

Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
August 2, 2013

The Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Committee, chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), held its fifth meeting on August 2, 2013.

Summary of Decisions

1. *The Committee unanimously agreed to pass the recommendations of the Historical Context Working group on to the NPS for consideration and use in other park management activities.*
2. *The Committee unanimously adopted additional recommendations based on work done by the Historical Context Working Group.*
3. *The Committee unanimously approved the Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI), as revised at the meeting, subject to editorial changes made by the Co-Chairs, and instructed the Co-Chairs to transmit the final version to the Park.*

Welcome and Opening of Meeting

Suzanne McCarthy, Acting Superintendent, Gateway National Recreation Area, and Acting DFO, opened the meeting at 9:28 a.m. and welcomed everyone. Gerry Glaser, Co-Chair of the Committee, welcomed the Committee and members of the public. The Committee adjusted the meeting agenda based on the delay in starting the meeting opening due to the new venue and adjustments to the sound system based on the acoustics of the room. Robert Fisher, facilitator, provided an overview of the agenda for the day. Committee members introduced themselves.

Historical Context Working Group

Shawn Welch presented work done by the Historical Context Working Group. The Working Group reviewed the military history of Fort Hancock underpinning the designation as a historic district. The Working Group proposed six recommendations to the Committee aimed at giving the Historic Landmark designation more prominence within the Sandy Hook Unit and bringing the Historic Landmark designation and its significance.

The purpose of the historic designations is to articulate the historic status of the buildings to the public, as well as Congress, the NPS and its partners. The Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Grounds were designated a historic district in 1980, and a National Historic Landmark District encompassing the entire Sandy Hook Unit in 1982. Shawn noted that Dan Saunders, who was not able to attend the meeting, could provide more information.

The discussions after the presentation the Committee included the following:

- A National Landmark is not necessarily over a Historic District and although they are evaluated differently, the protections are essentially the same. **(CHECK SHAWN WELCH NOTE)**
- Signs identifying the National Historic Landmark District could increase visitor awareness and change their perception of Sandy Hook.
- The National Historic District nested within the National Historic Landmark District should be on Park maps.
- An effort to identify the National Historic Landmark District could bring an increase in visitation.
- Partnering with the Monmouth County Historical Association and Commission through events, including the Weekend in Old Monmouth, could enhance marketing efforts.
- A clear aerial map identifying the Historic District and the National Landmark District should be developed.
- Reach out to Brian Williams to suggest an audio tour or a visit to Sandy Hook to bring attention to the Historic Landmark District.

The suggestion also was made to create a museum of artifacts and display artifacts collected from Sandy Hook at Fort Hancock. Suzanne McCarthy explained the collections need to be maintained in a climate controlled environment which the Park will set up on Staten Island and rotating collections could be available at Sandy Hook.

The Committee reviewed the Historical Context Working Group's proposed recommendations and changed the first sentence of the 6th recommendation. The Committee unanimously agreed to pass the following recommendations from the Historical Context Working group on to the NPS for consideration and use in other park management activities:

1. The Committee and NPS should emphasize the Fort Hancock National Historic Landmark with the Sandy Hook Unit in common NPS public documentation and maps for clarity --
 - Apply the Fort Hancock National Historic Landmark designation to frame the greater Sandy Hook Unit
 - Apply the Historic District designation to frame the "main post" section of Fort Hancock as a subset of the greater "Fort Hancock National Landmark and Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area"
 - Emphasize Fort Hancock Historic District (FHHD) specifically as a "small town" that supported the overall installation (the "Landmark") and that it offers the same "life support, education, cultural and recreation opportunities" to a renewed public presence as it did during its service to the Army.
2. The Committee should reflect the Historic Landmark and Historic District designations in all future products (such as the REFI) to highlight the high significance (top 3% of Historic Register Sites) and importance of preservation and reuse, highlighting how the "District" is a subset of and supports the larger "Landmark" and garners its importance from the overall "Landmark" designation.
3. NPS should ensure both the National Historic District and the National Historic Landmark designations are correctly nested and identified on all maps, documents and signs describing Sandy Hook.
 - NPS create a brochure to synthesize the history of Sandy Hook and the Historic Landmark (Fort Hancock) and develop a plan for a broad dissemination to inform the public of the rich history so contained and legal protection mandates
4. NPS should ensure the General Management Plan (GMP) fully describes and ascribes the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Landmark status to the entirety of the Sandy Hook Unit.
5. The NPS should identify the significance of the Historic Landmark status when building and presenting President's Budget justification material for congress for one time capital investment in restoration of historic structures within the Committee's purview.
6. NPS should facilitate an appropriate museum or interpretive facility or capabilities within the Fort Hancock Historic District (FHHD) that supports the original intent of the enabling legislation (interpretation of Sandy Hook's history) and the intent of the former Army/NPS facility on main post Fort Hancock (i.e., FHHD). This will provide:
 - A resource to Partners that are re-using selected main post buildings
 - A physically accessible source of information for Partners and the Public that is greater than "sign post level" detail related to the history of the greater Fort Hancock (the Historic District and Landmark) and other key facets of the Sandy Hook peninsula.
 - The ability for the Partners and the Public to see rare historic artifacts and documents directly related to the history of the Sandy Hook peninsula within the Fort Hancock/Sandy Hook boundaries
 - Provisioning of a small gift shop within the Museum, similar to the previous museum gift shop run by Eastern National, will further support partners, the public and historic interpretation.

The Committee also unanimously agreed to the following recommendations:

- The Committee and the NPS should clearly recognize the national register designations -- Fort Hancock Sandy Hook Proving Ground Historic District (the town) and The Fort Hancock Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Landmark (all of Sandy Hook) -- in the RFEI and provide links to detailed information on the Committee's website.
- The Committee shall return to the full set of recommendations from the [Historical Context] Working Group (see above) to consider their application in each step of carrying out the Committee's responsibilities.
- The Committee recommends that the NPS take immediate actions to make the local community aware of the landmark designation and the importance of them (e.g. entry and exit signs).
- The Committee recommends that the NPS partner with the Monmouth County Historical Association and Commission to enhance the Committee's marketing efforts.
- The Committee recommends NPS create a map clearly showing the District and the Landmark in relation to the whole of Sandy Hook and Gateway NRA and post that map on the Committee's website. (See for example the map in slides 6 or 9 of the August 2, 2013 Historical Context working group presentation to the Advisory Committee).

Draft RFEI (Request for Expressions of Interest)

Copies of the current draft RFEI and a one page, double-sided synopsis of the RFEI referred to as the "tearsheet" were distributed. Gerry Glaser summarized the current draft, and the changes made since the June meeting in. The tearsheet will be distributed to the public and contains links, including a QR code, to the RFEI website. Interested persons will find the full RFEI document on the website which includes detailed instructions on submitting a proposal.

Gerry explained the intention of the RFEI as drafted is to invite all individuals, organizations, and governmental agencies to submit responses for use of any one or all buildings identified in the RFEI. The current RFEI draft provides additions may be considered by the NPS although not new buildings. Some committee members raised the possibility of allowing new construction because new development will be required to subsidize rehabilitation of the old buildings. John Reynolds reminded the Committee that the RFEI is a starting point and it can be reissued if no workable responses are received. Gerry Glaser suggested that the RFEI could allow respondents to consider other structures beyond the thirty-five identified in the RFEI. There are 110 structures within Fort Hancock that could be considered and could include the added availability of docks and waterway access.

Suzanne McCarthy also showed the design for the RFEI brochure. John Reynolds pointed out that the brochure is focused on communication, while the RFEI is focused on identifying the technical steps to respond. Gerry Glaser reminded the Committee that once the RFEI document is finalized, the final text will be incorporated into the brochure so the texts are identically.

The Committee then reviewed and discussed the RFEI line-by-line making changes to the document. During the review, the discussion included the following key points:

- Whether to allow new construction.
- The RFEI is an NPS offering and should reflect the NPS desire to restrict any new construction.
- Many buildings lie vacant at Sandy Hook rehabilitation of these must be prioritized over new construction.
- There is a \$600 million maintenance backlog at the park, and \$20 billion NPS-wide.
- New construction goes against the prevailing approach that no new facilities may be constructed before the existing backlog is controlled.
- Although development projects usually are met with community opposition, putting out the RFEI without new buildings and requiring the Committee to start over is inefficient.

- The neighboring community of Highlands is strongly opposed to any new construction. New construction will yield no support from the local community.
- A portion of the audience for this RFEI will look at the document only once which could be lost if the Committee has to republish the RFEI.
- Allowing the construction of ancillary structures is an option.
- Public support is critical to the success of this effort.

Following the discussion, the Committee initially determined to prohibit the construction of new primary structures, and allow new ancillary structures.

Public Comment

Anne Lutkenhouse, Army Ground Forces Association (AGFA), stated Fort Hancock is a unique venue that attracts people to the park. The enabling legislation recognized the military significance of the area and there is an opportunity for military history interpretation here. People can see cultural life and history as well as the batteries that defended the harbor. She recommended the Committee look for business, industry and companies that would thrive here and could use the location as a marketing tool. Those organizations will come here for a reason and need to be made to fit it. The community also has many ideas that should be embraced. These buildings would have fallen to pieces if they were constructed in any other era and they can be brought back to life within a short period of time.

April Mims, National Park Conservation Association (NPCA), complimented the Committee for the work that went into the RFEI and expects there will be more work to do. The Committee can use NPCA as a resource and NPCA can help get the message out to the public. NPCA support is critical to address potential resistance.

Betsey Barrett, Sandy Hook Foundation, commended the Committee for working together. She stated that the NPS should not allow new buildings and avoid discussion about ancillary structures because the public may never understand what that means. The park must be careful to temper any talk of new structures because that will result in headlines that the park is allowing new structures.

Finalizing the RFEI

Following public comment, the Committee revisited whether new or ancillary structures should be permitted in the RFEI. Some Committee members expressed concerns that allowing ancillary structures would invite litigation. Other Committee members urged the Committee to move forward with its best plan with the assumption that it might be sued and discussion of lawsuits is premature because lawsuits require a flaw in the public process to give a citizen standing to bring a lawsuit.

The Committee unanimously approved the Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) as modified at the August 2, 2013 Advisory Committee meeting, and with such non-substantive, editorial changes as Gerry Glaser, Co-Chair, determines are appropriate. (See the Committee website for both the version distributed at the meeting and the final version as submitted to the NPS).

The Committee also unanimously adopted the following recommendations pertaining to the RFEI --

- The Advisory Committee recommends (and expects) the RFEI be ready for public release by September 20, 2013, the Advisory Committee's next scheduled meeting date.
- The Advisory Committee also recommends (and requests) that the NPS periodically inform the Advisory Committee of the status of the RFEI review throughout the NPS approval process.

Community Outreach Working Group

John Ekdahl reviewed the Community Outreach Working Group's progress to date, and its impact on the draft RFEI. He spoke about modeling the Committee's marketing strategy after Fort Monmouth and the Working Group suggested targeting larger corporations and developers. The Committee also discussed a possible visit to Fort Monmouth, and looking at some of the work completed at the site by K. Hovnanian.

Gerry Glaser suggested the Committee leverage the assistance offered by the NPCA and utilize their large grassroots membership to drive interest. John Reynolds suggested networking with Alex Brasch who has media contacts in New York.

The Committee established a timeline for finalizing the RFEI. Suzanne McCarthy stated she would need between six and eight weeks to have the document approved at all levels of the NPS. The Park will aim to have the RFEI ready for distribution by the next meeting on September 20th.

For the next meeting, the Community Outreach Working Group will develop recommendations on how to advertise the RFEI and asking for Congressional support. The outreach efforts to take place before and after launch will be determined at the Committee's September 20th meeting.

Gateway N.R.A. General Management Plan Update

Suzanne McCarthy provided a brief update on the Gateway N.R.A. General Management Plan. The comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement opened on the same day as the meeting and will close on October 2nd. Open houses will be held at the Chapel at Sandy Hook on August 21st and September 12th. The Park's preferred alternative in the General Management Plan is Option B, discovering Gateway.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on September 20th at the Chapel at Sandy Hook. Suzanne McCarthy emphasized the importance of this Committee's work to the park, the local community, and in each option of the Park's General Management Plan.

Suzanne McCarthy thanked Committee members and the public and adjourned the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

Attachments

- A. List of Attendees**
- B. List of Materials Distributed to the Committee**
- C. Action Items and Working Groups**

Meeting Summary approved by Gerard Glaser, Co-Chair

Signature: _____

Date: _____

**Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Commission
Meeting #5 – August 2, 2013
Attendance**

Committee Members:

Lillian Burry
Linda Cohen
John Ekdahl
Mary Eileen Fouratt
Gerry Glaser (co-chair)
Tim Hill

Arthur Imperatore
Guy Hembling
Michael Holenstein
Frank Nolan
Howard Parish
John Reynolds (co-chair)

Margot Walsh
Shawn Welch
Bill Wilby
Karolyn Wray

National Park Service

Alissa Askew
Karen Edelman
Brian Feeney

Suzanne McCarthy
Pam McLay
Robert Revzin

Robert Vohden
Daphne Yun

DOI:

Robert Fisher, Facilitator

Public:

Betsy Barrett, James Krause, Anne Lutkenhouse, April Mims, Jim Wassel

**Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Commission
Meeting #5 – August 2, 2013
List of Materials Distributed to the Committee**

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Presentation titled “A Public Unaware: Leveraging Historic Importance to preserve and reuse Fort Hancock” dated August 2, 2013 prepared by the Historical Context Working Group.
3. Draft Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) prepared by the RFEI Working Group
4. RFEI Brochure prepared by NPS staff
5. RFEI Tear sheet prepared by NPS staff
6. Proposed Marketing Strategy prepared by NPS staff

**Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Commission
Meeting #5 – August 2, 2013
Action Items and Working Groups**

<u>TASK</u>	<u>WHO IS INVOLVED</u>	<u>STATUS</u>	<u>DEADLINE</u>
1. Send draft Action Item List to the Committee	Facilitators	Done	August 5 th
2. Post presentation materials from August meeting to Committee website	Park Staff	Pending	TBD
3. RFEI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Send Landmark / Historic District additions & comments to Gerry Glaser ▪ Send editorial comments to Gerry Glaser ▪ Make non-substantive, editorial changes to the RFEI approved by the Committee at the meeting and submit with the 2-page tear-sheet to NPS on behalf of the Committee 	Shawn Welch Committee Gerry Glaser	Done	August 7 th August 15 th
4. Finalize Action item List	Facilitators	Pending comments	August 9 th
5. Committee members provide comments on draft Summary for June Meeting (#4)	Committee	Pending	August 9 th
6. Finalize summaries for meetings #3 and #4 and post to Committee website	Facilitators	Pending	August 15 th
7. Outreach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organize list of potential recipients for the final RFEI ▪ Develop list of outreach recommendations and suggestions for distributing the final RFEI and engaging the public 	Community Outreach / Communication Working Group	Pending	September 21 st (Distribute proposal to Committee one week before the next meeting if possible)
8. Working Group meetings / conf calls (see below for a list of the Working Groups)	Working Group members, Park Staff, Facilitators	Pending	As Needed
9. Develop proposed Agenda for the next meeting	Co-Chairs, Park Staff Facilitators	Pending	One week prior to the next meeting
10. Send proposed meeting #6 Agenda and meeting materials to the Committee	Facilitators	Pending	At least one week prior to next Committee meeting
11. Draft Meeting Summary #5 and Send to the Committee for Review	Park Staff Facilitators	Pending	At least one week prior to next Committee meeting
12. Explore Park signage or plaque to highlight Landmark / Historic District status	Park	Pending	TBD

Fort Hancock 21st Century Advisory Commission
Working Groups
(As of May 16, 2013)

COMMUNITY OUTREACH / COMMUNICATION Working Group *(established at the March 12, 2013 meeting)*

Charge: (1) Develop a community outreach and communication plan; (2) Prepare draft announcements and other materials for the Co-Chairs and Committee

Coordinator: John Ekdahl

Committee Members: Lillian Burry, Linda Cohen, George Conway, John Ekdahl, Mary Eileen Fourett, Tim Hill, Lynda Rose, and Karolyn Wray

Staff: Daphne Yun

FLOOD INSURANCE+ EXAMPLES Working Group *(established at the March 12, 2013 meeting)*

Charge: Look at other NPS sites and identify resources and information

Coordinator: Tim Hill

Committee Members: George Conway, Tim Hill, Michael Holenstein, and Dan Saunders

Staff: Dave Emmerson

HISTORICAL CONTEXT Working Group *(established at the May 16, 2013 meeting)*

Charge: (1) Review military history and context at Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook and present to the Committee; (2) Develop proposals for integrating the mission and reuse of military facilities into reuse plans for Fort Hancock and the Park's interpretation at Sandy Hook

Coordinator: Shawn Welch

Committee Members: Mary Eileen Fourett, Guy Hembling, Tim Hill, Michael Holenstein, Howard Parish, Lynda Rose, Dan Saunders, and Shawn Welch

Staff: Dave Emmerson and Pete McCarthy

REAL PROPERTY COSTING Working Group *(established at the March 12, 2013 meeting)*

Charge: Support working groups and subcommittees with analysis and options

Coordinator: Shawn Welch

Committee Members: Guy Hembling, Michael Holenstein, and Shawn Welch

Staff: Dave Emmerson and Pete McCarthy

REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST (RFEI) Working Group *(established at the May 16, 2013 meeting)*

Charge: (1) Provide information to the Committee on RFEI's and ways to move forward with the RFEI; (2) Prepare a draft RFEI for the Committee to review and discuss at the June 28, 2013 meeting

Coordinator: Gerard Glaser

Committee Members: Linda Cohen, Gerard Glaser, Arthur Imperatore, Jr, John Reynolds, Shawn Welch, and Karolyn Wray

Staff: Robert Fisher and Pam McLay