terms of community engagement. Glaser said he could not emphasize how important that is. The heart of our work for the last couple of years has been around working groups.

Early in the Committee's work, Glaser said, we understood the charter and bylaws, but had to determine what it is we wanted to do and how we would get community consensus, accommodate cultural responsibilities of partners, and both enhance and promote education and ecological resources. We all noted that Fort Hancock is more than a beach and recreation destination. We have more visitors to Sandy Hook than most other parks in the nation. With that kind of visitation and proximity to urban centers, we need to create a vision that could accommodate that kind of visitation, and look at whatever adaptive reuse programs we could move forward with that considered all of the above, and which was inclusive. He cites that this is not NPS's park, it is your park – as often stated by previous Chair, John Reynolds.

Welch stated that all reports and documents are on the website. The Real Property working group information gives you big numbers, and while they are specifically incorrect, they are generally accurate at the macro level. We "costed" all the facilities at Gateway based on the park's real property inventory, current reported facility condition, industry standard cost factors for maintenance and repair, restoration and replacement with an overarching cost factor for historic structures and we costed various facility services to include utilities using Department of Defense Cost Factors from 2007 (inflated to 2014). Vision working group information should be in April meeting minutes. The Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark is the entire peninsula. The Fort Hancock Historic Post itself is **in** the district and is not itself the district. We learned that what was the Fort Hancock Historic District in 1976 was replaced in 1982 with a designation identifying the entire peninsula as an the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark District – which is larger than the NPS real property holdings – it includes the USCG station for one. The Fort Hancock Historic Post is the area in which the majority of the support and operating buildings are located.

Glaser continued: Working groups came out of the Committee's view that these were big areas that needed to be addressed. It is always on the table to continue conversations about these topics in spite of the fact that the workgroups that created these reports have "disbanded." As part of the early work, Glaser wanted the Committee and public to know that there is a very vibrant and active collection of partners at Sandy Hook doing extraordinary things. Linda Cohen spoke about New Jersey Sea Grant Consortium, an education organization that brings 25,000 kids to Sandy Hook annually to get hands-on learning. There is also a state of the art fisheries lab at Sandy Hook run by NOAA. They do basic research and studies on ocean acidification. There are 20 or so scientists at Sandy Hook examining just that issue. The lab is an educational resource and can have kids working side by side with marine scientists. There are ways to take advantage of that.

Additionally:

- Rutgers has an office at the NOAA lab and they have a team member who knows more about coastal geomorphology than anyone else.
- The Sandy Hook Foundation, led by Betsy Barrett, is also responsible for helping this Committee gain some insight.

- There is a daycare facility at Sandy Hook. There is an opportunity to grow this Community.
- There is a marine science high school at Sandy Hook (Marine Academy of Science and Technology, or MAST). We need a grammar school, undergraduate schools, more programs, etc.
- Clean Ocean Action and the American Littoral Society are here at the Hook—ALS since 1961. They do extraordinary work bringing lots of kids to Sandy Hook and teaching them what it is to be in partnership with the ocean.
- Army Ground Forces Association (AGFA) is an all-volunteer 501.c.3 historic association with about 30 members from all over the United States. While absent full time on-site tenant offices, the Association works here on a recurring, monthly (and sometimes more) basis on restoration and interpretation projects. This group has been enormously helpful in drawing attention to, clarifying, documenting, restoring, preserving and interpreting the Coast Artillery era harbor defenses that protected New York Harbor.
- The NY-56 NIKE Veteran’s Association is another all-volunteer 501.c.3 historic association. Absent full time on-site tenant offices. They are very active in preservation, restoration and interpretation of Fort Hancock’s Nike Missile sites. They conduct tours on a monthly and sometimes weekly basis. They provide a great place to learn about the cold war and what our military was doing to prevent the cold war from becoming “hot.”

It is important for the public to understand there is a community out here and there is a lot we can do with the groups that are already out here.

Welch noted that the cooperators at Sandy Hook often link programs. For example, NJ Sea Grant works with everyone to pull off Ocean Fun Day. AGFA, Rutgers, and MAST are creating a trigonometry project for high school students that will use the devices located in the plotting room, fire control stations and the guns of Battery Gunnison/New Peck. As the leases take off, new lessees will help create a larger community.

New member Jeffrey Tyler asked: where is Sandy Hook going to be at the turn of the century, 85 years from now? Is there a consensus about what will happen in terms of sea level rise?

Nersesian answered: In the NPS, we think about ourselves as being in the perpetuity business. Climate change, sea level rise, ocean acidification, winds, and especially after Sandy, this is real and must be incorporated into our planning. We need to be able to show that investment of federal dollars is accounting for climate change and sea level rise. We have developed some metrics, guidelines, and milestones we have to meet to support that. For example, with leasing, all utilities must be three feet above ground. We are looking at how all buildings fared during Sandy. We are facing some tough decisions. There are some buildings we cannot make resilient and we have had to pull out of projects proposed for such buildings.

Welch added: The Army years at Fort Hancock were “feast or famine.” During wartime (Spanish American War, WWI, WWII and some of the Cold War years), there were a lot of soldiers – between 3,000 and 5,000 - available to do work on the facilities. However, for most of the active life of Fort

Hancock (1870s to 1960s), there were between 200-500 people at most stationed at Fort Hancock – the buildings were for the most part receiving very minimal maintenance and repair. The buildings were constructed to withstand neglect and the ravages of the coastal environment – that is why they have held up so well to about 40 years of almost zero real property sustainment investment (routine maintenance and repair). What the NPS is beginning to do now regarding sustainability is moving in the direction of good real property management practices.

The presentation continued. The Committee started the process by advising the park regarding the issuance of Requests for Expressions of Interest (RFEIs). We wanted to ask the community what they thought useful rehabilitation projects would be. RFEIs allowed anyone willing to respond, telling the park what kind of creative projects they would like to help create at Fort Hancock. The RFEI provoked a lot of interest, from those just curious to those providing thoughtful consideration as to what could be done with all the buildings (35 of which the park focused on for this purpose). The NPS had to whittle it down to 35 buildings to start.

Several of the 41 proposals received desired residential use—in spite of a perception that residential would not be very popular. There was some discussion about whether having a master developer was a good way to move forward; it was the method the park used last time. Bed-and-Breakfasts, hospices, museums, and recreation were just some of the uses proposed.

The big categories we moved ahead with were: education/non-profit; B&Bs/lodging; residential/office use. At the same time, the park took on one of the buildings itself. From the rehabilitation of Building 7, the park will help the public work out how to best meet Historic Standards and Section 106 rehabilitation requirements.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) presented a more complicated process as they are a formal real property lease procurement action. RFPs contain quite a bit more detail and require applicants to meet a financial threshold. The initial RFPs were “pilots” so that the park and the Committee can understand what happens as we move forward with this.

The Committee could have asked the park to move forward with all buildings under the initial RFP. The Committee understood that there were implications for the park in releasing all at once. Though the park intends to build a viable, vital community at Fort Hancock, the park must be able to provide resources that we are not sure we have right now, such as staff and infrastructure. For this reason, the Pilot Project was limited to leasing no more than six buildings.

Based on the responses to the RFEI, the Committee helped the park to create a use map. How do we take those buildings and figure out what we want to do, based on the ideas the public came up with? The plan changed over the course of time and may continue to change.

What we learned from the Pilot: Interest in residential use was high (more than most expected). No proposals for B&Bs came in. The B&B buildings are larger and more expensive to rehabilitate. We can talk more about why B&Bs were “ignored.” There may still be an interest but we did not see that in the form of interest that came in. Based on the responses, we determined the use map should change. We

recommended a new “compatible use” category and recommended the park issue “rolling” RFPs for those residential facilities on Officers Row. Negotiations are underway with proposed Lessees who were selected in connection with the original RFPs. We have since released an RFP for ongoing submissions for residential and compatible use. We have not tackled B&Bs and non-profits.

Glaser explains that NPS may negotiate with non-profits without going through a competitive process. We continue to explore new ways to reach out to parties who may be interested. We have taken out ads in publications and continue to build a mailing list with more than 200 emails. As we sit here, the NPS is talking to two individuals prepared to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in the rehabilitation of facilities and this was not even a consideration two years ago.

Linda Cohen asked: Do we have figures as to cost of Building 7 if we are using it as a measure?

Nersesian: We will get there – though we are not there yet. We are doing some temporary roof work and historic window rehabilitation, and we are contracting with an A&E firm to develop a more detailed Scope of Work for what needs to be done on that building. All of that information will give us a sense of what it will cost to do so (at a cost to the government).

Welch: Where Character Defining Features are absent or damaged beyond repair, there is more opportunity for flexibility in restoring the facilities. Nonetheless, there is a serious uptick in inquiries about rehabilitation of structures. For example, when there is a collapse such as Building 23, there is much greater room to be creative and shape the building for a future use.

Katherine Stevenson, a new member who recently retired from the NPS, asked about Project Management Information Statements (PMIS) status of these buildings. Nersesian explains that PMIS ranks and prioritizes projects for funding. The park’s new General Management Plan identified buildings as either preserve, stabilize or ruin. This Committee is focusing on the “preserve” and “stabilize” bands. We do have to prioritize among the preserve band as well. We are trying to make targeted investments as to how to stabilize remaining buildings. There is limited funding and we have to determine whether to preserve, stabilize, etc. Taking on the rehabilitation of Building 7 demonstrates that the park is willing to step up and preserve buildings along the Interior Secretary’s standards. The park will be going through an optimization process for FMSS so that we can prioritize on a higher level some of the buildings we are not currently occupying.

Welch discussed both FMSS and Maximo. Maximo is used by Army at selected installations and is the commercial off the shelf facility management system that forms the backbone for FMSS. The system is used to estimate the cost of facility projects. It requires engineers and other skilled facility folks to go into the buildings and identify the condition of the buildings and input that information into the FMSS to generate accurate project costs and structure. These costs account for Davis-Bacon and other statutory requirements so they may seem excessive to the private sector.

Stevenson asked if the park has done any analysis on the Historic Tax Credits (HTCs). The answer is no, but we did have Audrey Tepper from the Washington office give a presentation about it in July 2014. (The PowerPoint is on the Committee website.) Stevenson suggested we should put together a pro

forma with made up numbers just to get a sense of what is required. Nersesian reminded members that HTC's are only eligible for commercial use.

Tyler asked if we have done any calculations to determine whether the numbers work out. Is there an actual pro forma that someone has done?

Pam McLay, chief of the Division of Business Management, said that the park is working with two potential lessees. They will share that information and at the end of the day, we hope to be able to share in the information gathered with them, and the applicability of historic tax credits so we can have a real measure of what happens in one of these buildings.

Summary of the last meeting

John Warren, external affairs officer at Gateway's Sandy Hook Unit, pointed out that last meeting minutes are up on the website. He mentions the 2015 meeting schedule and the current call for nominations. Highlights of last meeting included updates on work at the Sandy Hook observation platform, Building 7 progress, maintenance facility relocation and alternatives, streamlining restoration and decision efforts leading to the creation of "approval process working group." There was a discussion as to what to do next (post-Pilot RFP). NPS determined a new rolling RFP should be issued. NCPA provided us an intern for the summer. The intern compiled information about organizations that might provide grant funding subsequently. One member proposed an immediate selection for the position of co-chair, which John Reynolds had vacated in December. The motion was carried and Welch was selected by consensus.

We planned to meet again on September 11 but, since Lillian Burry was unable to attend, we moved the meeting to September 18. Since the last meeting, it was decided to cancel a meeting scheduled for October. The last 2015 meeting is Friday, December 4 at Sandy Hook Chapel. We do not yet have dates for 2016.

The new Call For Nominations went out Wednesday, September 16. Membership in the Committee is only obtained by approved application. Terms run for three years, with staggering of renomination dates so that the entire committee does not reapply at once. Applications are due by October 15 and can only be submitted by applicants themselves. You must nominate yourself; nominations by others will not be considered. After the park nominates prospective members, they are reviewed by the Department of the Interior (DOI) and a White House liaison. If selected, members serve for a term of three years. The Committee is looking for potential members from the following areas: cultural resource and historic preservation, science, environment, and government officials from Highlands, Sea Bright, and Atlantic Highlands.

Committee members must have an ability to collaborate, ability to understand NPS policies, etc. The Committee is asked to help spread the word for new applicants. The Committee can have as many as 30 members although there is no plan at this time to have more than 25 members at any one time. Those who were not selected before are welcome to reapply.

Lynda Rose and Margot Walsh pointed out that Karolyn Wray is a member of Sea Bright so that town is represented. We may have wanted to get a political representative from Sea Bright on the Committee. Other current committee members either live or work in all of the towns mentioned in the Call for Nominations.

Rose asked if we wanted a table at a community expo coming up in the next week. She offered to make arrangements for NPS to represent at the Eastern Monmouth Area Chamber of Commerce BizConnect Expo on September 30, 2015. The Committee encouraged this to move forward.

Business Management report

McLay introduced the winner of best NPS photo—a photo of Sandy Hook with a pink sunset over Officers Row.

When the Committee met last time, we talked about progress we made with the pilot program. McLay “hears” Hembling’s concerns about the pace of rehabilitation and the park wants to move ahead.

The park heard from the Committee that members want additional work done and we have since released additional RFPs for Officers Row buildings for compatible use.

- We discussed revisions to the use map. The “compatible use” designation now includes 27, 52, and 114.
- We wanted to build on momentum of Officers Row. We are getting a lot of interest. We have had a lot of serious walk-throughs of buildings. The message is getting out.
- The first rolling RFP closes September 30 and the same process will be followed as before.
- The Regional Office will pull together a panel and we will continue the RFP until the all buildings are leased. We will keep updating the Committee. We will share whatever information is available and appropriate to share.
- The evaluation criteria are the same as those found in the initial RFP as are the weighted averages identified as appropriate measures by the committee with respect to the first RFPs. McLay has prepared a presentation that will be shared on the FACA site. Evaluation criteria include use, financials, rent, experience, sustainability, preservation. Evaluation criteria and weights have not changed since the last RFP.

We did have an intern from NPCA who compiled information about non-profits for us. We may share some of that information at the next meeting. She contacted non-profit organizations that were interested in the RFEIs to determine what prevented them from submitting an RFP. This should be an agenda item for the next meeting.

We should talk about issuing a Request For Bids and plugging in numbers that are real, credible, and rely on true market conditions. McLay asked the group if they wanted to wait to talk about an RFB until we have real and credible numbers.

Michael Holenstein believed we should talk about how tax credits are a funding source. We use words too liberally and we think something will happen based on an idea. We need to understand this better.

We have some expertise on the Committee that might be able to talk about what it really means in terms of funding. When we released the RFP, we went out with the idea that people would have to “show us the money.” A successful bidder needs to demonstrate why they can do what they promised to do.

Stevenson: Is it possible to find out whether the interested parties are interested in the Historic Tax Credit? It is only one element of a big menu of things people are going to have to look at.

Holenstein: It is an appropriate consideration on the part of the Lessee to determine whether they can operate under a tax credit but it is not one of the evaluation criteria.

Discussion continued. Tax credits require a lease term of 39.5 years and also a commercial use under the lease. We have discussed this with the proposed Lessees. We cannot reveal the details of any such discussion regarding lease negotiation.

When someone comes forward as a prospective Lessee, they qualify after satisfying a number of criteria, not as an automatic “in” for tax credits. We have an opportunity to discuss this openly and not to make it obscure.

Nersesian recommended that the park issue talking points about tax credits. McLay pointed out that if there is a way for NPS to assist with application for tax credits, we should find a way to make that happen. Nersesian: It does require investment and work to be eligible for tax credits.

- Action item: Pro forma model that we can share that is grounded in market derived numbers.
- Action Item: Talking points for Tax Credits.

We have been happy with the proposals that came in and that is why we keep the feedback the same.

McLay asked the Committee: Do we want to issue an RFP for Commercial (purple buildings)? Is there added value? Smith asked for comments.

- Welch asked how easy it would be. Chief BSD assures him this is a project that can be handled by her division. Welch says execute. Smith asked if anyone had concerns about this. There were none.
- Welch said he has been talking to restaurants and wants to know if buildings 54, 55, 56 in the education/commercial zone can be considered for restaurants. There does not appear to be any reason why not.
- Tyler asked if members can just let people talk to us and focus on opportunities available. Can we directly negotiate? The answer from the park: NO, committee members can only provide information that is publically available to interested parties. NPS is happy to take anyone out and show a building. Nersesian pointed out that we are required to go through the RFP process for any award to a Lessee that is not a non-profit or otherwise excused from competition.

- Nersesian also noted that people wanted some sense of what activity would be limited before they moved ahead with proposals. We grouped the buildings to address that concern, but nothing is set in stone. The buildings can be leased for what uses we determine we want that are consistent with the status of the area and the values of the NPS. Do we have objections to including all back buildings in to commercial RFP (purple and yellow)?
- McLay: We will issue two separate RFPs so as to keep concerns separated for each (for purple and yellow buildings as depicted on the revised use map).
- Should we add Buildings 114 and 27 to the current rolling RFP? Yes.
- Do we need to do something in education and outreach that differentiates this RFP from the other? Yes – we need to identify how RFPs are different (uses are different).
- Can we get consensus on commercial and education RFPs? Yes. The group agrees we can issue those and address any issues with clarity.
- Michal Walsh is fully supportive of issuing the RFPs for all.
- Smith: Are we comfortable on issuing RFPs on commercial or educational buildings? Yes!
- McLay: The Committee, at the last meeting, decided that Buildings 27 (Bachelors Officers Quarters or BOQ) and 114 (Officers Club) could be part of the buildings considered for residential use and any for any compatible use and should be included in the current RFP (rolling). Agreed those will be added – Yes, consensus.
- Welch recommended putting the use map right up front in the booklet. That way, people know what they are looking at from the start.
- Nersesian pointed out that Building 114 needs a lot of work. It is an amazing building and she is counting on the Committee to get the word out about Building 114. That building can be an anchor building for the rest.

Public Comment Period:

John Warren read the rules. Due to number of members of the public in attendance, speaking is limited to three minutes.

Chris Brenner: Local resident from Fair Haven. Makes films for hobby and produced a 40-minute film about the far southern end of Sandy Hook near the Route 35 Bridge. The film was for fun but it went viral and over 12,000 people have seen it. Chris has cards with the internet web address of the film. He received hundreds of comments about the film and was amazed at how many people have no idea about the facility (Building 600 – formerly known as the Sandlass Pavilion) that has been there since the

late 1800s. Many people have no idea how much impact the Highlands and the resort (Sandlass Pavilion) have on shaping tourism in the State of New Jersey. It was a resort and a bar and the Sandlass family home. He hopes the committee can find a way to salvage the last structure from the resort. If you have not seen the film, please do so.

John Warren: We received a message which the author asked we would read aloud. The committee does not do that, but we did post it on our website and have made copies to be distributed here. It is on the same subject – the Sandlass building. It is easy to see as you are driving out the park and is in an area prone to flooding. **(See Appendix B of this document.)**

Susan Gardiner: Sandy Hook is the cradle that nurtured her in her formative years. She is here because of the building that lies in the park grounds but does not have the same function as Fort Hancock. Fort Hancock was a place she could not enter growing up. Her family has been part of the community since 1887 and has a love of the community. The Sandlass family has represented recreation in the region. The lost resort on Highlands Beach is just as much part of the story as the lighthouse and the military buildings. The film produced about this shows about the hunger to connect with the birth of tourism on the Jersey shore. It is the last element linked to social change in the region. The house that still exists after 122 years and survived Sandy and its impact is closely tied to tourism on Sandy Hook today. The significance is embodied in the building. When our history and lives are changed, it deserves to be acknowledged and preserved. We'd like to have the house be revitalization to the community. Assist us in making this goal a reality. Warren asked her for the full text of her remarks, which were limited to the three-minute time limit. The remarks will be placed in full on the website under the comment section. Written comments may be sent to john_warren@nps.gov.

Jim Walters: He is here to speak in support of maintaining the Sandlass building to address community growth and if there is public value in use of the building and growth of the shore. He has developed a program to link HS and College students to community programs. His students have done research and determined there is a way to have a good community outcome. Students can apply theory to practice through a structured higher education program developed by Jim Walters. There is a handout called the "Save Sandlass Vision." Maybe similar activities can be saved by applying theory to practice that begins in an educational framework.

Mark Pavliv: Sandlass House is his topic. He has 45 years in architecture and he was refereed to this project through AIA. He is new to the discussion but he has yet to come up with a project that has had so much interest and support from the public. He was the studio architect that worked on STLI. His son graduated from MAST 20 years ago. He wants everyone to understand that projects are not recognized for what they are worth. The Sandlass house has been moved and is a wood frame structure. It was thought to be outside the boundaries of Sandy Hook and so was excluded from protected status. Subsequent discussion with SHPO revealed the building is not significant from an architectural perspective. Speaker states that it is important from a social perspective. Speaker compares it to a similar project in the area where a church was deemed significant based on its use. This site is worth another look in terms of historic significance.

Jean Howsen: Dovetails on former speakers. Lives in Atlantic Highlands and is interested in Sandlass House as a result of project she worked on for DOT when constructing the bridge above. They were required to produce an illustrated history of travel and transportation to Highlands and Highlands Beach. The history regards the resort as important. It is the last vestige of a socially significant movement which was the early jersey shore. The document exists and she worked on an exhibit at twin lights about the history of the bridge and that section of the shore, as well as the Sandlass Pavilion. It is an important vestige of local history and deserves attention.

Phyllis Riddle: The Rumson resident never heard of Sandlass Pavilion until she saw the movie mentioned earlier. She never saw a roller coaster that got pushed up manually. The story is unbelievable and she would like to see it survive.

Suzanne Brenner Caffrey: She is proud of her nephew who put the film together. She grew up in Sandlass Beach. She is a beach club baby. She looks at that house every time she goes over the bridge to go to her most recent beach club. She has fond memories of the Sandlass and of Sandy Hook. They used to go on the beach by boat to Plum Island until they were chased off by MPs. It breaks her heart that that is going to go somewhere where no one knows about it.

At the request of an audience member, Warren asked how many people are here for Sandlass Pavilion topic discussion; 18 people raised their hands. John thanked the speakers for their time.

Tyler asked, is this topic within the purview of the Committee to address this?

Nersesian: It is within the boundaries of the park, and within the historic district, but not a contributing structure. We would leave it to the Committee to address. Tyler thinks it is a "lost child" and wants to know what we should do.

Rose: Can we empower them? I am sorry they waited three years to come forward.

Welch: This issue may be best raised with SHPO. SHPO has final authority on this. The point about what is the scope of the Committee. The buildings in the historic post are clearly contributing to the historic landmark district. Maybe the group needs to do some research about getting on the register.

Nersesian: Points out that there is a recent determination on file regarding Building 600. A member of the public asked, what does that mean?

Dan Saunders of NJ SHPO explained how a determination is made. The Sandlass building does not meet the criteria identifying it as significant. (There are four criteria under which you can qualify.) SHPO says they do not see Criterion C (architecturally significant) merit but thinks they need to find the professional expertise to make an argument that there is a Criterion B (social history) argument. However the building has been moved and has been modified. As a matter of experience, it is challenging to evaluate this sort of a property. They may have some professional expertise that can help them articulate a more compelling case.

Nersesian: We are in this because we care about history and that has shaped who we are. There is a lot of passion and interest and we want to work with the community to find a solution. For the park, the fact the building does not fit the Historic District (because it is not an Army building but was built for another purpose), does not contribute to the park's mission, lies in a flood prone area, does not have room for parking, is significant. But if there is interest in the community in preserving it and putting funds into it, or finding a site for it to be moved to, the Sandlass community is welcome to do so.

John Ekdahl asks if there is a plan to take it down. Nersesian: We do not have a timetable to do so, nor do we have funding to do so. She reiterated that action can be taken by members of the Sandlass Community.

Michael Walsh said he thought the story about the Sandlass pavilion was amazing but, with respect to our mandate and mission, he does not think this falls within it. We are limited to the Main Post within the Fort. Should we do more than applaud the efforts of the Sandlass Group, encourage their efforts, and encourage their efforts to find funds? Personally, he does not know if it is the mandate of the committee to advise or address this. "We applaud you and urge you to continue to work with the park service but I don't know that we can provide resources for you."

Warren gave historic background about the formation of the Committee and the historic district that was often referred to as Fort Hancock. We now refer to that as the Fort Hancock Historic Post because the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground landmark covers the entire peninsula. It was always the intention to address the buildings at the Historic Post, in the far north end of the Peninsula. Welch said he believes Warren is right as the other seven posts are long ago demolished and gone.

Michael Walsh: That does not dismiss the importance of the project to the folks who turned out today.

Tyler: It is a great idea to preserve the building but the Highland beach land is not what it was. Maybe that is not the best location for the building. Maybe there is a better location across the river that can preserve the history.

Comment Period Concludes

After Lunch:

New member James Krauss asked about the status of lease negotiations. NPS cannot discuss those terms but notified the Committee that the park is still talking to the proposed Lessees. NPS has introduced the Lessees to each other so they can work on economies of scale. Those proposed Lessees put in for residential use (the only use we received proposals for).

Cohen: Asks what happened to non-profits, especially Romer Shoal?

McLay pointed out that this was meant to be an agenda item but it is already so packed. To date, Camille (NPCA Intern) has identified non-profits who might be interested in Fort Hancock Historic Post rehabilitation. We have a spreadsheet with information we will continue to work with. As for Romer Shoal, no progress.

Superintendent's report on the park

The park is still in the thick of Hurricane Sandy recovery. We are investing millions of dollars in that recovery. The buildings on Officers Row fared well due to construction and elevation. We are in the process of planning new maintenance facilities. A draft Environmental Assessment is due later this year but we have come to a good place, especially considering the opposition we received from Birders and MAST. The talk about building a new maintenance facility has resulted in talk about caring for existing structures and reusing what we have. We are working on the engineering and contracting for the beach centers. Building 102 at Fort Hancock will probably be complete fall of next year – it will become 38 units of seasonal housing. We still do not have staff housing on site but we just contracted for our Phase II buildings at Sandy Hook which includes 58, 35, and 28 (to be the Fort Hancock Museum), as well as others that will be used as park housing. This will be a year-round use building that will periodically be available in the off-season for use by cooperators and volunteers. The Porch on Building #26 is almost complete and should be done by October with the help of HOPE and NJ Youth Corps. We also awarded the contract for the main telecommunications line project. Phase I was just a shorter extension of that line. This additional phase will bring the lower hook telecom up to the northern end. This is important because it supports the buildings and the needs of proposed Lessees. We are also upgrading the sewer plant and will have a new wastewater treatment plant by 2018. New signs on Sandy Hook should be up by next year. This is our first phase of looking at the signs across the park.

Rose asked if we can have block numbers put up on the buildings so they can be identified. Nersesian said she thought it was a great idea. There are already numbers on the buildings but they are hard to see.

History House and the Theater will move into contracting and design this fall. Improvements to Spermacetti Cove (the once and future Visitor Center) should move into contracting in September.

At 3 PM today, the Sandy Hook BioBlitz begins in partnership with ALS. It is a 24-hour marathon of counting and cataloguing all species. It is not unknown that species new to Sandy Hook have been discovered.

Thanks to the Sandy Hook Foundation for successful summer concert series and the Annual End of Summer Party for ALS/SHF. The Iron Girl Triathlon also took place. It was a fabulous summer in terms of beach weather in spite of a shaky start. In August alone there were 447,000 people at the Hook, about 40,000 more people than were here this year. Our recreation fee revenue is up and 80% of that money comes back to the park. We want to be cognizant of how we cover our costs and maintain our park so that visitors have a great experience.

Rose asked how long have campgrounds been open at the Hook? Warren: They have been open to the public since 2013. They are booked every weekend in the summer.

Over Labor Day Weekend, postcards were handed out at the fee booths to help get the word out about our leasing efforts. Nersesian wants to thank the field staff out there. They provided a great experience

for visitors under challenging circumstances. It was a tough ocean season with a lot of rip currents and even shipwrecks off the coast of the Hook.

Rose asks about the goats. Nersesian related that the goats are rented from a farm where, tragically, a barn fire killed all 100 of them last winter. Hopefully we will have goats back at Sandy Hook for Summer 2016.

Holenstein asked if we are allowed to solicit for donations for rehabilitation. NPS is not allowed to solicit donations but we can work out a fundraising agreement with SHF perhaps.

Glaser asked if potential lessees can use HOPE crew to rehab facilities. Yes, but you have to pay the HOPE crew. Glaser asked if we are providing resources to the potential Lessees regarding the types of services necessary to rehabilitate buildings. It's a bit of both. Lessees are working with their own professionals and we are filling in gaps where we can.

Question from the Committee: How do you identify who can come work on rehab?

Answer: Through the evaluation process where the proposed Lessees must identify the team of professionals they are planning to use to rehab facilities.

Mothballing: we have completed a lot of vegetation removal along the buildings that need to be mothballed. We will have a larger discussion on this topic when Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator Pete McCarthy is able to attend.

Section 106 Presentation

Marilou Ehrler, historic architect at Gateway, and Dan Saunders of NJ SHRO conducted this presentation on standards for historic preservation. More specific information can be found in the PPT presentation prepared by Saunders and Ehrler, which can be found on the website at forthancock21.org.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act mandates that all Federal Agencies:

1. Take into account effects of their actions on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register, and
2. Give the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, established under Title II of the NHPA, a reasonable opportunity to comment.

Saunders and his supervisor report to Bob Martin, NJ DEP Commissioner.

- Size and scale of projects determines scale of review. It is the park superintendent's obligation to ensure a park complies with review requirements.
- Cultural Resource Management Teams exist in every park and includes historical architect, historical landscape architect, historian, ethnographer, archeologist, and curator.
- Section 106 process largely delegate review process to the state. SHPO represents the state's interest in protecting historic projects,

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is comprised of 23 members who are Presidential appointees.
- “Taking into account” means identification and evaluation of properties and of effects and seeking agreement about how to resolve adverse effects, in consultation with SHPO (or Tribal HPO).

Saunders: There is a difference between the types of impacts. Change to historic components, whether to a historic building or an archeological artifact is adverse in any case, and that is the SHPO default position.

Adverse effects must be corrected. This is typically accomplished by Memorandum of Agreement with SHPO and the entity seeking to undertake the project that has an impact.

Assessing Adverse Effects: Alterations not consistent with SOI Standards is the one most typically at issue in our situation.

Standards: Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoration, Reconstruction are all subject to case law on the matters as to what constitutes any one of the above.

Saunders offered an example: A window survey is required and if the survey reveals the window can be saved, it must be. Otherwise, a window is replaced and must meet a different standard as to what can be used instead.

At this point, Guy Hembling interjected: If you have to work on the windows to this degree, you are at cross-purposes. The buildings will collapse while you work out this window issue. For example, Building 22’s temperature never goes above 50 degrees. Smith jumped in, but Saunders agreed to address this topic now – not to wait until the end of presentation.

Hembling felt the material costs are 2-3 times what the project should cost because of the painstaking process. You are saddling people with buildings that are not insulated, that heating will be running through the roof, and the windows will need to be painted every three years.

Welch: I understand what you are saying. You are correct, it can drive you to where you can’t spend the money. There are ways to achieve compliance at lower costs this but it requires effort and in some cases the help of senior leaders to help frame options for compliance that are less onerous and costly and are in consonance with the reality of how the building otherwise functions.

The presentation continued: Tax Credit Projects in 2014 resulted value of two Billion Dollars. Saunders: The Secretary of the Interior (SOI) sets the policy—not SHPO, not NPS. Hembling replied that he is trying to get a meeting with the SOI to make changes to the standards.

Saunders and Ehrler pointed out there is a Preservation Brief on how to make a building compliant with SOI Standards and also properly insulated, etc...

Stevenson: The Secretary of the Interior (SOI) cannot deviate from the law.

Welch: Yes, the SOI or other land holding Executive Department heads (must be a Senate-confirmed Presidential appointee) can, but only if they sign a letter stating they are willing to proceed with the stated action and understand and are willing to accept the adverse impact to further the organization's mission. This is seldom done.

Smith reminded the group we are here to lay out the standards and identify what those are so we can move ahead in accordance with those standards.

Ehrler: It is about education and understanding the standard. The tax credit program is successful and is implemented across the country, including here in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

Although some interjections continued, Smith wanted to hold the conversation about what we could do until we have a common understanding of what those standards are. The presentation continued.

Tenants of the rehabbed structure must: ID and preserve character defining features; Repair those character-defining features.

Ehrler said that the park was lucky: Fort Hancock has rehabilitation guidelines developed years ago and most character defining features have already been identified. Exterior standards were then laid out.

Roofs: Repair or replace in kind. If it is asphalt you replace, same for slate (on Buildings 17 and 18). There is preservation guidance that identifies how to repair cornices and rakes (replacing with fiberglass or other alternatives will be considered). Hembling pointed out that there are molds made for some of the buildings.

Existing preservation briefs mention how to preserve masonry and how to repoint butter joints.

Windows: Are there sashes beyond repair? Yes. Are the majority of windows beyond repair? Ehrler: I would say no. In terms of energy efficiency there are numbers of studies that will show you that a properly rehabilitated window with a storm window will give you a better R-rating.

Fouratt mentioned that having to put on the storms every winter presents a labor issue to tenants. Hembling argues that we are using inefficient obsolete technology that did not work when we first addressed it and does not work now.

Presentation continued: Porches: Doors, transom, porches. Porches are character-defining features. They are the interface between inside and out and are the most public part of a private space. The porches are now 90-100 years old. Material that lasts this long and is well repaired is likely to last another 100 years. Hembling: So you are using outdated materials and driving the cost. Ehrler: You can review the preservation brief regarding replacement of porches.

Hembling: We are using woods that are expensive and exotic because we cannot use pine. Why can't we use manufactured materials if looks are what you are concerned about?

Smith reminded Hembling that we can have the discussion after the presentation. Hembling preferred to talk about it now, because the people giving the presentation are the ones who can answer these questions.

Presentation Continued: Plaster, Tin Ceilings, and Stair Cases are all character defining features.

Rehab sub code in NJ allows the railings in certain historic buildings to remain as they were (an exception).

Federally-owned buildings are not required to comply with state codes. However, NPS defers to state codes and rehab standards. In cases such as this, where the staircase is a character-defining feature, we will require it be kept intact or otherwise rehabilitated.

Saunders: You have to talk about the project as a whole, and that is where you get flexibility. Each project means each building. Hembling: But we are charged with saving all buildings. Saunders: In the end, if you are able to save one of the buildings, saving the rest gets easier as you go on. Going through all of this once and coming to agreement on what the issues are will streamline the process going forward. Follow the Flow Charts provided by SHPO.

NPS is required to uphold the standard. NPS is the guardian of historic structures.

Section 106 Timeline

Saunders and Ehrler strongly recommended that potential leaseholders start the discussion early and sit down with a group of advisors at the park for review of documents. The park will figure out where there are issues and discussion commences. Cultural Management Team has 10 days to review the project from the date of receipt. If the project is larger, it can take as long as three weeks. Park consults with SHPO. Sometimes the park engages SHPO before park has even had time to review.

Glaser asked whether we are engaged with SHPO yet regarding the leases currently under negotiation with the park. Ehrler said yes; she and Saunders have attended meetings with proposed lessees already.

Glaser: At the end of the conversation, will the Lessee know whether they are supposed to repair or replace? Will they know before they start knocking things down what they are required to do? Will it be spelled out?

Nersesian: Lessees have to know before they start work because it impacts the cost. It needs to be stated in the lease so that they can follow the guidelines.

Margot Walsh: So what recourse does anyone have if they follow all the guidelines and then there is a problem with cold or leaking windows like there are in the chapel? Ehrler and Saunders gave examples of historic homes for which guidelines have been followed and resulted in warm, dry, insulated homes. Stevenson added that the Lessee can approach the park and ask that the issue be reevaluated.

Rose and Margot Walsh: Who is responsible for the costs of those fixes?

McLay: The lessee. But they can always re-amortize the value of those improvements against the lease charges (fair market rent).

Welch: The point is that the buildings are rehabilitated. What can we do to save time and money? The Committee's role is to give advice to the park on where it can improve but first we have to understand what those issues are.

Ehrler: The chapel windows were never restored and, yes, they do leak. There is no insulation and the HVAC was never properly fitted for that facility. That issue is being addressed now with repairs from Hurricane Sandy.

Saunders: By the time NPS makes a submission to SHPO (after reviewing what a Lessee has proposed), the state SHPO should know about it. Ehrler: And that is what typically happens. We are not waiting to have full construction documents to begin the discussions.

This presentation will be posted on the website. Between now and the next meeting, NPS will solicit information about discussion on these topics we want to have.

Rose asked if there is a list of materials that are already approved for use. Ehrler replied that there was a type of roof shingle identified for roofs, but it is no longer made.

Saunders: Once we identify those materials for one building, we can apply that definition to the rest of the buildings. You have a preservation team that knows how to do this and how to figure it out. Saunders and Ehrler: Costs alone are not enough of an argument to forego compliance with the requirements.

Nersesian: Also, that was the intent of doing a pilot phase – to determine what we could do now and how we can apply that to future applicants.

Michael Walsh: The public has had access to this information. I've read all of this material. People should be informed before they make a bid. The standard has been in existence and no one should think this is a surprise.

Ehrler: Prior to NPS, she worked in historic preservation and has followed these details all her life, done it successfully and won awards for some of the projects. It is done across the country successfully and can be done here too.

Glaser stated he was concerned about operations and process, managing surprises and the unexpected. What happens when that surprise hits the Lessee after having made a \$1million investment? How can the Lessee deal with whatever that issue is? Glaser seeks a discussion about this issue and wants the park to help us take another look at the process. It never hurts to look at this once more. What if someone thought they have a window that could be rehabilitated and then it is determined that it needs to be replaced? How do we address this quickly?

Ehrler: Someone on my staff will have the ability to look at this. General Rule of Thumb: If you don't go into a historic construction project with a 15% contingency, you are naïve at best.

Glaser: I am just asking that we look at the time, the circumstances, and the efficiencies that we can consider. It is important to send a signal to those considering taking on a lease that there is a process that is supported.

Add to discussion next time: Concerns identified above.

Welch: We need manuals, checklists, and descriptors as to how we get from A to Z. What are the steps you take to do this? The Approvals Process Working group is using Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA) as the baseline materials to develop the Gateway approvals process.

Holenstein: If you want to be a part of that group, add your name to the list and make comments to the GOGA materials. One comment on perspective: We are talking about things and how expensive they are but we need to consider that these are large waterfront homes. If you think you can buy real estate at the NJ shore for 2.5-3 million dollars... Whatever it costs is still a bargain when you consider the cost of waterfront property in the area. Requiring a Lessee to invest in a property with those perks is not going to hurt anyone's feelings.

New member Anthony Mercantate: Cost is factored into the lease arrangement. It is simple from that perspective. There is a difference between rehabilitation of federal property vs. private property. Since we do not know what impact the cost of renovation will have on the projects, maybe we should do a what-if scenario. Maybe one year from now, after having reviewed many more RFPs and no one can come up with funds to rehab those buildings, maybe we consider rehabilitating a certain percentage of the buildings.

Tyler: Seems to me we are already there. When someone has a discretionary budget, they can do the figuring on whether it is worth it to parties to venture here. I ran the numbers myself and think it may not work for businesses or non-profits. Do we need 20 restorations? Maybe we need to consider having just a few that really meet the standards.

Smith asked members to hold onto that thought and address it later or at another meeting. We will come back to this topic in a more focused way at the next meeting.

Charter, Operating Protocols: a review

Smith reviewed the two founding documents of the committee for new members and as a refresher for continuing members, so that all members could identify topics needing further discussion.

The Charter is not open to revision at the moment. There is a process for revising it but it is big process. If we want to consider revisions to the Charter we should think about the importance of any changes. There is more room to revise Operating Procedures.

A Charter is required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972. It is developed by the agency (in this case NPS) requesting the Committee and signed and filed by and with the Agency Heads. There are statutory and regulatory requirements. This Committee's Charter defines the objective and scope on development of a reuse plan and the future use of the Historic District (which we understand as the Fort Hancock Historic Post). Changes to the Charter require approval by the SOI and typically must be noted in the Federal Register.

Membership requires representatives from a number of skill areas and local communities. Ethical responsibilities are incumbent on members as well.

Subcommittees are different from working groups. Subcommittees are not allowed to provide work products to the Agency but are meant to bring broader issues for discussion or exploration before the whole Committee. Their meetings must produce minutes that the public can read. Working committees are less formal and there is no reporting requirement.

Operating Protocols (OP), on the other hand, are more detailed, but easier for the Committee to change.

Margot Walsh asked if we should clarify that the Charter can be renewed in Operating Plan? We are already in our fourth year. She said it looked like we should cut language about renewal and just leave in language about termination.

Members are listed in the Charter. Hill wanted everyone to know that he is the Borough Administrator (not the Planner), so that needed to be corrected.

Michael Walsh asks if the appointments are staggered. They are. Rather than putting the list in the Operating Plan, we should add it as an appendix with the dates.

Margot Walsh commented: We have people serving on the Board that are representatives, not alternates. Though Mayor Frank Nolan of Highlands is not here, we have someone from Highlands.

Warren: The issue of alternates was addressed early in this process. There are no designees for appointed members. To be an alternate, you would still need to be appointed.

Nersesian asks that she also be identified by name in the Appendix, not the OP.

Co-chairs discussion

Michael Walsh asked if the Committee needed to review the roles of the Co-Chairs. There are two co-Chairs in the OP (as opposed to a chair and a co-chair). Nersesian: At the last meeting we only put the co-chairs decision in effect until December 2015. Hill suggested continuing with two co-chairs because the task is too large for one person to handle. Margot Walsh said that we decided at the last meeting that we want two co-chairs. *OP says "up to two" so maybe we want to revisit this. (*Editor: The OP states simply "The Committee will select two co-chairs.")

Michael Walsh asks if we need to have two. Smith: We will talk about this at the next meeting. Walsh replied: It does not sound like we have time to wait. Smith: We can work on some of these things between now and the next meeting.

Nersesian: Can we approve and use it? Yes, says facilitator.

Holenstein: From a legal perspective, we cannot operate unless we have two co-chairs but I think we should have had two all along. If you feel the need to change that, you can... such as in the case of retirement, withdrawal, untimely death.

Michael Walsh, Fouratt, and Holenstein wanted agreement on the issue now. Michael Walsh: We should agree a new co-chair should be selected at the next meeting.

Welch said that we should add language indicating that we do not need both co-chairs to be present in order to move ahead at a meeting.

Michael Walsh: The issue that remains before the committee is whether or not you are selected for life if you are selected as a co-chair. There needs to be something in there that allows for exiting. There should be opportunities for succession and a way that chairs are selected with terms. You can be re-selected but there has to be a term. Smith asked Walsh if he has an idea as to what that term should be.

Holenstein called for a two-year term. There are 30 people on the Committee* and if they want to participate on that level, they should have the opportunity. Right now there is no mechanism for allowing others to take a co-chair position. (*While the Committee may have as many as 30 members, only 22 serve currently.)

The issue of whether anyone would be serving after December was unclear. Holenstein: Let's be clear that the person whose term is expiring in December is Shawn Welch, not Gerry Glaser.

Krauss asked if the co-chairs' terms should be staggered. Holenstein replied yes – so there is the added benefit of allowing the newly appointed members to get familiar with everyone and being able to make a selection/appointment.

Smith: So why don't we implement a process whereby two meetings before the end of the year, those interested in being a co-chair should let their interest be known, and at the last meeting of the year, the decision gets made. Right now, it is hard to think about what we want to put in to our ongoing procedures vs. what we are doing with the very real expiration of Welch's status as co-chair through December 2015. We do not even have all members here now to make a decision about how we want to approach this.

Margot Walsh: If we are asking people to step up, we need to let them know for how long.

Smith: Given where we are today, it might make sense to think about how to solve this problem in the longer term. What would be our ideal process about what we want for our co-chair?

Welch: We've needed a review of our operating procedures for some time. The other thing we need to think about is how much of a complicated document do you want to create? The less specificity, the more flexibility you have. We should look at what hems us in. Glaser and Welch have been on the phone at least once/week in between meetings, sometimes more. It appears to me that we do not need both co-chairs to have a meeting and that if both cannot make it, the DFO is sufficient?

Smith: Does it help if we say these are guidelines and not rules written in stone? On the other hand, if we identify how we want to work together, we can follow them and do not have to worry about them.

Fouratt: It has been working because we have not had to pull those rules out in three years.

Margot Walsh: We need to send out an email that we will have a selection process in December because we only selected a co-chair through December. We can submit a draft about the manner by which we will make the selection in December.

Smith: Do you want to make a selection by email?

Holenstein: The people who want to be involved are those who come to meetings. We should send out an email to all members letting them know we want to make a selection of a co-chair and that if you are interested in being considered, let us know.

Hill: We should send out the email but advise the committee that we propose to take action at the first meeting at 2016.

Fouratt said why not make the decision at the December meeting? Smith replied that, this way, the parties interested in being a co-chair can make their interest known.

Cohen asked if the facilitator is staying to be a co-chair. Nersesian explains the facilitator is not a co-chair and that John Reynolds, our retired co-chair, left a significant period of time after the facilitators originally assigned to the project left.

Welch: We should probably go through the rest of the Operating Plan and determine what we want our co-chairs to do. Holenstein (to Welch): Colonel, you just put yourself in your own box.

Nersesian: The presentation you saw earlier today is a compilation of the activities Glaser has undertaken the last year. Glaser has participated in many working groups, and was the one who called all the RFEI applicants who responded to the post action poll.

Smith: For purposes of time, the facilitator (herself) will play with Operating Plan item D language, to address clearer language about term, alternating, etc., as well as responsibilities of the co-chairs consideration by future co-chairs. She will send an email to the committee stating that Welch and Glaser will remain the co-chairs through the first meeting of 2016 but there will be an opportunity at the December meeting for others who are interested in acting as co-chair to come forward. We will address staggering the co-chair terms, notifying folks that the next term is for one year, and the following will be

for two years. Maybe we limit the notification to Welch only and retain Glaser through the end of 2016, after which his position as the co-chair can be opened to newly interested parties.

Nersesian asked Glaser and Welch to write up a job description.

Welch read aloud different portions of the OP and asks us to look at it again. What should the periodic communication to the Committee be? For example, when the Sandlass Community discussion came up today, co-chairs were already processing that information and have been having behind the scene discussions about it. Is there something we should be looking at that defines how that is done? Smith: Maybe the co-chair job description should be embedded in the appendix. Nersesian: I'm not sure we need to do that.

Michael Walsh: Maybe we should just consider prescriptive language and replace with simpler (should vs. may) in the Operating Plan.

Smith asked the members how they wanted to proceed. Will we draft a job description and email the committee about the process? Have a workgroup and address revisions? Ask all to submit comments about any OP concerns?

Glaser noted that Welch has redlined his copy of the Operating Plan. Why don't we ask Welch to submit the identified inconsistencies to the Operating Plan in writing and just work on those? There was no need for each member to go through the entire Operating Plan in detail. Glaser did not want to write a position description for a co-chair, having had too much experience doing so in his professional life.

Holenstein: Why don't you offer to speak candidly and openly to anyone that is interested in a co-chair position? I move for consensus. **Consensus reached.**

Smith: We have a process in place for taking on any changes needed.

Closing Statements:

Krauss would have liked to hear more about the non-profit outcome and plan of attack. What is the time frame for the RFP process on other buildings? He thinks the October meeting should not have cancelled because we have too much to discuss.

McLay committed to releasing additional RFPs before the next FACA meeting in December.

Hembling: These buildings are not going to wait forever. It is up to NPS to be proactive. NPS needs to identify the CAM charges, run gas lines up the peninsula, and buy 10,000 yellow bricks. NPS should work on all the buildings as one project and look at them as a whole. Look at Building 23 (which has suffered a partial collapse) and then look at the sides of Buildings 18 and 19 – bricks are falling as you speak. Hembling apologized for his tone.

Michael Walsh appreciated everyone's passion around the table. He did not mean to talk at this meeting and obviously broke his promise but he is passionate about this and believes in historic rehabilitation.

Holenstein thanked everyone, including the new facilitator, who he hoped would “stick around.” He hopes we reestablish our operating procedure and use stand up name plates for discussion. He thinks we are on the right track and it was a good meeting.

Hill asked the group to look at what has happened since Sandy and where we are now. The process has been painfully slow, but we are on track. With the new RFP, we are moving along. Hill asked Hembling to remember that at our original meetings people were asking why we were forming a FACA to address the buildings at all.

Margot Walsh agreed with everything that’s been said but thinks we should not get caught up in procedure. We should move ahead with getting things done. Our discussion today was good and we should keep focused. Are we on target to do what we need to do and do it well?

Saunders: I agree with a lot of what Hembling said about critical timelines. But what we need to resolve is not where the time goes but getting to the agreement with proposed Lessees that will move this along. That is the critical path to historic preservation.

NPNH Commissioner Joshua Laird extended thanks to all and especially to new members for being able to serve on the Committee. We need the impatience of someone like Hembling to keep the energy and momentum going and we need to keep a balance of dedicated and determined people.

Nersesian: Thanks to the new folks for the new energy and new perspective. There is good momentum behind this. Regarding mentors and mentees, new members have been assigned to mentors. I will be interested in hearing how that transition went. We are looking at potentially bringing on new people and I would like to learn from this onboarding process for anyone who wishes to join us. Also, I’d like more feedback from the facilitator and I’d like to keep her and bring her back with the consensus of the Committee. We can discuss some things such as CAM charges at the next meeting.

McLay gave an update on CAM: NPS is close to addressing this, with a meeting about it next week.

Nersesian: There are additional topics we have not even gotten to, such as efficiencies and resiliencies that Ehrler could provide an update about.

Glaser: The work reflects on the whole committee. He is flattered by Nersesian’s compliments. Yes, today’s agenda was very crowded. We struggled to put the agenda together and it was a tough balancing act. As we move closer to the next meeting, if we ask you for new ideas don’t be shy. We build the agenda from the notes in the transcript.

Welch: Thanks the staff and Glaser for all the insight and discussion provided during the meeting. This helps shape the agenda you see here today. Thanks to all who attend the meetings and engage in the discussion. He addressed Hembling: I appreciate where you are at and part of this is getting the park to where it needs to be and while a whole lot of bricks have not moved, the people who need to move those bricks have made seismic shifts. It is up to us to help everyone understand this creature of Congress in order to move this preservation effort forward. Thanks to all the new members that are here and it is wonderful to see you jump in feet first. More is to be gained by sharing thoughts. That is

critical. Thanks also to Smith, who jumped in with both feet – she provided Gerry and me the ability to reflect and confer during the meeting – something that was impossible otherwise.

Mercantante appreciated the work all the staff does. We have to learn to live and work with Federal Regulations. Those buildings will be long gone before any change to those regulations would happen. Our next two meetings will be supercritical: they will identify responses to the business and non-profit RFPs. Residentials will be an “easy solve,” but if we get no responses to business and non-profit, we will have to reconsider how to address those buildings.

Meeting adjourned at 4:07

Meeting minutes approved by consensus via email.

Gerard Glaser and Shawn Welsh, co-chairs

Appendix A: Attendees

Committee: Gerard Glaser, FACA Co-Chair; Linda Cohen; John Ekdahl; James Krauss; Guy Hembling; Tim Hill; Michael Holenstein; Anthony Mercantante; Dan Saunders, NJ SHPO; Dr. Howard Parish; Lynda Rose; Katherine Stevenson; Jeffrey Tyler; Margot Walsh; Michael Walsh; Shawn Welch, FACA Co-Chair; Karolyn Wray.

National Park Service: Joshua Laird, Commissioner, National Parks of New York Harbor (NPNH); Jennifer T. Nersesian, Gateway NRA (GATE) Superintendent and Designated Federal Officer; Marilou Ehrler, GATE architect historian; Pam McLay, GATE Chief of Business Services; Karen Edelman, GATE Business Services; John Warren, GATE External Affairs Officer; Daphne Yun, Public Affairs Officer. Stacie Smith, facilitator, CBI.

Public: Carl Ratchen; Gary Gardner and Susan Sandlass Gardner; Mark Pavliff; Chris Brenner; Jim Walters; others.

APPENDIX B

Written Comments (found online at forthancock21.org in the Comments section)

monmouthhistory@comcast.net 11:29 AM (6 minutes ago) to me

Mr. Warren: I wish the following comments read and recorded into the record on the matter of the Sandlass, Highland Beach, building. Thank you.

Randall Gabrielan,
Appointed Historian, County of Monmouth,
Commissioner, Monmouth County Historical Commission

Highland Beach, or Sandlass's, is important because the public and recreational New Jersey ocean shore began there. Various places now claim, nearly all without merit, that "the Jersey Shore begins here," but for the better part of a century the Jersey Shore began at Sandlass's. Highland Beach was an excursion resort which meant that it not only could but was designed to accommodate day-trippers, the ordinary citizen who could not afford or have the time for an overnight stay. Highland Beach was a resort of the people, by the people and for the people. This contrasts with the shore scenario in New Jersey and much of the country which is regarded as bizarre in most of the world where the ocean shore is usually the domain of the few, by the property owners and for the exclusionary wealthy.

I am a writer and historian and preserve history through the written word. As I do so I realize that the public in general experiences history through places, their ability to visit history and see history firsthand. I also work to encourage heritage tourism and promote preservation because I know the considerable value our built environment contributes to our quality of life and the ability of the public to recognize and appreciate that history. This is why Sandlass's should be saved and utilized to promote history. The challenges to do so are daunting, but those committed to making it happen deserve the opportunity to do so.