

CONFIDENTIAL ROUGHLY EDITED REALTIME FILE
Compliments of HRICART.com

This file was created in real time by a Human Realtime Captioner for the purpose of communication access. It is not a certified legal transcript and may not be entirely verbatim. It is intended for use by the consumer only as notes of the proceedings. A consumer should check with the presenter for any clarification of the presentation.

(Captioner and meeting host attempting to work out captioning for Zoom.)

>> I think we'll need to wait a minute or two until we start, Janis, to work out this last little bit.

>> Computerized Announcer: Recording in progress.

Jen Nersesian: Welcome to Matt Montekio from Congressman Pallone's office today as well. Thank you for joining us today to take the next step forward in our leasing program at Fort Hancock in Gateway National Recreation Area.

We've got some new, new designs to share with you today, some new advancements since our last meeting, and our working group has some thoughts and recommendations to share as well in their next step forward in that process.

So we are looking forward into diving into all of this with all of you, and with that, we'll kick things off with the Pledge of Allegiance. Do we have the flag?

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you. And we don't have Gerry on, but Shawn is our co- chair. Would you like to say anything?

>> Shawn Welch: Well, it's great to get everybody back together again; it's been a few months. And there's a boatload of great information that we're all going to be hear today.

We're also going to be on the hook to make some recommendations, fellow committee members, so we need to have our thinking caps on, because we're going to get a lot of great info and we need to give the Park Service some feedback.

So, with that, Jen, let's roll.

>> Jen Nersesian: All right --

>> Bennett Brooks: Let me say my good morning to everybody; Bennett Brooks with the Consensus Building Institute -- I should know the name of my organization -- I'm joined today by Simenesh Semine, helping us on all the tech pieces here; and so if anyone has any questions, any problems, please let her know, and she will jump on that and try to get them straightened out. So, thank you all.

As Shawn just said, it has been a busy few months since we saw you all, and this really is an important opportunity to catch you all up with progress on different fronts, and of course most importantly hear your thoughts.

Just to tell us about our agenda for today, we will really be focusing in, dive right into the leasing updates in just a minute, and different things.

We will spend some time hearing from Stillman Development International. They've been doing the () project, interested on there and exploring. So we'll get caught up on that and we'll have an opportunity to (indiscernible), as well as lots of others we want to catch you up on as well. And Jen and Karen will be sharing that information.

We will go, for members of the public that are here, we will have public comment at 11:00. We have set a half- hour for that, and we'll see how much of that we need, but we want to make sure we're hearing from folks who have opinions that they want to share, because it's really important for the committee to hear that.

Following public comment, we will shift to focus on the leasing working group that has been meeting for remarkably a year plus, and they have had lots of good informative conversations, have heard lots of important feedback from them.

They are still working, meeting, they're not done. Sorry, working group members if you thought you were done.

We want to share the feedback we've been getting because it's important for you all and the conversations you need to have.

Towards the back end of our meeting today, we'll hear some general park updates from Jen, we'll have an opportunity for kind of around- the- table feedback from our committee members, and then we'll talk about next steps.

As Shawn said, this is a meeting where it would likely be very helpful and important to get whatever kind of recommendations make sense to you all, to Jen and her team as they move forward.

So recognize lots of things are in play, but this is an important conversation.

So with that, let's go to the next slide.

I should note, by the way, we'll have a break at 10:50 before we go to public comment, so if anyone needs to make a phone call or anything, that would be the time to do that and we will adjourn at 1:00.

Next slide, please.

There we go. Just a few discussion protocols for committee members.

First of all, just contribute. We need to hear your perspectives. It's really important to the National Park Service team. As you do so, please be as focused in your comments as you can so we can hear from everybody. Ask questions of one another. To the extent you're developing recommendations, try to integrate and come up with recommendations that obviously reflect the thinking across the committee.

To contribute to the discussion, if you just raise your virtual hand, which you should see at the bottom of your screen, there's a hand up, so just click on that; if for whatever reason that does not work, just throw into the chat that you have a comment or you can ask yourself to be taken off mute and let us know.

To committee members, if you can keep your cameras on, I would greatly appreciate it. I realize that's not a situation where not everybody can do that but it would feel like much more of a meeting and please put yourself on mute unless you're contributing.

For members of the public, again, at 11:00 we will have a public comment session. Before we answer questions that come up, you can feel free to use the Q&A function that's available in the Zoom webinar and again, if you put your cursor at the bottom of your screen, you'll see it at the middle right.

To the extent that it's a question that the Park Service staff can address today; if not, we'll just capture the question and try to provide an answer after the case.

At 11:00 we'll go to public comment and talk about that.

I notice one person signed up in advance, and then we'll open it up to others.

Please know, members of the public, if public is speaking is not your thinking, we invite you to commit emails to Daphne. So we have a chance to hear your thoughts.

Let me just pause and see if there's any questions of anybody.

One last thing I want to note is we are having live captioning, and that will be something we will have available at all committee meetings going forward. That is a Park Service requirement, so you should anticipate that, and hope that is ().

So Jen, I'm going to hand it off to you and Karen to talk to us and lead the conversation.

>> Jen Nersesian: Great; thanks. And we have a couple of individual projects that we want do a deep dive into for our recent updates. And then at the end, we'll go through the full roster of other updates related to our program.

We'll start with the Stillman project, and we'll have them present, but I just want to tee this up and remind everyone of where we are in the process.

I won't go back to the beginning of the committee early, but we'll start in 2020 when we received a proposal from Stillman Development International for all of the rest, essentially the available buildings on our leasing RFP.

And we debuted this at the February 2020 Advisory Committee meeting, and everybody knows what happened shortly after that. In March of 2020, we found ourselves in the thicket of the pandemic; everything sort of turned on its head.

At the same time we also heard from Congressman Pallone and a number of environmental groups who voiced opposition or expressed concerns around things like residential use, ecological impacts, concerns about privatization and other issues.

We in the Park Service were also unsure whether the density could be accommodated in these houses, given the historic standards we had to meet.

So given all of this, we developed a phased process for doing this due diligence work on the project. And earlier this year signed a general agreement with the Stillman group. It's similar to our letters of intent, but with an outline of a phased process, so we could take very deliberate steps at looking at what was feasible on a smaller scale before we jumped into the whole project.

So we started this first phase of pilot design earlier this year.

At the same time, the committee formed a working group made up of representatives of several of the groups who voiced interest or concerns over the proposal, so that we could better understand the concerns and work together on any strategies to address that.

We'll also hear some of the working group's ideas later in the meeting as I mentioned before; but right now we have the Stillman group's pilot design for buildings 7 and 12.

And as we took a look at these, there are a few things I want you to think about this.

As I mentioned, we have questions about whether this could be done and still meet the standards for historic preservation. In seeing these design sets, I think from our perspective in the Park Service, we think they did a very thoughtful treatment in terms of the preservation of the structures and meeting standards. But we of course are very interested in your feedback and perspective on this.

And as we address that issue, we also need to be thinking about what are the next steps in this process, and I think when we first started thinking about the phased approach, we thought we could see what could be done with two units and extrapolate that over the rest of the buildings to determine whether the whole project could move forward.

But I think we're seeing that the reality is probably a little bit more complicated than that.

So from a business model perspective, given the varying rate of deterioration on all the buildings, that the Stillman group really needs to get in and do a thorough condition assessment on other structures to understand what level of investment is going to be required to recap them, and what the implications are from that on the entire business model, the financial model in particular.

And at the same time, as it informs that business model, I also want to update you that we did meet with the Stillman group in Middletown Township to start a discussion about affordable housing possibility. I know this has long been a recommendation of the committee and something we've heard interest in from the public in trying to create more access to these opportunities for different income brackets and in segments of the population.

So this is a very different business model that would require subsidies and partnerships, and we still have work to do chasing down leads to see if this is even feasible.

We'll come back to all of this after you see the presentation and have a further discussion, but I just wanted to set the stage by reminding everybody what led up to today and get you thinking about what steps might be as we look at the design.

So with that, I want to thank the Stillman group for joining us and hand it over to them to walk through buildings 7 and 12 and their process to date.

>> Roy Stillman: Thank you, Jen. This is Roy Stillman, and as general has articulated, the purpose of our work so far has been to examine the buildings from a perspective of existing conditions, and to compare those conditions with overall preservation standards and goals and to set forth an effort at an understanding or a set of rules of engagement that would be on a template basis for the first two buildings, and subsequently extended to the remaining buildings.

The idea is that to pick two representative structures, to examine them and to recommend means and methods and a philosophy by which we would undertake the preservation and restoration tasks of the buildings, and to give visibility to people as to what the intended designs would encompass.

In an effort to accomplish those goals, we have assembled a preservation team, which includes a specialty architectural firm and a specialty structural engineering firm, each dedicating their practices to preservation and restoration of older structures.

I would need to emphasize that portion of Jen's introduction, which discusses ongoing deterioration of the property. We've been through -- since engaging, we've been through a few winters, we've got another one coming at us, and of course nothing good happens in winter when you have buildings that are open as these are.

That being said, let's begin. We have here a selected set of slides. We produced well over a hundred slides to begin with, and we have selected some to facilitate the sort of expedited understanding of what it is that we're -- what we've tried to accomplish.

So we have, in terms of typology, we have taken building 7, which is a lieutenant's quarters, and we had taken building 12, which is the commander's quarters. Of course, the commander's building is unique, there's one of them. There are lieutenants, captains and commander.

We feel that we've taken a representative sampling of the buildings to show the preservation intent and the theory.

We began by a historical study of the buildings as they were originally produced in the late 1800s, I believe these are 1895 through about 1910.

And we have good historical records of original layout materials, and other design characteristics, and it's been very interesting to be able to compare those original designs and materials and other elements to existing conditions to show areas of subsequent intervention.

We also have a photographic survey of the general condition of the buildings. The most salient deterioration is exterior envelope deterioration, which causes the opportunity for interior deterioration, and we have noticed,

couldn't help but notice that since beginning this project, there's been an acceleration of exterior deterioration, which will eventually in our view be a dividing line of areas of responsibility between interior and exterior as between NPS and ourselves.

I could characterize the interior's physical state of the buildings as generally poor, and accelerating in a negative direction, by virtue mostly of water infiltration and the freeze- and- fall cycle.

A key study is the exterior character defining features, which is really the reason why we all care about these buildings and why they have been designated by preservation authorities as structures of significance and national patrimony.

As is typical of this period, you have a neo- Colonial style of the late 1800s, you have extensive use of both brick with whitewater joints. You have as I say neo- Colonial style, fieldstone foundation, blue stone, and stone curbs and lintels.

The porches, stoops and balustrades, Tuscan columns are defining characteristics, as are the decorative cornices, and the color scheme, the green on buff, is a very gracious perspective of the sea, offering peace and respite to the inhabitants, and opportunity to breathe the fresh air and experience nature. These are the defining characteristics or the design intent of the building, stylized with a neo- Colonial and neo- Tuscan style.

We have the original drawings of certain fenestrations, and openings and we can see that there have been subsequent interventions. For example, on the right we see the design of the front door, and you can see from that photograph just before how it has changed. There has been a fire in one of the buildings and certainly in the over 100 years of lifespan there have been modifications on the interior, and so in working with the reviewing authorities, we would make an effort where possible to restore based upon existing drawings such conditions on the exterior.

The exterior is really the defining force from a design perspective of what these buildings represent in patrimony.

The roofs were originally conceived in slate and through subsequent intervention have become asphalt shingle. Now on -- the windows are frequently boarded over, missing. They are in need of total replacement and upgrade.

The roofs are the single most important area of deterioration, and require urgent intervention to stabilize the conditions on the inside of the buildings.

Additional changes have been sheet metal cornices going into other materials, subsequent design additions were garages in the 1940s, roofs have been destroyed and openings on the garages for -- by virtue of the weather and lack of maintenance.

Interior defining features are principally the staircases. Of key importance, they occupy a central physical position in the structures. They are ranging in the state of physical existence from fair to beyond poor, so that you actually cannot safely traverse. As you'll see from our preservation plan before, later rather, and our design layouts, we intend to preserve and cherish these stairs and keep them in their original positions. This would be the subject of an extensive structural rehabilitation and restoration in the original design motif.

Many of the ceilings are plaster on wood lath, tin as was common in the period, and flappered at the exterior.

You'll see from preservation standards later that certain changes would be made, sheetrock instead of plaster, for example.

Here we have evidence on the interior of subsequent intervention in the form of hexagonal floor tile, frequently encountered in bathrooms, which is not strictly original wood flooring and would be central to the restoration of the properties.

Likewise, you see original door designs and possibly an example here on the top left of a subsequent intervention. You can see a transom is missing, but panel structures are the same. Here you have a good example of a front door, although it does not appear to have the original glass in the epicenter.

() work on the interior has largely been replaced, and with non- original design, and we can establish that by

comparing existing conditions to drawings as well as what was commonly done at the time.

Kitchen cabinetry, interestingly, is old but not original. And kitchens would be largely replaced and modernized, as you will see later in the design layouts.

Fireplaces are a critical piece of the historic fabric, although there have been interventions on mantel pieces, that all fireplaces would be preserved in place with an effort to have a historically accurate surroundings.

Radiators are original although they will be removed because of the requirements of a modern heating system.

Briefly, landscape- defining features are the general reason why we all care so much about this. It's the beautiful experience of peace and tranquility that people get from looking out of a window to the sea and seeing open space.

The intervention principles, we start with the generally accepted standards that the Secretary of the Interior has set forth. There are ten key standards, and we have made every effort from the next slide, which is among the most important slides that you should kindly reflect upon -- I'll call it the rules of engagement -- to integrate our work within the confines of the Secretary's standards of how to approach a project like this.

The proposed intervention principles which will be on the next slide is essential to focus on, and it varies from areas that we would restore, retain and rebuild, which are those key, key defining characteristic, fireplaces, interior doors, exterior structure view, and maintaining the original use, which is residential occupancy.

Then there are -- let's please stay with that. There's also replace in-kind, replace and rehabilitate, and sometimes remove, depending on the importance and current function of various items.

In our opinion, we have here a principled set of intervention standards that are appropriate in keeping with the Secretary's guidelines and in keeping with the level of importance of the project.

Certainly it involves additional expense, but it is the heart and soul of these buildings that are going to be maintained by safe adherence to these standards. I call this the rules of engagement.

Please continue.

We have reviewed many, many different approaches to the occupancy of these buildings, balancing various interests. The interests are maximizing benefit, commercial optimization, maintaining integrity to the buildings, and adequate add enjoyable interior design.

So we looked at many schemes, ranging from three residential units per building, four residential units per building, five residential units per building, and two theories on each of those. So we looked at a total of six schemes on how to schematically design the interior layout of these buildings.

We feel that the best balance of the various components is achieved with other scheme B1 or scheme C1, depending on the building, and also a mix among buildings.

You'll see as we continue looking at the successive slides that the layouts are modest. You have from the -- from the next slides, you'll see that room sizes are modest, overall unit sizes are modest. This would not be considered luxury housing. This would be considered faithfully restored housing that is of a modest quantity and scale, and laid out and designed to maximize natural features such as windows, views, while maintaining various essential elements of preservation, most notably the central staircases.

We have done that study across both buildings and feel that we have representative samplings of also trying to minimize waste in terms of excessive circulation space, and maximize net occupancy levels.

I'd like to take a quick digression and pick up what Jen mentioned, which was our discussion on affordable housing, veterans' housing, and other similar concepts, and we have expressed our viewpoint that all things being equal, we express a preference to affordable housing, and arms wide open to the concept, although we must recognize from an economic perspective that there is a () impact and there would be a concomitant requirement of subsidy, whether in the form of occupancy costs, rental subsidies, or other, in order to achieve that.

But we are wide open to the discussion of expanding the concept of public good, whether it be for veterans, for

economic affordable housing characteristics, or other segments of the population that have a need.

Please continue. I think we can scroll through the building 12 schemes, because it's similar thoughts to building 7, although the specific layouts are a little different, because building 12, having been the commander's residence, is the largest of the buildings and would have slightly larger scale, too.

That being said, those were our goals in undertaking this work. It was done in conjunction with the preservation architects, preservation structural engineer, our review of the premises, our consultation with NPS, and a good amount of effort on our part to produce a theory which is responsive to requirements of the task.

And I do believe that's the extent of our selected slide presentation.

>> Bennett Brooks: Great; thank you. That was fantastic and very informative. And Jen, I think I want to hand it back to you, just to do a little bit on sort of where we're heading next, just so people understand the process and then we'll open it up to committee questions.

>> Jen Nersesian: Great; thank you. And thank you, Roy, for this presentation. And again, I want to reiterate that from our perspective in the National Park Service, what a thoughtful and historically sensitive treatment that we thought this was.

And I know you just got to see glimpses of the floor plans, and samples of the B1 versus B2, C1 versus C2, and those number- two plans had probably a greater level of historic impact on the features in the buildings.

But those designs that were highlighted as were probably the most feasible, you know, again, I think are very thoughtful treatments.

I'll also say that those, that B versus C design, the primary difference is the number of units, four units versus five units. This is something that as the committee discusses this, it would be useful to have feedback on.

I'll say that as we've discussed it internally in the Park Service, in the end, four units versus five units, in thinking about the impacts for us, I don't know that there's that much of a meaningful difference. They both work probably in terms of the historic standards, understanding we still have tax credits, SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), other partners we need to engage in this conversation, but also with our own internal historic expertise.

And given that, we were looking at trying to think through density, numbers of people, greater impact with more people, and in the end, the number of people in four larger apartments versus five slightly smaller apartments, the number of people that can live in there may not be that different.

So I ask the committee to consider the scheme B versus scheme C in that context.

I also again want to think about next steps, and remind everybody that this was our phase 1, doing designs on two buildings, to determine if we had enough to go on here to move on to the rest of the buildings.

And I want to frame this in terms of, we are nowhere near signing a lease. There's a lot of work to be done here.

Moving on to the rest of the buildings does not mean the project's a go, that we're signing these tomorrow. It means that we start the process of doing condition assessments on the rest of the buildings, understanding what level of investment is going to be needed, and continue along the line of doing our due diligence work, looking at the affordable housing models.

I'm very happy Roy expressed his openness and preference for that type of model, and I think that that kind of use is something we would all like to see.

But the bottom line is, it has to be economically feasible. There has to be some way to make the dollars work on that kind of model.

Again, we have more work to do there in seeing what is possible.

So moving on to the next phase would be furthering our work on those fronts, and that's something I would ask

the committee to think about and discuss as well.

And as we get into the next session with the working group, we can talk about how to address some of those concerns, or integrate their thinking into this process as well.

With that, I think we'll open it up for people's reactions, questions, and any thoughts on moving forward to some next steps.

>> Bennett Brooks: Great; thank you, Jen. And again, thank you, Roy, for the presentation.

We've got about a half- hour for questions and discussion right now from the committee. And so let's start with just questions that you might have. I think anything in the presentation that you want to understand better.

I will just note I am having Internet issues but at the moment I can see you all, it's all good; but for some reason if that changes, Daphne or someone track the members if I can't see them.

Members, if you would raise a virtual hand; if you put your cursor towards the bottom of the screen you will see a raise hand function and see what you have, and we'll quickly move from any questions to perspectives that Jen has put on the table.

Jim, why don't you jump in. You're on mute.

>> James Krauss: Two questions for Roy. What is the range of square footage sizes of the one- and two- bedroom apartments?

>> Roy Stillman: I don't recollect the tabulation, but we have dimensions on the drawings and square footages per room where they can be readily calculated. You'll find them to be, as I said, modest.

>> Jen Nersesian: And we'll share those slides with everybody after the meeting as well as post the slides onto our Fort Hancock website.

>> James Krauss: And then second question concerning density. Given your knowledge of the real estate world and apartment leasing and the average number of tenants in a one- bedroom and two- bedroom apartment, could you give us an estimate of what the number of tenants would be if, say, at the low end, all of the buildings were developed with the lower number of apartments, say four apartments, and at the higher end if all of them were developed with five apartments?

>> Roy Stillman: I believe that would range from -- not exactly the number, but you'd be in the upper 70s to the mid 80s of number of apartments, depending on whether you have four or five per building.

>> Jim Krauss: Thank you. That is very helpful.

>> Thanks. Assemblyman, why don't you come in.

>> Gary Scharfenberger: Hi, Roy, and I apologize if you answered this question, I had to step away briefly during your presentation. But do you have a timeline for the feasibility analysis when that will be done?

>> Roy Stillman: We are soon to undertake that. What we're looking for at this particular moment is instructions from this collective group and the National Park Service, and what I mean by instructions is that we have produced the presentation and there's even a little bit more that was redacted.

And we are looking for feedback from NPS. And there are a few classes of feedback.

One of them would be density. And another one would be general timeline. I think we're trying to move a little faster than maybe a big organization like the United States government can move.

And then there's also the concept of delineation of financial responsibilities. We have established, Assemblyman, that when we first began, that the project would achieve a newly acceptable return to allow its production.

Since then, there has been physical deterioration, which we are asking the National Park Service to ameliorate. And so there is that other aspect of feedback.

So we want the -- we want to be really in charge of all of the interiors with a slight amount of exterior and the National Park Service to be more involved in the exteriors and other site characteristics.

So that's the third big class of feedback that we need in order to produce a mathematical statement of commercial viability.

But I can say that if those parameters can generally fit into mutually agreeable solutions, then we have a viable project on our hands.

There are plenty of steps, particularly SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), and essentially there's this informal caffer [ph] process, the coastal area for review, that -- it's not specifically called caffer but has all of the bells and whistles of it, and those have time and cost characteristics associated with them.

These are sort of variables that have to go into a mathematical statement as to how viable things are.

But my overall instinct is if everybody is working together in the same spirit, yes, it's a viable project; and yes, we would like to undertake it.

And then the other dimension, the really big dimension is what's going to be the public policy on affordable housing, people with disabilities, veterans, people who need some sort of economic or other programmatic assistance.

And that's relevant, also, in how various decisions get made and the concomitant economic impacts of them.

>> Thank you very much. Thanks.

>> Let's get a couple more folks, Michael Walsh, Shawn and then Tony.

>> Jen Nersesian: And Bennett can I jump into with one other thing too about timeline? I want to be clear, too, that this isn't, we'll move on to the next step and then we'll have a done project to come back to the committee with; that this will continue as we take each incremental step to be a public process. We'll continue to share where we're at through the committee and through these public meetings.

So you'll continually have a chance to weigh in on the topic.

>> Great. Michael Walsh?

>> Michael Walsh: Thank you very much. First thing I want to say is thank you to the Park Service, Jen, and to Roy Stillman, for all the hard work and time effort that's clearly gone into assessing this and looking at the possibilities for this project. First of all, thank you for that good work.

My question is, and Roy has brought this up a couple times, is contribution by the Park Service or by the federal government to support this project monetarily. And obviously this is something that's going to be negotiated, but just want to get a sense of, is it a flat "no"? Is it something to be negotiated for both for the exterior work, and I assume there will be work needed for parking, for example.

There's, while I don't think -- I agree with Roy; there's probably not a big differential between the number of people who would be in the apartments whether it's four or five apartments, so I'm kind of indifferent to that. But it would likely impact the number of vehicles on site. Having 90 people living there, I don't think the vehicle numbers are gigantic, but I just know it's limited in the Fort Hancock area, and I just am wondering if there's likely to be support by the Park Service or federal government to both build out the infrastructure and also contribute to the exterior work needed on some of the buildings.

>> Jen Nersesian: I will take that. And when we put out the RFP (Request for Proposals), we had a notation in there that we were planning on making some investments in the roots, the stabilization work we're currently undertaking.

We had talked about this project for a long time; it's taken inordinately long to get to happen. Over the past year we had contracting issues we were dealing with, that project had gone back out to bid.

I'm happy to say that those bids closed today. So that's a multi-million-dollar investment in some basic stabilization, that we can easily move forward putting into the buildings because it was part of the competitive

opportunity all along ().

Now, further investment by the Park Service would hinge on a few things.

One, finding money somewhere, being able to get money to put into the buildings themselves, which is an ongoing challenge. But then figuring out what we can put in under the current -- with the current proposal, whether it would require -- whether that's allowed under the solicitation.

I think there's a lot of gray area in here because at the point at which the proposal was put in, the buildings were in a certain condition. And they are in far worse condition now a couple of years later, and continuing to deteriorate.

So the proposal that Roy put in was based on the condition the buildings were in at that time. So understanding what kinds of investments that we can fit in there, under the parameters of the competitive solicitation, again, I think there is some negotiation room in understanding what that means.

If we could get some money to be able to do that.

And with each passing day, we are acutely aware of, as these buildings deteriorate further, that it impacts the financial equation, and as Roy alluded to, there's some threshold beyond which this is no longer going to be a feasible project.

So we want to keep moving, and we are looking hard at those financial aspects.

At the same time we are making other investments and I'll cover these later on in the park updates and project updates, in things like utilities that will help support the leasing program, as well as other operations in the park.

>> Thanks, Jen.

>> Thanks.

>> Bennett Brooks: Shawn, and then Tony.

>> Jen Nersesian: Oh; one other thing, if I can jump back in, because Michael had asked about parking as well. And I didn't address that.

Yes, we're also aware that more people will require more parking, and we are very constrained in what we can do in terms of footprints; we're very aware of the environmental impacts, but we will need some more parking.

One thing we've been working on is a traffic study that looks at making Park Shore Drive and then looping around the playground, I think it's McGruder on the other side, making that a one- way loop and using the other lane of traffic for on- street parking.

So that may be a light- touch way to fit in more parking space. Whether that accommodates everything, we need to see the results of the study and figure out what other options there might be, but we are looking at that as well.

>> Bennett Brooks: Shawn, why don't you jump in.

>> Shawn Welch: I'm going to ask Tony to go, and then come back and pick me up.

>> Bennett Brooks: Tony?

>> Anthony Mercantante: Okay, thanks. I think we've made a lot of progress, which is great. A couple of things, the last thing you were just talking about is parking.

So assuming 88 -- 80 residential units, you can figure about 144 parking spaces on average. So I think the two things need to go hand in hand. In order to determine whether three, four, five is the right number of units per building, that needs to be done simultaneously with saying can we realistically provide parking for that number?

Because what you don't want is people to move in there and not have enough parking. Because then, you

know, you get complaints, you're going to get pressure to create more parking, you're going to get illegal parking, you're going to get parking in places that are supposed to be reserved for the park programs and activities, and it will just be a conflict from day one.

So without the adequate number of parking spaces -- and you have to factor in some visitor parking into that as well.

So I don't think we can commit to a density of units without seeing parking accommodations that go along with that because I think they're critical.

The other thing is, one of the things that's going to come up is that if you have X number of residential units, there will be possibly some impact on schools. And the issue with schools will be primarily, not so much the number, because I don't think you will generate the number, but transportation. The school districts are going to be responsible, the school district is going to be responsible to bus students from here. So obviously there's a cost impact to that for them.

If you've been reading the papers, the cost of school busing is exorbitant these days and they're lucky to get enough buses or drivers.

One thing to think about is whether there's a possibility of creating some sort of user fee or some sort of host fee for the local school district to at least offset their cost for potential school busing in the future.

That's it. Thanks.

>> Bennett Brooks: Thanks. Shawn, jump in.

>> Shawn Welch: Yes, first, Roy, awesome. Thank you for sticking with this. I feel your passion. I can see it in your face. I can hear it in your voice, the same with your team. The briefing is fantastic, and it gives me a very good idea of where you're going. And in general, I applaud it.

For me personally, it's about paying the bill, and you're the guy who's paying the bill. And sometimes I wonder if everybody understands that, that at the end of the day, the bill's got to get paid.

The Park Service is going to help you as much as they can, but just general information for everybody: The entire Park Service budget would not fund the operations of either Fort Benning, Fort Hood or Fort Bragg. Keep that in mind; the whole Park Service cannot operate one of those three major installations.

So money-wise they don't have it. Authority-wise they don't have it. Skill-set-wise they don't have it. Do not have an expectation that they will come in here with the power of the U.S. Army to do this kind of work.

I want to tamp that back because there's some people who seem to think the Park Service can turn miracles. Don't.

However, what this group has done, Gateway, with Jen, Amy, Pete, the rest of the team, Patti, is fantastic with the set of tools they have in their toolboxes. So that's a general for everybody.

Two thoughts for you. I heard you say the radiators, which are vintage, turn of the century to the 1930s, are going to go away, and I kind of bristled at that and thought, wait a minute; they can be used. That's probably a financial issue, but I would ask you to rethink that a little bit. It's, to some degree, do not let that go.

Why do I say this? The history is not just about what you see, it's what you experience. If there's anything I've learned in 20 years over at Battery Gunnison, it's that history is an experiential thing for our visitors, who when they see original equipment working, it gets their attention.

All during the pandemic, Roy, we worked, and a lot changed out at that gun battery. You haven't seen it originally. A whole lot more has been done over the past two years. I invite you to come out and take a peek when you get a chance.

But I would consider something with your radiator and heating system. There are some options you may be able to reuse those, and that gets you to the physical experience of the building.

The other thing that seems to get missed in general about this is, we're talking about a period of significance of

the 1890s through the 1940s. And you have three major things coming of age in that time period. You have telephone communications, you have electric service, and then you have the water treatment and potable water distribution.

The Park Service clearly owns the electric and the potable water; they're doing a wonderful job with the water plant. Cathedral windows are going back into that original plant, and the structure itself will support this post area.

However, as you go through these buildings, you're going to discover a lot of electrical and telephone equipment, and what I've seen in the past is it ends up in the dumpster.

But that's serious history. One of the reasons that Fort Monmouth was created here in New Jersey was because of Menlo Park, RCA Labs, Bell Labs, all of that. This was an epicenter for telephone advancement. For Fort Hancock, it's two things: It's commercial telephone and it's tactical operational telephone networks.

Remnants of all of that still exist here. Army ground forces takes that material and uses it. So if you step into the battery, you're going to find it's working. It's got phones hooked to it and it functions.

I would ask you to consider maybe reaching to the Park Service, talk to us a little bit about what's there, because a lot of people gloss over that material, and we've talked to a few leaseholders and managed to save a little bit of it.

Now, the Park Service has a limit on what they can store, so we've got to choose the best of the best; but I ask you not to forget the fortification crowd out there because we reuse some of this stuff, and our next project is electric and telephone communication of the water battery, and that's a substantially large structure, we're going to need some materials for that.

Otherwise, I love your approach, your breakdown, how you're pulling this together. And to me personally, your density, it's what you take to pay the bill.

And to me, I'm going to defer on your density decisions based on your economic projections and what's going to work for you, because if you can't pay the bill, we've wasted a whole boatload of people's time. That's kind of where I'm at.

>> Thank you, Colonel.

>> Bennett Brooks: Thanks, Shawn.

Gary, and then over to Jim.

>> Gary Casazza: Thank you. First, my compliments to everyone, especially to Jen, and Roy Stillman. Great job; this project has to move forward, in my opinion, and you're getting that done, which is fantastic.

Shawn summed up at the end something that's very important about entity. And I do think that density has to be determined by two things, finances and parking, and that's how you determine your density.

Also, I think that some homework might have already been done but I don't know it. Who the client is going to be and can any of the units be restricted to senior housing? And is that the market you're looking for? And can you tie that into affordable housing?

I don't know the answer but I think those are important items, and who the client is purchasing this in the end is critical because that determines finances, which determines density, which determines everything in life.

Thank you. And again, good job.

>> Jen Nersesian: If I can respond to that, we certainly are open to looking at all options in terms of affordable housing. Senior housing, we certainly again would be open to looking at that, and if you have any connections or leads or advice on that, we could certainly use it.

When we met with Middletown, some of the issues that we realized we need to consider on, you could tailor affordable housing to any population, veterans housing, disabled housing, a number of different models we could consider.

We need to think about transportation access, which communities may have vehicles and which may not. Some communities who may not have their own vehicles, typically come with transportation, with shuttle service. Others do not.

Given that this is a relatively remote location, we can't walk to the grocery store; we need to think about how all those pieces fit together.

But if you can help us think about senior housing, certainly we are open to exploring.

>> Roy Stillman: Permit me to make an observation, which is in keeping with the historical preservation mandate, you have here staircases, and we don't have elevators. And you do have multistory buildings.

So the concept of sort of people with needs is a massively broad concept. There are all kinds of -- with the Americans with Disabilities Act and its subsequent interpretations, it started off with your classic bias as to what a disability is, and it became substantially broadened.

But we do have to set that into the physical limitations of the other side of the coin which is the preservation.

And so we're not going to be exterior elevators, for example, outside the buildings. That would be an anathema from a preservation perspective.

So there's a big opportunity here for people with needs, but I think you would have to drill down to which subset of that, and that's why I was trying to express there's economic needs, there's other service needs, and et cetera. And then there are these subsidiary issues of access, parking, social services, that may come along with that.

So I wanted to express our arms- wide- open willingness, maybe even preference, from the societal- good perspective, to try and provide that. And also want to mention that this is not binary. It doesn't have to be all or nothing. It can be some and some. So that we can have a diverse community here as opposed to one that's not diverse.

>> Bennett Brooks: Thanks. I want to try to get two more questions or comments in, and then I think we should shift to the other leasing updates and obviously we'll keep circling back to this. But Jim, and over to you, Michael Walsh.

>> Jim Krauss: Roy, I think I misphrased my question before. I was really trying to get at the, say, an estimate of the minimum and maximum number of people who would be living, and I think your response of 70 to 80 --

>> Units.

>> Jim Krauss: -- was the number of units.

>> Roy Stillman: Yes, it was.

>> Bennett Brooks: Do you have --

>> Jim Krauss: Based on, say, industry averages, could you translate that into people?

>> Roy Stillman: The distribution of unit sizes is studio 1 and 2, and not 3. So you would have a one- bedroom might frequently have on average like 1.4, 1.5 people. And a two- bedroom might have about 2.5 people on average.

>> Jim Krauss: Okay, thanks. I can --

>> Bennett Brooks: Roy.

(Overlapping voices.)

>> Bennett Brooks: Jim, on behalf of everyone else, Roy, if you have done that arithmetic and could just put a rough bracket around sort of min/max, depending on the array.

>> Roy Stillman: Permit me to make a more thoughtful response and check with you --

>> Bennett Brooks: You bet. You bet.

Michael, we'll give you the last question or comment here.

>> Michael Walsh: Just very quickly, first of all, Roy, I think your point about this is not binary is critical for the understanding and also critical for developing a really great community. I would hope that there will be some diversity in the community, and economic diversity is part of that.

When we talk about affordable housing, we often talk about the elderly and disabled and I have both within my family, so of course that's a concern; but I also have young people in my family and people who are in service industries. This is a tough area to live in; it's an expensive area to live in and finding housing for young people, people in the service industry, social workers or teachers, our police force, it's difficult.

So when we talk about affordable housing, it's not just the elderly and disabled we should be talking about; we should really think about the entire range of people who are looking for affordable housing. And certainly our service workers and our teachers and police and our young people who are struggling to find affordable housing are in that mix as well.

So I appreciate everybody talking about affordable housing; I just hope everybody keeps in mind that there are lots of people with the need for housing in the area, and the area needs their services; and that if there's an opportunity here, that's great. But again, I think that both economically and just for a really great dynamic community that having a wide range of people living at the fort would be great, and that would mean it would not just be 100 percent affordable housing.

Really just a comment. Very much appreciate, again, Roy and Jen and the entire Park Service and Stillman organization for thinking about this. So, thank you.

>> Bennett Brooks: I know we need to push on, I'm going to throw a question out in a minute as to whether or not we should just hear the other presentations or whether you want to add a little time right now just to invite the committee to crystallize its thinking.

I've heard a number of different themes, and I don't want to pitch any of this as broad because we're hearing from individuals. But interest in obviously housing that can serve a number of different communities of need, interest in perhaps and having that be diverse. A couple of comments around density and the importance of density and the relationship to economics and maybe that's what drives it.

Some very specific comments around rethinking radiators or considering a user fee for school bus service, et cetera, and in general appreciation for the quality of the proposal.

But Jen, do you have a thought as to whether this pushes forward, or Shawn?

>> Jen Nersesian: Yes, I would suggest that if there are recommendations that the committee wants to put forward now that we do it while we're talking about this and we can do it separately for the next presentation as well, since we're -- this is still fresh.

In addition to the things you listed, I would throw out there again, we have now fulfilled the terms of Phase 1 of our agreement. The next step would be to move on to Phase 2, look at the condition assessments on the other buildings, continue with the development of the business model and the exploration of affordable housing in any shape or form and the percentage across the portfolio.

So I want to see if the committee is on board with that, and would ask you to include that, thinking about next steps in your recommendations and thoughts.

>> Bennett Brooks: Shawn --

>> Shawn Welch: You take down a good list of things, housing availability, I think that's a good rubric that can cover a number of things.

What I'm thinking about here is a formal list of things that the committee says, please consider, please look at. And then I also am thinking about a general recommendation from the committee about moving forward. And continuing this work.

Because I think that that's an important statement that the committee can make today if it agrees to it as a body that Stillman and the Park Service need to continue moving forward.

But then on these specific issues, the ones that ticked my mind, so get your mountain pen out there, Bennett, because I want you to write these and you'll probably hear more from the committee members.

Housing availability, density; school bus and other outside requirements, where there's going to be a financial need. I'm going to give you a category of the under- appreciated experiential history; what is that? Well, it's your heating system, it's your telephone stuff, your electrical stuff.

Obviously you can't use a lot of that, although I can have some discussion on the radiators offline but we need to make sure we save it and it doesn't end up in the dumpster, especially the stuff that can be reused and if it can be, who is going to reuse it and how.

I also think that we're going to hear some things later regarding this working group that may add to that list, but those are four things that come to my mind.

>> I want to make sure I've got them. Housing availability, I think you're meaning sort of broadly available?

>> Shawn Welch: Yes.

(Overlapping voices.)

>> Bennett Brooks: Density tied to economics.

>> Shawn Welch: Yes.

>> Bennett Brooks: You know, consider user fees or school bus and other possible needs, and then systems reuse, radiators, wiring, plumbing, keep that. Is that correct?

>> Shawn Welch: Well, not so much (), making sure it doesn't go away as in into the dumpster and it's gone. Some things need to be preserved for future reuse; they don't need to just disappear.

>> Jen Nersesian: And Bennett, I would revise, based on something Shawn just said, my recommendation to, let's talk about recommendations now instead of later. Shawn mentions how the recommendations from the working group might inform any committee recommendations as well, and I think that's a really important point.

So maybe rather than voting on any formal recommendations at this point in time, we can get out the current thinking and then come back to () after we hear from the working group as well.

>> Bennett Brooks: I support that, Jen. I think there's a fuller picture the committee should be having and thinking about.

But let me invite Jim and Gary and Michael just to throw some thoughts out as to other things the committee might want to be folding into a recommendation, and then again we'll revisit this. Jim?

>> Jim Krauss: Actually, I forgot to lower my hand before.

>> Bennett Brooks: Even better.

Gary?

>> Gary Casazza: What I would like to see, and I'm used to going to meetings where we always have motions, I would like to see a formal motion on how to proceed and to me, one of the items that we need to do is actually start with constructive balances and constructive finances, saying, this is what we're authorizing to spend or we're recommending at the Park Department, and this is what Mr. Stillman is going to put into with the spend, so that we can get closer, putting a hammer to a nail, and move forward in a project.

It's come so far but we have to be able to see some light at the end of the tunnel, and I strongly recommend moving forward but I need something concrete to be able to say, yes, this is a viable project; and we're not quite there yet. We will need to spend more money to get there; I need that. But we need a motion to recommend what someone is going to spend.

>> Bennett Brooks: Gary -- sorry; please finish; I didn't mean to cut you off.

Okay. So -- you're on mute. But I want to try to take what you said since obviously the committee doesn't have spending authority and sort of put that into a recommendation or something the committee might want to think about, is the piece to fold in there is as this moves forward, the committee wants to better understand sort of the project economics both from developer and Park Service perceive. Something like that?

>> Gary Casazza: Very well, yes.

>> Bennett Brooks: What you're saying? Okay, great.

Michael?

>> Michael Walsh: Just very quickly, we may or may not be voting on this later on in terms of recommendation but I want people to understand my point of view, is while I would encourage the possibility of affordable housing out there, for a lot of reasons economic reality, transportation, things like that, I would certainly not recommend that it be a fixed criteria that there has to be affordable housing out at the fort. So I just want to make my position clear that while that's a nice to have, good to have, I would not recommend that be a requirement that the Park Service impose. Thank you.

>> Bennett Brooks: And if I've heard others, Michael, I think that's a helpful thing to say. I haven't heard anyone say it as a requirement; I've heard it as people want to see this fully explored and are excited by the idea. I don't know how that's landing for other folks.

Shawn, I'm going to put you on hold for a minute since you've had one bite at this and bring in assembly man and we'll come back to you.

>> Thanks, Bennett. Just real quick: I want to just point out that if we include or say that there's going to be affordable housing in this project, you're going to get some resistance from some sectors of the public out there. If they feel that Sandy Hook, these historic buildings, are going to be turned into affordable housing. And just having seen the local battles over affordable housing, that's something -- I'm just saying we should keep it in mind. I think veterans housing is a little more palatable, especially given the historic and military context here.

I just want everybody to keep that in mind that that could be a little bit of a flashpoint with the public. Okay?

Thank you.

>> Bennett Brooks: Yep, understood.

Shawn?

>> Shawn Welch: Yeah, you know what? I'm going to skip -- oh, wait a minute. Jim, did you have your hand up or did you take it down?

Okay, no hand up, all right.

>> Bennett Brooks: I think he weighed in.

>> Shawn Welch: A couple of things here, Gary.

I get your point wanting to understand the financial structure. I tend to try to steer away from that, after we did that big cost analysis back in the 2013 time frame. We kind of backed away a little bit because this is something the Park Service and the leaseholders have got to figure out. If we get too deep into that -- I just want to know if it's doable or not and right now I'm hearing it's doable and that excites me.

I think if we get too deep into recommendations that ties to specific numbers we might be very off course of what we're chartered to do. I think we need to be careful of that one.

I think that's about it, what I got. And I think maybe we do hold until we've seen the working group thing and come back.

I would like to ask one thing. Gary, you mentioned a point, let's do an actual formal motion. I'm going to

make one motion for the committee that we applaud the work and we encourage continued collaboration between Roy's group and the Park Service to move this project forward. That it's a general statement that we like what we've heard. I'll make that motion.

>> Gary Casazza: I like to second that motion.

>> Chris, your hand is up.

>> Chris Doxey: Yes, on the deterioration of the inside structures I looked at it and my heart was broken, actually. But I think Roy's approach to the situation is fantastic, but I also think it's imperative at this point that we move a little faster; I do agree with that.

Also, are we not required by law to set a certain percentage of buildings aside for affordable housing? Or does this not apply on a government installation?

>> Jen Nersesian: It does not apply on this project.

>> Chris Doxey: Okay; all right. Okay.

Also, are we going to speak of maintenance, maintenance of the building after this project is completed? Who is responsible for the maintenance --

>> Jen Nersesian: The lessee will be responsible for the maintenance.

>> Chris Doxey: Excuse me?

>> Jen Nersesian: The lessee will be responsible for the maintenance.

>> Chris Doxey: Responsible for their own?

>> Jen Nersesian: From our perspective, our lease will be with Stillman, and Stillman will be responsible for the maintenance.

>> Chris Doxey: They will, okay. That was my question. Thank you.

>> Bennett Brooks: Okay. What I would like to do is put this conversation on pause, note the recommendation that Shawn you put on the table, but to Jen's point, let's hear about these other building developments, go to public comment, hear from the working group, and then pick it up if that works for folks.

Okay. So with that, then, Karen, I think I want to hand it off to you to walk through the next set of updates on leasing.

>> Karen Edelman: So we are going to talk about building 114 and Amy Sebring, our chief of project planning is going to present on building 114.

>> Amy Sebring: Good morning, I'm Amy Sebring. I'm going to turn my camera off just because of my bandwidth; I don't want to freeze up here.

So we'd like to show everybody another adaptive reuse project we're working within with a attention lessee. This project would rehabilitate the historic officers club 114 into an event and lodging space.

This historic building is two and a half stories, it's brick with mansard roof and dormers, vacant since 1981. The original structure was expanded in 1905 with an addition to the west, and again in 1940 with a masonry addition on the south, and then again in 1943, another wood addition. So on this slide, you can see the second row -- the second row over to the left, you can see that addition. And unfortunately, it took down a historic wraparound porch.

It was poorly built, those two, and it was having structural failure with the roof and floors collapsing.

Next slide.

So this is February of 1922, this is what it should look like. So you can see where the porch was and this proposed lessee would be rebuilding that. Next slide, Karen, please?

The lessee would like to remove those additions and reconstruct the original wraparound porch as well as a one-story event space on the south side, which will complement the historic structure. The proposed design does a very good job of preserving the important character-defining features and rehabilitating the building back to its 1900s period of significance.

So actually do back; I'll point out a couple of things. Sorry, Karen, one more back to the main floor plan.

So the light blue is obviously the original building, and then now we're upstairs again. Can you go back to the main floor.

>> Karen Edelman: Sorry, technical difficulties.

>> Amy Sebring: That's okay. I just think it's important to point out for the group.

>> Karen Edelman: I'm going to stop sharing and resharing; apologies.

>> Amy Sebring: No worries.

Basically what I'm getting at, everyone, is the addition was very thoughtfully designed on the south side and it's set back. The addition is in the light pink and the light blue is the original. They hired a historic architect, and you can see on the left there, they're going to rebuild the historic wraparound porch, but you'll notice they're adding accessibility. That's very important, and the law.

When you walk into this building, you'll experience it much like in 1922, which is what we want. They're rebuilding the bar where it was, and they're refurbishing the historic mural behind the bar. They're rebuilding the kitchen where it was, and they are maintaining that front entry with the historic staircase.

We lost our visual.

>> Jen Nersesian: Karen, are you resharing the slides?

Did we lose --

(Overlapping voices.)

>> Karen Edelman: I'm having difficulties. One second.

>> Amy Sebring: I'll just mention while Karen is getting our drawing back that we have initiated consultation with the state historic preservation office; that's because we wanted to review this addition. Now you went to the finale; that's fine. Let's just -- okay. So let's stay on this one. So the -- (Pause).

So the plan is that they would have parking on the north side, you would maintain -- when you're on that north side, and the west side -- you're basically going to experience this building as it was. Next slide.

This is the upstairs as proposed for lodging, so you could have a family wedding here and the wedding party to stay overnight.

Next slide.

So the elevations, this is kind of important. The proposed addition on the left, so the top drawing is the front elevation. And you can see how sensitive the addition is. It's one plate height, it has receding hip roof, and it does not overwhelm the original building, and actually frames it so you can see the way it was. Next slide.

This is the rear of the building and the other -- okay, let's say on this. So the site plan sort of shows the addition is put probably in the perfect area. It is set back from the original. It's tucked away with these trees, so as you drive around Fort Hancock and you come around and you park and you walk up that front walk, you're really going to experience the original building.

They're doing a green roof on the connector to the addition. Next slide.

And this is what we'll be left with. So at Park Service we're pretty excited about this. It's a very thoughtful, sensitive addition to make the adaptive reuse program work.

The historic architect, Barton recalls [ph] is showing materials and fenestration pattern that complements the

historic building but doesn't overwhelm it and that's what we like to see.

We didn't ask the lessee to do multiple perspective renderings. The rendering you're seeing now would be the most impactful.

If you're that gentleman walk up to the front porch you won't even see the addition because of how far set back it is.

So we're really excited about this, and we're in the preliminary stages, of course, our next steps are, we need to get this concept approved with our investment review board, but we wanted to show it here today.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Jen Nersesian: And before we move on into the full discussion, I just want to put this in the context of we've heard from -- I believe we have Scott Hagney on the line; he is the letter of intent holder on this property with whom we've been working with for a very long time. I will remind everybody he's also the letter of intent holder for buildings 24 and 25, the large barracks building, which have been moving forward and we'll touch on in minute, as well as the YMCA building.

This is a project, he's been very clear that for the business model to work, for this to function as an event space, there needs to be some additional space. We have looked at some initial proposals for an addition, a three-story addition that we in the Park Service did not feel would meet our needs in terms of historical considerations.

And there's been a lot of back and forth and a lot of work to get this to the point where we feel like it's ready for sharing with all of you that in our estimation, this does do a very nice historic treatment in terms of the addition.

And so we're happy to be able to share this with you, and with that, I will give you the floor, for any questions or discussion from the committee.

>> Bennett Brooks: Great. Just so I can manage the time properly, Karen, can you tell me how many other slides you need to get through?

>> Karen Edelman: Just two more.

>> Bennett Brooks: Why don't we just finish those up, and then I'll know what I'm managing, too, because we need to make sure we try to get in a little break and then have public comments at 11:00.

>> Karen Edelman: Sure. If you'll bear with me, my computer is not --

>> Bennett Brooks: We seem to be having computer issues all over the place today. Unfortunately the gremlins are at it.

>> Shawn Welch: Probably a bandwidth issue, wait. If you punch it two or three times, it will queue up and come after you.

>> Karen Edelman: I wanted to follow up on this discussion of building 114. We are talking about buildings for which letters of intent are currently in effect, and those are the four that Jen mentioned: The officers club, which is building 114, buildings 24 and 25, which are former barracks, and building 40, which is the YMCA. The next buildings that are probably going to come online in terms of executing the lease on the lease will be 25 and then 24, and those will be utilized for lodging residential.

And finally, the last slide that I wanted to share with you all is the status of buildings that are currently leased or subject to other agreements. Right now, as you all know, Lillian Burry has been instrumental in connecting us with the county so that we can utilize, so that MAST can utilize buildings 23 and building 56 in connection with Middlesex County Vocational School District use. Those buildings --

>> Monmouth County.

>> Karen Edelman: Sorry; Middlesex County is mine, sorry. Yes, Monmouth County educational use.

So these buildings are currently under some sort of rehabilitation. They're subject to an agreement and not a

lease, because MAST has legislation authorizing them to utilize facilities at Sandy Hook.

Then as you know we have building 53, the post exchange which is a café, currently in use and it's open. It's open intermittently as the winter comes, but it is open more during the summer and shoulder season.

Building 21 also in use; that's the duplex building. It's in use for lodging.

Building 104 is an old quarters building and it is in use for office.

Building 52 which is a lieutenant's quarters is in use for lodging. And then building 36 as you all know which was the last building to come online in terms of an executed lease will be utilized for dining restaurant and event space, and I am not sure what the timeline is on the opening. I thought it was going to be the end of this calendar year.

>> Jen Nersesian: And I believe that building 56 is getting pretty close to completion. So that's very good news, that's one of the MAST buildings.

>> Shawn Welch: I had a peek at 56; it's gorgeous. I like what I've seen.

>> Jen Nersesian: And if any of you have been on site, you've seen Dan plugging away and the progress that's been made on the minibar; also very exciting.

>> Shawn Welch: The top floor, Jen, he's already polished the interior top floor for the second floor. He's protected it. Oh, my, it's beautiful; the wood is just gorgeous. He's got the bar in. He's moving forward; it's a beautiful job.

I saw him last week and he was working on windows.

>> Karen Edelman: And that's this building featured on the photo in the slide.

>> Shawn Welch: Yes.

>> Jen Nersesian: And in terms of building 25, that large barracks building, one of the two that's under a letter of intent, we are getting very close to lease- signing stage. We have been talking about this building probably for about five years now, working through this due diligence phase and talking with the committee as this has moved along.

Again, this is for residential, a mix of short- and long- term flexibility there. But it's getting very near to the lease- signing stage.

So I want to flag that for everybody because, you know, it's been tough getting these committee meetings set up, and with any kind of short frequency between them, just because of the process we have to go through and the approvals and the Federal Register notice, et cetera, statutory requirements, and it's possible that this could be ready for lease signing between now and our next meeting.

So I want to make sure we're getting that in front of the committee.

>> Bennett Brooks: Great. So let's see if we have any questions or comments here. Patrick, I know you've been waiting, and Chris, I'm not sure if your hand is left over in which case I'll let you lower it.

>> Chris Doxey: It is left over; I'm sorry.

>> Bennett Brooks: Patrick?

>> Patrick Collum: I'm just checking on 114. We saw the plans for the addition, and then there's a multistory addition for hotel rooms.

In the original structure, I realize you're maintaining the kitchen and the bar area. What's happening to the upper levels in that building?

>> Amy Sebring: So if we can go to that second- floor plan -- I know we jumped around on you -- the second- floor plan, can we show that, Karen, the one where you can see the roof plan? There we go, there we go.

So that's the second floor is on the right and the addition is below it, of course, because it's one story. So you're seeing the top of the roof.

But these are, this is getting rehabilitated into lodging for the available for the event space.

Again, what I was saying earlier is, one of the things we like at Park Service is keeping these character- defining features, so you can see the main historic stairs stays, the main walls are staying. They've really done a good job of keeping the -- we call it the parkey [ph], the vision of this building is staying the way it was and it will obviously be renovated to meet the building code.

>> Patrick Collum: Thank you.

>> Bennett Brooks: Thanks. Michael?

>> Michael Walsh: Thanks. I also wanted to comment on the officers building. I think it is remarkable how we can get back to what it originally looked like. And I'm sure some people will have a concern about the large addition, but I agree that it does seem to be something that's consistent with the original design that is, as I said, set back.

And just in terms of the commenting about the area, I live in Monmouth County, I live in Fairhaven, there have been a number of places locally. I can think of the Shadow Brook Country Club, Rumson [ph] Country Club, Diehl [ph] Country Club, all of which have the basic structures, a large old home they've renovated and added to or about to add significant space to accommodate events.

In this design, I think, and the purpose is exactly in line with what other area places are doing, and I can also tell you there's a huge demand in this area for space for events. It is a -- people are moving to Wednesday, Thursday, Friday weddings because they can't get a Saturday or Sunday. I think that this is a very nice design, and I do think that in this area it will be very much utilized.

So thank you for putting together the plan and I hope that this can be executed on.

>> Bennett Brooks: Thanks. Gary, let me bring you in and then I'll go up to you, Shawn.

>> Gary Casazza: First of all, my compliments. This is a great blending of old and new. I think it's exactly who the whole fort needs. I'll be short and just say fantastic. Nothing else.

>> Shawn Welch: You know what? Let's do Patrick first. Patrick, you've got your hand up?

>> Patrick Collum: I forgot to take it down.

>> Shawn Welch: Great job briefing this. FYI for everybody, that upstairs reuse, this lodging is consistent. Typically in officers clubs, single officers could rent space in the clubs. At most of the major installations I've been at you could do that in the '80s and '90s, and that was a cornerstone for socializing and professional development for the officers. When I was a young lieutenant and captain, we used to do our training in the officers club. We'd rent a room and go over our professional development.

So this is very much in line with what was happening historically at Fort Hancock, so thank you, Amy.

And one little sideline: When people are eating in there, not so much on the back addition but maybe from one side of it, you'll be able to see nine- gun batteries. So FYI for you, we're in the process of restoring all of the remaining platform lights for that nine- gun battery. We're about a third of the way through that restoration. You can reach out and touch us.

But that would be something interesting. You're dining and all of a sudden, the sun goes down, and boom, that battery lights up. So, food for thought.

>> Bennett Brooks: Question for you, Karen or Amy: Is there any kind of recommendation that you need or are looking on for building 114 from this meeting?

>> Jen Nersesian: Yes, like I said, we really worked with Scott and his team on getting to a point where we felt comfortable with the addition and felt like it was very complementary of the structure without taking away from the historic aspects of it.

I wanted to put it up there to see if the committee feels the same way and if this is an appropriate thing to consider in the context of this project.

I think it's very exciting. We inside the park really are happy with this design. But I want to throw it out there and see if there's any other perspectives or see where the committee is at on this, too.

And I also, before we totally move on or before we break, want to get any feedback or input on continuing to move forward with building 25.

>> Bennett Brooks: So a specific request, if there's any kind of statement the committee would like to make along sort of supporting the design and approach being taken on building 114. Anything on the progress, and anything on 25. But it's for you to weigh in on.

Chris, I see your hand, and Karolyn, we haven't heard from you; let's go to you next.

>> Chris Doxey: I think the building is wonderful. It has a stately look about it and it has a flow, so I think it's great, and I can't wait until it opens.

>> Bennett Brooks: Karolyn?

>> Karolyn Wray: I think it's fantastic. There's been weddings out on Sandy Hook forever and ever. It's great having the chapel there.

This is going to be so beautiful and the fact that it can house some of the wedding party, the design is gorgeous. Just a couple weeks ago there's park loft now on Fort Monmouth. It's also catering, slash, wedding menu. They did the same thing; it's restored and gorgeous.

They're starting to book up like crazy. This will definitely be an asset out there. I definitely love it.

>> Bennett Brooks: Great, thank you.

So I'm hearing only support and full throated enthusiastic support.

Shawn, why don't you jump int.

>> Shawn Welch: So let's have a motion here in support of the work the Park Service is doing with Scott and building 114, and their movement forward with 24, 25 and 40.

>> Michael Walsh: I'll second that.

>> Shawn Welch: Bingo.

>> Bennett Brooks: All in favor, raise your hands.

(People saying "aye"; vote taken.)

>> Bennett Brooks: Anyone -- I'd like to ask very specifically if there's anyone who is not in support or wants to voice an abstention there.

Okay. All right. Then I think we are good there.

It is 10 of; you all are scheduled for a break right now. So let's take a ten- minute break and then we will come back at 11:00, and turn to public comment, and then again after public comment, we will pick up with the work, back to leasing, with what I think will be a very interesting discussion and understanding of what the leasing working group has been talk about for any number of months now. Thanks to all. We'll see you in about ten minutes.

(Break)

>> Bennett Brooks: We're going to start up here in one moment, so if folks can get back to their seats and computers and ask the staff and committee members to turn cameras on so they know you're there, but we do want to start our public comment at 3:00 sharp if we can -- not 3:00 sharp; 11:00 sharp.

And maybe if we can bring the slides back up, that would be great and go to the public comments slide.

I'm not seeing it on mine.

>> Technical difficulties.

>> Bennett Brooks: Now it's up; all right. So while this is getting to the right slide, let me remind us again, we have set aside 30 minutes today for public comment; we'll see if we need that or not. We're happy to use every moment of that hearing from folks.

Thanks. We appreciate everyone taking time to listen and share your thoughts with us.

I want to invite folks to share comment. If you wish to make a comment, there's a couple of ways to do that. First of all, if you raise your hand, your virtual hand and put your cursor at the bottom of the screen, you will see a raise hand there, just click on that and let us know that way if you want to.

If for some reason that's not working for you, you can just write into the Q&A that you're interested in being recognized and we can do that as well.

We'll fit in as many people as possible.

And again, we also invite additional comments by email so if folks have perspective they want to share but you don't feel comfortable making a comment today, I please invite you to submit any comments you have in writing and send those to Daphne.

We do ask folks who make their comments today to limit their comments to a few minutes each and I'll jump in if we're starting to get close to that three- minute mark so I remind you of that.

I apologize for advance for any chirping and chiming I may need to do and when you start, I would really appreciate people starting with the name and affiliation so the benefit has the benefit of knowing who is sharing their perspectives.

And we did ask people to identify ahead of time if they were interested in making comments and we did hear from one person, Susan Gardiner. So Susan, we'll start with you and if anyone else would like to make my comments.

Susan, I think your mic is open and ask you to share your thoughts.

Hang on.

>> Can you hear me? (Off mic.) Now we've got you.

>> Good morning. My name is of course is Susan Gardner; I'm the author of Sandy Hook's Lost Highland Beach Resort. And I just would like to start out by saying old houses are the keepers of our past.

Our goal is to rescue one such building in the Sandy Hook NHL. The 1893 Sandlass House, SH 600, is in desperate need of help.

Why is this justified, both historically and practically? The significance of associations with the resort and its historic remnants are found in the same natural environment which surrounds the structure today under criterion A in the National Register. This represents its integrity as a bathing business which provided swimming, fishing, boating and enjoyment of nature. In addition, the house was on the contributing structures list for 25 years in the NHL nomination.

Can you show photo No. 2, please?

In 2004, the historic documentation of Highland Beach by NPS started in earnest.

One, to collect the remaining photos, interviews and artifacts of the resort experience.

Two, in 2005, the NPS signed a memorandum of agreement with NJDOT to prepare interpretive exhibits in a history of travel and transportation at Highlands and Highland Beach to be shown at Sandy Hook NPS Museum.

Three, a group of advocates formed a preservation team to work directly within NPS and active discussions for

a future lease at the time the last ranger vacated the house.

And four, interviews were conducted by the NPS Museum curator and the Sandy Hook Historian.

Please show photo No. 3.

In 2004, the New Jersey DOT cultural resource survey noted two contributing structures, identified within the APE during the bridge building project, which provided, quote, concern by Shippo for the Surf House, which is a/k/a Sandlass House, a traditional American four- square.

In 2010, the chief of cultural resources started an NPS nomination for Sandlass House for Shippo consideration. In 2012, the NJDOT presented three highlands and Highland Beach illustrated history panels to NPS. The request for funding of a wayside exhibit of Highland Beach Resort, an interpretive signage, was approved by NPS.

(Switched to other captioner)

Signage was approved by NPS this memorandum agreement has yet to be completed. In retrospect there are questions abrupt removal from the contributing structure list at Sandy Hook relating to the National Historic Act requirements. This regards the 2012 of the house after 25 years on the list. At the time the homeless suddenly remove from it would have qualified for the current leasing program.

An administrative change in the chief of ()the nomination stopped, and the house was suddenly removed without consultation of advocates or other party and the agreement violating this requirement in the process. Could you please show photo Number 4?

Bennett Brooks: I just want to let you know you're over three minutes at this point.

Susan Gardiner: I just have one more comment to make. The administrator notified that NPS national historic requirement to submit this home for review when a home has merit.

The Sandlass house meets criteria from 2004 to 2012. Nomination requirement has yet to be satisfied we are asking the committee and NPS to return to home continue structure list and ensure the building can participate in section 111 leasing this fall. Solutions have been presented regarding the parks preservation by the preservation advocates. Valued by the citizens legislature and community. Let's bring back the cooperative partnership we shared for eight years with inconsistent National Park Service at gateway. And thank you for sending all the necessary documents since the last meeting in April and thank you for listening.

Daphne Yun: Susan, apology I didn't have the fourth photo.

Susan Gardiner: It's the photo of the house if you were to pass by entering the park.

>> Thanks, Susan.

>> You're welcome.

Bennett Brooks: I want to check and see if there are other members of the public that would like to make any comments. Again, I'll just invite folks to put their hands up. Brian Samuelson let's bring you in and if you can start with name and affiliation. Many of us do already and we can focus on the comments, three minutes, that would be great.

Brian Samuelson: Hi, everyone, real quick, I'm Brian Samuelson. Thank you for committee, good work. My big concern right now is Mr. Stillman's proposal he's been handed over 23 buildings. We read between some of the lines. I'm a little concerned about the 21 buildings has taken 2 and a half years to get to this presentation. It looks like he's the landmark locked up at least 23 buildings in repairs now.

A bit of doublespeak. I just want him to go forward and do this. I'd like the park service to have an expiration date on this. We don't want this to go 20 years. He has an exclusive right on this land making, holding it hostage, you might say. I'm concerned about that.

We're shutting down in January through April. We're not getting alerts. We have a few other issues with the business office. They are not responding to us. We had catastrophic flood and failure last January and they are holding our insurance check hostage and not communicating with us, and I hope to take this offline with superintendent and hopefully, she can help resolve this. We all want the landmark to be saved and do a good job with that. Thank you, everyone for listening. I'll shut up. I apologize if this is a bad connection so thank you great work, everyone. Appreciate your great work. And let's make sure we hold everyone's feet to the fire. Not just mine.

Bennett Brooks: Thank you. And your connection was fine by the way, so we had no trouble hearing you at all. All right. Let me see if there's any other members of the public that would like to offer a comment. Please raise your hand anterior if you can't raise your hand let us know through the Q and A. Michelle why don't you come on in. If you can start with name and affiliation and focus your comments in about three minutes that would be great.

Michele Pezullo: My name is Michelle. Can you hear me?

>> Perfectly.

>> Can you hear me? Yes.

Oh, you can okay great. My name is Michelle and I live in Highlands. Although these are beautiful renditions and get back which I totally love the original look of everything.

Technical/audio interference

The beauty of Sandy Hook and where we are. And then to say that, you know, affordable housing isn't mandatory out there, but, you know, it would be more palatable for Veterans just kind of stuck as just a little elitism. Also, who pays for all of these services? Does it come out of the taxpayers, so when you have, you know, snow clean up, or if you have a fire, you know, and you need, you know, that kind of infrastructure, who pays for that, and where does it come from? And if the taxpayers pay for it, don't they have I guess an ability or, you know, to be out there? I know I'm all over the place on this, but I mean it is beautiful. I'm not going to take that away from anybody. It just doesn't sit right when it just seems like it's for people that can afford those kind of services. And I yield back. Thank you.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks very much, Michelle, I appreciate you taking time to share your thoughts. And, again, it's part of the reason for having these comments in the middle of meeting. It gives the committee a chance to hear the different perspective from the public that are here. Are there other folks why don't you come in and starting with affiliation.

Allen Porto: My name is Allen and I submitted, and I plan on living in Seabright full time. My house address is ()we'll be building hopefully, in the next year or so. And I think Stillman is an investor that put a lot of diligence into this and understand the challenges that he needs to go through. A few points and I think Brian brought this up as well.

The time frame of movement seems incredibly slow. One of the biggest failure project duration higher risk they become, and unknowns occur that homes would be as you pass by them you can see they are steadily eroding and eventually will probably co lapse if those aren't dealt with so I'm just making a point.

The second I hear affordable housing and I think Michelle brings up a good point. I think a comment should be considered for multi-use, maybe a rental, ABB so you have different income. If you do all affordable. If you do all rental you lose a lot of people's ability to use them in a way that might be more historical value.

The third thing I like to bring up, from environmental standpoint. I didn't hear anything on how you would go off grid. So, the HVA would be a separate discussion. But in my proposal, I suggested

solar roofs. The tiles would be solar and stored into batteries and support the house. I think there's more consideration and how you use the ()I think that's great. I think as you go into this, and more consideration is to integrate modern with historical and make into much longer solution. The Tesla one reading 194 an hour. Miles per hour, which is a high wind rating. Something to consider, and I'll stop talking at this point. Thank you.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks very much, Allen, appreciate the thoughts. Let me see if there's anybody else who would like to jump into this conversation. Again, either raise a virtual hand at the bottom of your screen or just throw something in the screen saying you would like to join in.

I'm not seeing anyone else at this point. Susan, are you raising your hand again?

Thank you all for the comments. The pieces I heard some concerns around the time frame. And there should be an expiration date. Comments around how does the public get to use issues and affordability questions around who pays for services or things that might be tied for it. And the suggestion around thinking about ability to build in solar panels that can have these units be off the grid. Thank you all for those comments, and I am sure they will roll into the conversation the committee has going forward here. Susan, I see your hand come up again. Are you wanting to make another comment?

Susan Gardiner: Thank you, thank you. I just got my audio. I have one comment.

(Simultaneous talking).

Bennett Brooks: Allen, hang on one second. I got Susan going and then we'll go to you. Go ahead, Susan.

Susan, you can talk you have to unmute.

>> Thank you for the clarification I probably misspoke there

Susan, if you come off mute.

I think maybe we're ready to move on.

Then thanks again, members of the public for joining in listening and sharing the thoughts. It's very helpful to get your perspective into the mix. I want to move us now then to our next agenda topic -- You're back, Susan.

Susan Gardiner: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now. I have a question. I wanted to ask about an e-mail I received yesterday as a CC from Connie Ramirez, who was the former director of the federal NPS institute, and she sent one page that she wanted to read to Daphne, and I was wondering if they have and if we could hear the comments?

Daphne Yun: I did not receive that.

Susan Gardiner: Oh, my goodness. Can I forward it to you? From the CC I got yesterday. Or I can read it right now if you allow me from the copy I sent.

Bennett Brooks: I think I'm looking at Jen or Daphne or Shawn. Only I didn't know what the protocol would be because you didn't receive from the person.

Daphne Yun: I think we can still read, and Susan can forward it to me and that way we'll have it.

Bennett Brooks: Great. Susan, if you wouldn't mind please go ahead.

Susan Gardiner: Thank you so much. Connie is the federal director of the federal institute and office of associate director of cultural resources and partnership and science for the NPS in Washington, D.C. she would that post from 2000 to 2015 a period of 15 years. She made a statement about the Stanislaus house. A in the history of the late silent beach resort included in the gateway Sandy Hook is being destroyed by bureaucratic mix up and policy of the NPS in the New Jersey historic office. Both agencies failed to recognize that places of significance are eligible for listing in the national register of historic places. Hence the review of the effects of undertakings by the National Park Services in accordance tea with national Historic Preservation Act. Avoidance of recognizing the eligibility for national register has delayed the opportunities for preservation for the national historic act Section 111 leasing authority. Because of such inactions the NPS is guilty in failure to meet responsibilities as stewards of our American history. Many residents and

interested sit access have sent letters and to have the house included in the list and thereby in the Section 111 leasing program. The return to Sandy Hook in the fort Hancock proving ground historic school district would make authorized in the national historic act Section 111. Specifically to help federal agencies find income producing ways to keep historic properties not needed for their mission observed. To transfer the Stanislaus house if it can be moved to another site is not viable alternative to controlled land within the area in which the house has significance.

It's the last sentence. Committee should be asking for New Jersey and the NPS is -- how does American public including citizens of New Jersey benefit by the National Park Service allowing the house historic element in the NHPA to deteriorate. Whether the house should be included in this historic school district and why with are these agencies supporting the possibility of preservation of the house to the provisions of the national preservation act Section 111. Thank you. Constance Warner, PhD. Thanks again.

Bennett Brookes: Thanks Susan. With that, let's push on and we want to spend the next hour getting caught up on lots of interesting conversation that the group has been having the conversation mentioned again likes I and we want to share where the thinking is today given that this, you know, group is still meeting important context.

What we want to do is hand it off to Jen just to remind us what the working group is, where it is in the process. And they have been hand it off to Jim and to share some of the thoughts from the committee from the working group at this point. Then we'll go back to Jen hear a little bit about where heading next and open to working group members we have some members and obviously to you, committee to continue deliberations Jen, over to you.

Jen Nersesian: Thanks. The committee itself formed the working group to explore the concerns that had been expressed when the proposal was discussed. Several environmental and other groups. The working group is comprised from the New Jersey Historic Trust, the New Jersey Audubon, the National parks Conservation Association, and the Sierra Club. I don't think I'm missing anybody. Someone call me on it if I am. And we have been meeting and there's a handful of committee members involved in this too. Jim will talk more about the group in just a minute. And as well as Tony and Gerry and Shawn have been listening in as well as myself. And many of the presentations have been done by patty who with the chief of stewardship resources for the park and that includes cultural and natural resources.

We have gone through a whole series of meetings. The first meeting was to try brainstorm and get the list down of all the things that the group wanted to explore or all that we needed to hear from the concerns that have been raised, and then a presentation outlining what all the laws regulations policy and how the park service and managers of properties and issues. And we had discussions on climate change. The discussion on a whole list of different types of ecological impact, climate change, you on the committee have seen a couple of these presentations now.

I think the first two, would be laws regulations policy and presentations, and then the climate change presentation. And have expressed a strong interest in seeing others. I think as you got a glimpse from the first they have been thorough and in depth and understanding how we can approach these issues.

We looked at trying to fit another one in this meeting today. But given how many other things we have on the agenda and time to discuss that didn't seem feasible and coupled with the fact a lot more meetings we're way ahead of where we're at in the committee in terms of presentations.

Just as a side note, one option we're looking at and we're going to look forward instead of waiting for the next committee meeting and instead of in advisory committee protocol. We may look at doing a number of these presentations at once as a town hall. And invite you to come and go through so we as a committee can play catch up. Anybody from the public would be welcome to this as well. I think it's a really useful way to get your feet wet in National Park Service management with these kinds of issues and a good way for us to hear what questions and concerns exist around those.

So, that we can do as an in-person meeting. Knock a few of these out at once. I'm throwing that out there for your consideration. It might be a nice way to get everyone back out to Sandy Hook together to. And look at some of the structures while we're out there.

We will bookmark that for now. While the working group has made a lot of progress on all of these issues, its work is not done. There's one major topic we haven't gotten to yet and that's the social

equity piece. And that -- so, you know, I want to acknowledge that and make you aware that there's more to come and if there are questions around that, we still haven't had the chance to really do the deep dive there. But that will be coming and is acknowledged by everybody as an important top ink and consideration.

I think what we're looking at today, you know, we have go gotten as far as calling out some of what we mentioned as recommendations and various meetings. But these -- I will leave it to the group to talk about there may or may not be consensus. There may be some things that represent certain points of view. You know, it may not -- it certainly is not comprehensive yet with the social equity piece in there but represents as far as we have gotten in terms of really understanding these issues.

And I invite anybody, you know, Jim will do the overview of where we're at right now. And certainly we got a number of our working group members on the line today. If anybody else wants to add to that, you're certainly welcome. This is supposed to represent your viewpoints and give the working group a chance to inform the thinking of the committee and the committee then makes recommendations to the park service.

Did I miss anything?

Bennett Brooks: You hit that quite well my message is to amp MRI if I still message on going lots of thoughts with committee benefit and more to come. With that, I think we'll hand it off to you, Jim, and let you sort of give a high-level overview. I know we have on Eileen Murphy and Bill. They might be the only members we have right now.

But let's start with you, Jim, and we'll see who is able to fold in.

Jim Krauss: Okay, I'll start by saying I think unless I missed it, I think that one of the working group members that Jen did not include in the list was the Sierra club. So with that --

Jen Nersesian: I thought I did, but if I overlooked them, please thank you for getting them in there.

Jim Krauss: I think that the important thing to focus on is to what the working groups mission or goal was that that we wanted to understand as a group what the parks current management practices were to discuss the impacts of the possible proposed residential and commercial development contemplated by the leasing principal. And most importantly to make recommendations on how the park should increase or modifying the management practices to minimize potential impacts if the leasing program progresses. And Jen did list the various topics we decided to address. She did mention that we have not discussed social equity or economic justice considerations. One of the reasons for that might be that we have raised the issues of whether the members of the group were the right people to be discussing that and that maybe we should be adding and subtracting from the group to discuss that particular issue.

In addition, there's one major issue we still have some significant work to be done and that is on climate change considerations and climate change recommendations. And then finally just as a note, when we met just two days ago on Monday, we asked the non FACA members and the nonservice park members to come back with two things to the working group. One was to identify that I shall particular priority items and secondly to raise any issues or concerns that we have not discussed. They started with a small breakout session. We certainly have not given them sufficient time to -- to do that, so we do not have their response to that at this meeting, and we hope to have that at our next meeting.

If we can put up the table on the screen, and I think it was up. It was just up and then went away.

Karen Edelman: I'll put it right back in a second. Sorry.

Jim Krauss: On the left-hand side of the table is the working group recommendation in the center column is the related resource concern and then the right-hand column is the what the park is doing currently. And I just want to -- I'm just going to comment on some of the things where the -- if the leasing program does transpire particularly with the still man proposal that the park will need to step up its management practices.

Karen Edelman: It's up now Jim, in case you're not seeing it.

Jim Krauss Yes, okay. On this particular page, the second item and is basically an overarching concern. And personally, I had to look up what adaptive management meant. And a new phrase to me, somebody that's been in the business world and the management for close to five decades. Adaptive management means a process where management is not a fixed set of rule of principles. An assessment is made of what your concerns and needs are. And issues developing a plan, followed by implementation, constant monitoring of the results, and evaluating the results. If you're not achieving the benefits, you go back to square one and start modifying and repeating the cycle. The park service does have a framework for that. But it needs to beef up its plan in particular for Sandy Hook. If we can go to the next slide.

My pages are not quite the same order. And maybe we can go to yet the next slide. And the very first item and this is of particular interest today considering the concern about who should be bearing costs, but the working group has recommended that the developers should bear the cost associated with mitigation and adaptive management from the leasing program.

The next item and there was quite a bit of discussion on this including discussion of the not only the residential development but the commercial development of controlling the lighting in the development and making sure it does not disturb particularly the wildlife.

And then the last item, very similar noise restrictions. We can go to the next slide. On this slide primarily the first item, management of waste and garbage, etcetera, and in particular, trying to avoid attracting predators and other wildlife. And if we go to the next slide.

Several on this page. On air quality. The very last line, and I'm focusing primarily -- I should have said this earlier -- on the column on the left. The last sentence on the first item, rules to restrict idling. The next category quite a bit of discussion on this. Limiting the number of vehicles that tenants can have up there and also prohibiting certain types of vehicles including large recreational vehicles. Two items down to provide electric charging stations. I know locally in highlands we're already working on grants to get four or five charging stations and that should be a goal in the park.

And then somewhat climate related, the next item, management maintenance of stormwater and -- next slide, please.

Top item very important, the infrastructure needed for increased particularly increased residential, water, sewer, electric, stormwater, etcetera. That has to be -- that evaluation has to be put in place. And then the item after that and this particular item since this only came up on in particular on Monday we did not have the related current park management they are doing quite a bit to preserve native habitats presently. But there was also some discussion about managing nonnative invasive species to add to that those management practices. And I think those were the highlights to the park service, the working group felt that the park service will need to step up its management practices if the leasing program goes forward.

With that I'll turn it over to you.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks, Jim, I appreciate that. That's really helpful and as you can see, a lot of good feedback and thoughts from the working group. I want to in a moment invite working group on the call to jump in and add in any perspectives that you think would be ample or hit any points that struck you or high-level impression. One thing I really want to make sure is clear. As Jim said at the outset this is a working group that is put together to help identify concerns that might be associated with leasing and identify potential management measures, research measures.

It's, you know, the piece that Jim just walked through and talked through isn't an endorsement of a proposal and shouldn't be seen as such, but it is reflection of a very thoughtful that the group has had around consideration related to leasing and sharing of their perspective, again, on concerns and possible way to mitigate.

With that, I want to invite any of the working group members who are on right now to join in. I see Eileene, Bill, Bill C., Ilene Murphy, and Tim. And I know Harold was on earlier, but I don't see his name right. If any of you would like to jump in with a comment or perspective, please just raise your hand so we can get you off of mute. Do you understand anybody want to jump in? Tim, Ilene, Bill?

Well, if none of you want to jump in right now and I will continue to encourage you because I think it would be great for the committee to hear your voices and thoughts and, again, just amplifying

anything that Jim had to say. I will look for your hands, but in the meantime, let's go to the committee and see what questions you might have either for what Jim said or Jim said or just for the committee members I'm sorry. The working group members on the call.

Committee members any thoughts or questions about the working group's work?

Tony, I know you sat in on these meetings.

Tony Mercantante: Yeah in an effort to break up the dead silence, I think one of the things that a number of issues were raised by the people who made up the working group who are not FACA members. One of the things we learned they raised a number of issues and environmental long- and short-range environmental concerns. One of the things we learn from patty was that the vast, vast majority of those things are already factored into NPS decision making. And I thought that was very interesting. Sort of some stuff that happens under the radar. But a lot of issues were raised were already addressed in park policy.

And from an environmental view standpoint, so I thought that was helpful to know that some of those that not all of us have necessarily experts in the park service does have an expertise in those things and they do take those things in consideration when reviewing any sort of change or development in the park. But some of the issues that were raised and as Jim mentioned that I think were valuable were some things like, you know, paying attention to sound. Right? Paying attention to noise and when we lease buildings, should there be some consideration of hours of operation or hours, you know, when which noise should stop because, for example, we talked about the fact that there are places that may serve alcohol and food in the long run. Well, when you ever alcohol and food you tend to have entertainment. Have we considered that? Have we considered outdoor entertainment? Should there be a time limit on when the noise should end? I don't think we had in any detailed way but that's something we should factor into our decision making going forward.

Similarly with lighting at what point should ambient lighting be considered in the long-term decision making in the various uses that may occupy for Hancock. Things like that I think are important things to consider going forward as we look at individual leases, and I think again, we learned that a lot of those factors are considered by the park service already, but a few issues, I think, were raised are important for us to consider as we go lesion by lesion, building by building and ask what uses are going to be there. Some of the factors considered another one is the introduction of nonnative plant species. The park service already has a policy on that, but we haven't discussed that issue as people move in and open their own businesses maybe we wouldn't have caught or controlled or addressed in a lease necessarily if that issue hasn't been raised. I think those are examples of things that came up during those discussions that were valuable that enhance the project don't hinder in any significant way but might not have come up if we haven't gone through that process.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks, Tony, that's helpful.

Let me see if there are, again, any, if any of the working group want to fold in with some thoughts or other questions or comments, observations from the committee members.

I'll just fold in as well some observations I've been helping to facilitate all those, and then things that just jumped at me at high-level issues that came occupy. A lot of conversation around -- a lot of calls for using best available science and practices, you know, Jim talked about the need to manage adaptively. That was definitely theme. Limiting vehicle impacts came up a number of times. The social equity impacts piece that Jen raised came up a number of times. Again, maybe this isn't quite the right group but it's a really important issue that the park service and you all as a committee should be thinking about. A number of comments around, you know, how do you account for unexpected effects. We can try to anticipate what we can up front but there's always anticipate how that is handled. Again, some high-level themes that came up. I'm seeing something in the Q and A.

I'll just note in the Q and A, Eileen said Jim did a nice job summarizing, so thank you Ilene for weighing in on that. Any other questions or comments from committee members?

I'm stunned by the lack of conversation here and I'm loathe to let go, because this group, I know you all will sit with the documents that patty put together but there's a tremendous exchange of information and there are a lot of really good thoughts, concerns and strategies recommended in

there that I think the committee would do well to give very, very careful consideration and thought to. Gary, why don't you jump in.

Gary Cassazza: First, I think the progress is wonderful. I'd like to see us -- well, not us. I'd like to see someone present to the group a time frame with goals on it. Because one of the comments that to have this open indefinitely is on the money and very important. And I think as a group we should say this is what we want to accomplish by this date. This is what we want to accomplish by this date and keep on moving along and at least they are goals. If you have a goal post you know where you're going but if it's vague it's not good for anyone. And that's the only thing I would like to add to the meeting. And I think doing well making great progress, but I need to (indiscernible). Bennett Brooks: That's really drawing on the comment we heard during the public comment portion of -- you don't want it to feel open ended. What's the time frame and deadlines. I don't know Jen if you want to jump in on it.

Jen Nersesian: No, actually I want to jump in on the working group and the things that Jim just went through, and just encourage the committee to think about how, you know, what's coming out of the working group informs your recommendations to the park service. How understanding these permanently but not solely environmental concerns, should shape our approaches and our thinking. And all that being said, I've been in all the meeting, Patti, and we in the park service are hearing and benefitting from understanding, you know, these concerns.

But I think it's important that the committee has a chance to absorb these and use them in their advice to us and it's as well as guidance. That may take a little more sitting with the recommendations, but, you know, as a committee also tell us what you need in terms of this connection with more working group, with this advisory body to you in your advisory role to us, to be able to fold these recommendations to any recommendations you have to the park service. I think there are a lot of things in there that for instance, you know, come into play as we develop these terms, you know, that make it clear that expectation and, of course, you have to confirm to all laws and policy, but maybe there are some clearer ways we could ensure that people understand what that mean.

In our management of the leasing program, are there things that we should be paying more attention to or be taking a different approach with. You know, this is, you know, a group of good minds and experience in the environmental role. We got historic expertise too, I encourage you to take advantage of it and not all of them are on today and they are being a little red dent as well, but I want to make sure we're taking best advantage of this expertise and willingness to participate.

>> Jen --

>> Hang on one second.

Shawn Welch: No, hold on one second. It occurred to me that maybe our members, that's a long list of items that was shown briefly on the screen. How many of our members actually feel comfortable accessing the list without it sitting in front of them on paper? That's a lot of stuff. We see it briefly, I mean, Jerry and I have seen this ad nauseam because we have been at every one of meeting but I superintendent people like Chris, Patrick and Carolyn and they are probably looking at this and their eyes are glazing over. Is there a way to maybe e-mail the document or something because there's a lot here.

Maybe it's something that continues, you know, into the next meeting as well, as people have a chance to absorb this, we can come back and, you know, couldn't to inform the committees thinking, recommendation, but I throw it out there even in that context. Is there anything else you want to ask now of the working group or anything else -- just want to make sure that we see this opportunity.

Bennett Brooks: Shawn, and I think your point's an excellent one. If it hasn't been sent around but if it hasn't we can certainly send around and give people five or 10 minutes to look at it and see if anything that comes up for them and Jen what I was going to ask a moment ago is there anything jumps out that is very time sensitive for the working group to sort of talk about today just because of where, you know, where things are in the leasing process. If there were anything on point that would be I think might be helpful for the committee to hear. In the interim perhaps Daphne if you

haven't already maybe you can shoot around to the committee members. And I think we have our co-chair, Gerry, I think, is on the phone and wants to jump in.

Gerry Glaser: I'm sorry. I had to jump in and out of the meeting all morning and I heard many pieces and certainly not enough of it. I just want to take a moment to thank the working group and all those that participated today for all that they've done and especially wanted to call out the work that the park has done to inform what the working group was able to learn. I wanted to emphasize for everyone listening some of the things that Tony just mentioned.

The park goes to extraordinary lengths already to preserve the cultural and ecological heritage of the parks and those things are of primary importance. I was constantly amazed at the efforts that the park goes to, to make sure those issues are addressed. I wanted to emphasize that. I wanted to thank the park for all that they do. And also to add to one of the things that Tony mentioned and not only are many of those already anticipated by the park, but the park has an extensive set of rules and guidelines and so forth that become part of everyone who takes on it's a requirement that they adhere to those conditions and responsibilities. So, we should all be aware of that. Their stewardship and I want to thank Jen and the court for all that they do, and sorry to jump in at the last second.

Jim Krauss: Yes, I'll apologize if I went through that rather quickly because I was under the understanding that the document had been sent out to all of the FACA members on Monday afternoon. And I would suggest that everybody look at it and that we put it on the agenda for at least a few minutes if not half an hour or so at the next FACA meeting so we can get more input from everybody else.

And secondly, I just want to -- I know it's maybe too much emphasis but what Tony and Gerry have said about what the park is already doing is just -- was so astounding and that almost without exception all of the working group recommendations were merely things to be added first-degree the leasing program comes through. And they are doing what's needed to be done currently to keep the park, maybe pristine is not the right word -- but do the right job at the park considering its current configuration. So, thank you.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks. All right.

Shawn Welch: I just checked all my e-mail and I think the last e-mail out of the working group material actually went to the working group on Monday. I don't think the committee has actually seen that ahead of time. And it dawned on me looking at the various spaces here, realizing they were looking at and going oh, my.

Bennett Brooks: That's -- accounts for a lot of things, yeah, all right. Let me ask you this, can somebody hit send on it real quick and can all our fellow committee members or the majority get to that, take a five-minute break, look at it and see if something jumps out on them. Chris, Tony, Gerry, is that reasonable?

Karolyn?

>> Sounds good to me.

Karolyn Wray: It would definitely be good to see, but like Anthony said it's really a compilation of the parks and the FACA has been kind of revealing over the past ten years, so it's not -- I'm not so much glazed over. I just think that it's nice they got to a point where it is in a nice document for everybody to go through and read.

Shawn Welch: Okay. In other words, you don't have any major points on this that we need to take action on.

Bennett Brooks: Okay, and my understanding is that Daphne just sent out the document that you're looking at to each of the faculty committee members, so you have that.

Jim, did you want to come back in or is that a left-over hand? Maybe a left-over hand. Okay. I personally would love to give folks five or 7 minutes just to look over a little more. I know we can and will and must come back at the next FACA committee meeting, but I think it's worth spending a few minutes and see if there's anything in there that strikes any of you to fold any recommendation you might want to make today. That's the value here. Is there anything that feels immediate and timely that would be important to fold in. I think, Sean, that's kind of what you're getting at too. Okay, if that sounds okay, to folks and Gerry I understand you're driving and in a car. Let me encourage you not to read it, but you can listen to the conversation. Happens all the time.

Gerry: All the commuters would be a very bad idea.

Bennett Brooks: But if folks want to take a few minutes now and just open up your e-mail and we'll just kind of hit pause for a few minutes and let folks read.

(Pause in proceeding.)

If any committee member does not have that, please come off mute and tell us so quick get it to you. But if you are not seeing in your e-mail, let us know.

(Pause in proceeding.)

Why don't folks take another minute or two and we'll open it up and see if there's any questions object thoughts by folks. If folks have finished reading if you could put a thumbs up in your corner or maybe you can't do that in a webinar. Raise a hand, and then I'll know committee members that you read it. Good. Looks like we're seeing that. Now, you can lower your hands again and let's open this up and I would love to hear additional questions you might have that you all read about or any thoughts that are percolating for you that is something you think the committee might be recommending as part of the discussion today. Let's open up to committee members. Let's bring in Chris and then Michael.

Chris, you're on mute. I need you to come off.

Chris Doxey: What jumped out at me on this list is the disturbance of the migratory wildlife. Sandy Hook has a beautiful wonderful ecosystem and we must be aware of the lighting and the noise and the habitat such as the piping birds, their habitat, we can't disturb them at certain times of year. I was thinking maybe a distribution of literature as indicated on the charts to all leasees, you know, slant tenants. So they understand just how important these points are to the entire ecosystem and the balance of nature.

Call it literature with the lease or something like that, but I think they should be given a handout or pointed to a Website that tells them that the migratory wildlife and they should be, you know, should watch the tape or, you know, cognizant of the of the literature that is given out so it will not be disturbed. I think that's very, very important.

Bennett Brooks: Great. Thank you. Michael.

Michael Walsh: Yeah, a couple points to sort of echo what Chris said. This may or may not already be addressed in the lease. I think most of the issues that Chris are talking about and the working group are talking about are covered in the rule that is relate to the park at Sandy Hook with respect to piping clovers and with respect to noise, I think those all are in the park rules and perhaps may already been addressed but the park service may want to think about including this the lease any leasee subject to all the rules and to, to extent this they have subtenants that those subtenants are also made aware of in writing in the lease, the sublease, that they are required to follow the rules of the park. I think that would go a long way to addressing, because I think the park has very good rules with respect to these particular issues and I think that list provided by the working group evidence to that.

Adds a side comment with respect to people's comments about noise and light pollution and all the rest there seems to be an indication that if we allow for restaurants or bars that will create a huge disturbance, I guess, I would just point to our local bars in Seabright and highlands, you know, I can think of ones that are very popular, you know, the proving ground in highlands and Tommy's in red bank, neither of one is open extremely late, nor do I think they have loud music playing, nor do I think they have loud blaring lights. If people are concerned that there's going to be a big noise bar in Sandy Hook, going late night, and I don't think that will be likely. I mean, even when the seagulls nest was open that did not go late and it was not a big noise and/or light producing area. While certainly it's something rules park service will put in place or limit any of that. I think from an economic point of view that restaurant or bar owner would be overly concerned about limitations that would limit late night noise and/or light.

Just from local experience to the excellent people on this call are not local to the area, I don't think that will be a major concern.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks Michael. Other comments or questions that folks want to raise at this point. Jen, anything you want to fold in?

Okay, I guess, a question I want to raise to you all, the working group on any number of occasions as Jen pointed out and raised issues around -- sorry. One of the important flags that the working group hasn't talked about is equity and social justice and they acknowledge we may not be the right people to do it anterior we're certainly not broadly the right people so, you know, we said we would raise that issue here today, and I think it would be very helpful to get a sense from the committee as how you would like Jen and her team to think about and tackle those issues and whether, you know, is that something that the working group, you know, plus others should be tackling? Is it something everyone different? They are important issues. We hear again and, again, in the context of different leasing proposals and I think it would appropriate to hear the committee thoughts on that and I don't know Jen if you want to add but seems important topic to get feedback on.

>>

Jen Nersesian: Sure. I think there are a lot of dimension to this topic. It certainly remits to our discussions about affordable housing and bird sense looking at access for a variety of economic demographic entry points. I think it's much broader than that. I think it's about, you know, all kinds of equity and access. I think it speaks to racial and ethnic diversity, which is something we struggle with often in the park and in the park service, making sure that we're accessible as accessible to everybody.

Our current group may not be the right one to speak to all of those issues. I think we want to think broadly about this and have some useful recommendations come out of it. Anything that the committee is thinking in terms of composition or any expertise that we might need to bring into inform those kind of discussions is well. I think it also relate to the issue that comes up about privatization or the perception or fear that we are private tiding the park. I want to make clear once again that, you know, everyone will still have access to Sandy Hook. This will not be a gated community.

What we are looking at will preserve a landscape and exterior of the building for everybody to enjoy, and everyone will still be able to walk the grounds and, you know, feel what it felt like to be at the historic post in its day. So that's what we're after. But, you know, we really could use some help and additional thinking on how best to achieve that in the way that serves all of the visitors ().

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Jen. Committee members. Any thoughts on that, do you have concepts on how to explore that, or even yes, that is important. I think some signal from you all would be very helpful and useful particularly at this juncture. It's timely, and I think it would be good to get some thoughts from you all before this meeting ends. Chris did you want to jump in or is that left over hand?

Chris Doxey: I think it's very important to try and explain to people that the word privatization is not the appropriate word for this project. I have defended this so many times at social gatherings or

just being out to dinner with friends. You'd be surprised how many people just think it's being privatized, and they shut their mind down and that's it. If there's a way or some kind of campaign or program that we could put out there to explain that the entire Fort Hancock is not going to be privatized and they'll be able to go out there and enjoy the park as they have in the past, that might be helpful and I think maybe to work on that first and have the project more accepted by people who are, you know, told how to understand it would be helpful.

BENNETT BROOKS: Chris, in addition, to that, do you have thoughts on how the park service might engage on this issue of social equity and justice is the idea of bringing, you know, create new table or bring more voice to the working group. Any thoughts on that.

(Simultaneous talking).

Chris Doxey: I think the working group is doing a fabulous job. Thinking of everything that, you know, should be considered in this project. I enjoy their reports very, very much. And I can't think of anything else, but I think that would be maybe meeting, a meeting or a presentation out at the hook to explain to people that the park is still there's. This is just to save historic building, you know, and enrich the park. Not to take it away from the people that use it. I think that has to be explained a little bit more.

Bennett Brooks: Go ahead, Gerry.

Gerry Glaser: Sorry for interrupting. I'd like to support strongly what Chris just said. And also maybe provide a couple possible solutions. On the social equity issue we have a long way to go how resolve and address that. But it's just one of many that I think we can begin to look at with the people that we are on the committee to represent. And I've said this before, by I would like to emphasize that each of us on the committee are there because there are constituents in our communities and in our circles of influence in we are urged to interact with. And I'm thinking that each of us could arrange for meetings within that group we represent we are members of local municipalities, elected officials or just a part of other larger organizations. I think now is the time for us to reach out to those people that we have been asked to represent and get the word out about the park about the gated community issues and so forth. Get that word out. At the same time I would also burden the park with the responsibility helping us convene some other meetings, community meetings, visit bureaus and townships when they have their regular township meeting and help try to get the word out that way. We have done some of that in the past, but this is the good time to reemphasize that rule that we all have. Thanks.

Bennett Brooks: Thanks, Gerry. Let's go to Michael and then Gary.

Michael Walsh: I feel like I'm taking up too much of the committee's time, but a couple things on this T. I think there's a history to the fort that it's one of the early integrated military facilities in the United States in the history of the fort should be, you know, emphasized to the extent that it's part of it is accurate and, you know, should be broadcast, and Jen, I hate to, you know, you've asked the committee for help and I'm afraid I'm going to turn back to you a little bit because I have to think or at least hope that the park service or at large or the department of interior at large has done some work or tries to do some work on how to make public facilities like the gateway national park more accessible to communities that are not necessarily the wealthy communities in the area. And to the excellent if there's somebody like that, maybe invite them to speak to this group to speak to people in the area somehow bring the work, education, maybe the department of interior has done with respect to how to make the parks attractive to a broader community. If that does exist, perhaps we can get them involved in this project, and to the excellent that it doesn't exist, perhaps you can make the recommendation to the Department of Interior the assessment how to expand the community of the park service.

>> Gary.

Gary Cassazza: Thank you. I look at my role to have two responsibilities have the meeting and give input and even more important get out to the community and communicate to the community what's going on and sell to it community because I believe it's a good item and to explain to, to them. Communication is very different than it was years ago. I think a short YouTube video of highlights a short YouTube videos of what's going on and then a long one if people want more information that each time we have a meeting we add to it so if someone knows nothing about the project and they watch the short one they can be told click here and you can get more detail. So much information that's great. Showing great information about the telephones and people get excited about that. That's what we want. We want excitement about the project and that helps everybody in the end. Thank you.

Bennett Brooks: Okay. Chris is your hand back up.

Chris Doxey: I have worked for the federal service for about 25 years. And every agency does have a public affairs department so why couldn't you approach the Department of Interior to help us with this?

Bennett Brooks: I'm a little mindful of time. We are now about a half hour from adjourning. I know there's one more piece for Jen to cover. I want to stay where we're at right now because I feel like there's some recommendation that that have been coming up here that we should run to ground and see what you all want to put forward. And so some of them we discussed and should revisit before the break. I've captured them and can share them, and I think there's a few that have come up in this most recent conversation around, you know, issues around privatization and some sort of outreach equity issues, and I can talk those through in a second. There's one issue that came up and I want to throw it back to the community, which is this issue around time frame. And that's an important issue, I can't recall which working group member, sorry which committee members brought that up after the public comment, but I do want to see if there's anything there that the committee wants to weigh-in on. Gary and Patrick.

Gary: By having a time frame, we commit to a goal. When we have a goal it's usually (indiscernible) then when you don't.

Bennett Brooks: Let me go to Patrick and Jen, I don't know if you -- what would be useful to the park service on that point, but Patrick let's go to you.

Patrick Collum: There's some name to put a timeline so this doesn't spin out indefinitely and we never get to closure on these issues. I think we have to also look at the side of the leasees and as Roy said earlier, he has some restraints as far as what type of -- before heck move forward -- what type of financial commitment is he going to get from the parks department and from other outside sources for such things as lower end housing. He can't be boxed in by a timeline that he can't control. I warrant too balance all of that. Whatever it is has to be tempered by that constraint.

Bennett Brooks: Anyone care to take a stab at anything? Or it can be an issue you flagged that you are not ready to weigh-in on today, which is also okay, you will meet again, and this process will still be ongoing. Jim and Linda -- actually, Linda, we haven't heard much or at all from you today.

Linda Cohen: Can you see me? Hear me?

Bennett Brooks: Yeah, welcome.

Linda Cohen: Hello. I have to express this at this point. I think that in the discussion public sentiment I have personally in my neighborhood experienced this as an Anthony M. well knows

and that is that there is a separate responsibility for those people who are leasing part time or Airbnb manner. These are different people than different people that have come into Fort Hancock, live there and take care of it and maintain and share it. And I think we have to make that distinction in order to get on the right side of public sentiment. I think it's a crucial issue. I've been working out at Fort Hancock for almost 30 years I'm there now it's marvelous but in great despair everyone that come there is wants to see it fixed up. But I do think if we have day by day residents it will be a transient area without the caring and lack of foundation that we need there. Can you hear me?

BENNETT BROOKS: I said, thank you. Yeah, thank you. Jim.

Jim Krauss: I would love to have a timeline, but I don't think we can set a timeline without having information, and the two significant pieces of information in my mind are what's a realistic assessment of when these buildings are going to collapse due to lack of maintenance? When the park service can actually button them up so they don't collapse, and whether, and how long the park service can -- needs to have in order to assess whether it can meet Mr. Stillman's requirement that the park service come up with some more funds and, you know, that I think in order to set a realistic time frame you need to do that, or you take the other approach would be -- I don't care, and I'm going to set an arbitrary timeline and then just open it up to other -- other potential lessor. I'm not so much in favor of that because I think the Stillman proposal might be our only savior at this point.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay, let me, if I can, take a cut but before I do that, I'm going to you Jen I saw your hand up pop up. And then potential recommendations. And.

Jen Nersesian: I want to comment on the last notion of setting time frames, and we have talked about this in the committee meetings in the past in terms of how long is too long before letter of intent instead of renewing it or put the building back outside. And what we concluded as long as we're continuing to move forward and making progress and the party we're working with is making the good faith effort to move the project forward we're going to stay in it. With the Stillman project and as we discussed we got a number of them seem committed to following through on. I don't know if we have exact timeline is going to be. We need to get them into do condition assessment on the rest of the build can, understand what the costs are going to be, understand what the rehabilitation project looks like, and look at this it rattle as they developed a business model. Understanding what it is level of investments that needs to be made. And what, you know, kind of revenue can the use of the building generate to offset that investment and whether that is, you know, any kind of affordable housing model or market rate or, you know, has set asides included as some combination thereof. You know, we still need to work through the whole financial equation.

Those are, you know, the next steps that this project would go through. Exactly how much time? I don't know. I would be hesitant at this point in time to set a drop-dead date beyond which we're going to if we're still legitimately working towards this together, and everybody is showing a good faith effort to move forward. I appreciate that committee in some ways wanting to hold our feet to the fire and keep the park service moving on this because we more than anybody else perhaps know how sometimes slow the wheels of bureaucracy work. But we are certainly committed to keeping this moving forward in a way that keeps the project alive the private partner that is used to working in different timeline. All that being said, I want to -- maybe that's a segue where we come to some recommendation from the committee. I just didn't want to lose the discussions we in the past how long we hang onto letters of intent.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Well let me, again I'm trying to capture what you all have saying here, and Shawn said earlier and I'm not sure I didn't get it right. What I would like to do is take 15 minutes we had set aside from comments and use that for round table confirmation if I may because I think that's really what we need to come away with today. I'm going to share my screen. And walk-through what I have written here, and you can all tell me if you got it right, close to right. This obviously needs to make sense to you all. And three things specific to the proposal, other specific leasing activity, and where he will relative leasing activity which draws on the last conversation.

Specifically, to the Stillman project proposal and this is quite similar to what we captured before the break but pulls in a few things from the more recent conversation and some helpful edits from Shawn. The committee encourages collaboration and staff to further explore liability. As this work move to next stage, the committee ask to consider the following. One potential for and viability of the project to accommodate a mix of housing types and needs affordable, senior, Veteran, etcetera.

(Reading from material).

Shawn Welch: One pause for you. Stick in their telephones and electric because it is not about telephones and sinks sticking in front. Telephones and electric. That's good enough.

BENNETT BROOKS: Got it. (Reading from material). And the last one is most recent conversation. (Reading from material). This is Tony to your comment a lot of stuff is in there. Make sure that it's, you know, on board. And then I don't know if this makes sense or not, but the committee recognizes setting deadline for executing lease to ensure progress but -- (reading from material). I'm going to pause on that before I walk-through the other pieces and see does this capture where you're at? Changes, addition, revisions, things to drop. Patrick, and then Gary.

Patrick Collum: I'd like to comment on the section on user fees for bus transportation. That is a state requirement of the board of Ed to provide the transportation. They cannot charge. I don't know how we can fix that in, and I don't know if the board can accept money, you know, to pay for transportation for a student.

Jen Nersesian I'll remind the committee too. This is a big topic of discussion when we had a number of meeting that is focused on taxes and the taxes that are being levied and what those moneys would go towards and one of the items that came up was, you know, there may be school age children.

BENNETT BROOKS: Tony, did you want to jump in on this point. I saw your hand go up.

>> Yes.

>> Did you say Gary?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I said Toni. I saw his hand go up, and then

I'll come back to Gary.

Tony Mercantante: I get it. The issue is going to be here, I think, you have very, very few, if any, so you may be sending a school bus out to for two students. They might be, one might be middle school and one elementary school and different times for pick ups, and it can be complicated. And I do know for example if you have military base in communities they will pay community impact fees because there's general impact on those communities. I'm not saying it can be required. I don't think so. And you're right that the school district has obligation to provide the transportation, but I would think some consideration about the fact that you have such a small number of children

requiring a school bus. Might want to think about some consideration for comp setting the cost of that school district.

BENNETT BROOKS: I wonder, you used a phrase there, if more general a juncture to say explore potential for community impact fees.

Tony Mercantante: Exactly.

BENNETT BROOKS: And sort of go generic there and rather than -- Even though we know significant impacts would be, but generic community impact fee would probably make some sense.

Jen Nersesian: And someone had mentioned things like garbage, snow removal, whole host of services that the park will be providing, you know, that are typically covered by the local municipality. We have talked about aside from the first five building released off the hook for this try to generate some interest early on, that the rest of the building would have a charge associated with the lease, may not tense knee and that may not cover everything needed to support the functioning but would help offset some of the costs.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Do folks feel -- well, Gary why don't you jump in here.

Gary Cassaza: My comment is again about the time frame. If you look at what Jen has accomplished and had obtained. Tremendous accomplishments in the last year. If you made a time frame afterwards I think that will help you understand how to make a time frame forward. And the time frame has two different parts. It has a legal part for the developer. He has five years, 10 years as an option to get these properties but not past that. I don't think this group should get into that. That's a discussion between a developer and whoever handles contracts issues there. But the goal is moving target. Even if you put something down on it, I don't want you to look at it that's written in stone. And if anything give yourself more time. At least by having a goal it gives you something. Good job.

>>

BENNETT BROOKS: And Gary, so does this language here which articulate the value of it but says we don't know enough does that seem helpful or point.

Gary Cassaza: It does. I want to stress the difference between the two and it's not something that can be written in stone at this point.

BENNETT BROOKS: Got it. Okay.

Gary Cassaza: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Does this work as is?

Gary Cassaza: Yes.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Others, Chris, was that a yes or were you going to say something else.

Chris Doxey: No, I want to ask you if you could perhaps change the word economic viability to further explore project viability. It kind of sounds like it's not -- to me that's a negative.

BENNETT BROOKS: I just need to know what to change it to.

>> Project continuation.

>> Or how about advancement.

Chris Doxey: Advancement, continuation. Yeah that sounds better.

BENNETT BROOKS: There we go. Thanks.

Shawn Welch: Based on what Gary said before the very last section if we change deadline to goal.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. You want to say time specific goal sits clear what the goal is?

>> Yes.

>> Sure, yes.

BENNETT BROOKS: Anyone else want to weigh-in? Are folks, everyone good with this first one?

>> Yes.

BENNETT BROOKS: The next one there was a this one which I'm highlighting here. (Reading from material) encourages and supports and I felt like there was something else I missed there. This is a pretty straight forward one and there was a lot of support for that, but I just want to pause and see if folks are good with that recommendation.

>> **Yes.**

Bennett Brooks: In terms of that recommendation, I'd like to hear specifically from the committee if we get to the point of being ready to sign a lease between now and the next advisory committee meeting on building 25, which is the first in the queue of all those. Does anybody have reservations about us moving forward.

Shawn Welch: Sign it. Move forward. Do not let any moss grow under your feet.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Then in the last conversation just kind of relative to general leasing activity and I don't think if you captured or important to include. I have one. Service should increase the efforts to address the public concerns and misconceptions to leasing activity equaling privatization or triggering concerns, I don't know.

Shawn Welch: I would stick in there privatization and Congress intent this be a vehicle to observe important historic structures because this is statutory structure created by Congress to preserve. We should highlight that.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay, sorry. Let me -- I'm going to put that on pause for one second and go backwards on the other leasing activity I think I want to capture design and approach being taken with building and recommend and park service.

Shawn Welch: Sign leases as appropriate.

BENNETT BROOKS: Sign leases as appropriate.

>> And particularly I called out building 25. It's up to you what you want to recommend.

Shan Welch: Put in parenthesis building 25 as appropriate paren such as building 25. Undo that.

Hit undo.

BENNETT BROOKS: Further recommends that NPS sign leases as appropriate.

Shawn Welch: Paren such as building 25. Does that cover you, Jen?

Jen Nersesian: Well, it lets me know that's what you support, yes, and again, if anybody has any reservations or concerns let me know now because that's -- that's the one that's first in the queue and could happen sooner than later.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you for letting me go backwards here. Just to finish the second half of that. Double their own effort to better address concerns. Several of you talked about that.

Gerry Glaser: I have some wordsmithing on that one. NPS should increase efforts to address public concerns as needed and any misperception that the public access to park resources ask facilities would be restricted by the leasing program. I tried to write down the words. Didn't come out quite right.

>>

BENNETT BROOKS: That sounded pretty good. I just didn't get it all.

(Simultaneous talking).

Gerry Glaser: Would be limited -- by leasing activities.

BENNETT BROOKS: I think I got that.

Gerry Glaser :Yeah, I don't think you need privatization word in there.

BENNETT BROOKS: National Park Service should increase efforts to (reading from material) would be limited by leasing activities Further, Committee members should redouble their own individual efforts to better address such concerns. further committee members double -- to address such concerns. Michael.

>> Can you hear me?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Yeah.

Michael Walsh: I guess I would be a little bit concerned about saying that it would not be limited in any way of course, the lease limits and, of course, the -- yes of course, the public is not going to be able to wonder around these buildings so that would not be unduly limited but I would take away any way because leasing activities should limit public access to some part of those buildings so just be careful about that.

BENNETT BROOKS: Looks okay with that line.

Gerry Glaser: I'm sorry. I'm not going to be -- I'm not going to disagree with that wording exactly, but one of the things that have been raised in past people wouldn't be able to walk the grounds near occupied building and that is the restriction that is not accurate and that I wanted to try to address in that point.

>> I agree.

Gerry Glaser: You can still walk around on the parade grounds and along the bay side of the officer building.

>> Agreed.

Shawn Welch: I think we need something in there that gets to the congressional intent of current legislation that empowers the park service to use leasing as key method of preservation. Somewhere in there we got to get that because the hostility of privatization undoes the intent of our legislature, and this goes back a long ways leasing is a viable option to preserving facilities. How do we get that --

BENNETT BROOKS: I need to do a quick time check. We are running out of time in two minutes here. I don't want the committee to sort of drift off. I feel like maybe we just -- we have to put a pause on these last two, and you come back and address it unless you can quickly do it right now but I'm very mindful of time.

Gerry Glaser: I'm good with the changes we got for that general leasing activity. I agree with your point, but I think that's a different one we're trying to make in that recommendation.

Shawn Welch: I think it gets to the public concerns part of what the public needs to hear is this a formal vehicle that has been approved by our legislature to do preservation. I mean a lot of people -- they are bristling at privatization but that in fact was a major effort by our government to enable preservation. We shouldn't let that go away.

BENNETT BROOKS: And, again, I got to jump in again, I need to ask Jen or Daphne can we go past our end time relative to the committee discussing recommendations. I really want to make sure.

Daphne Yun: Yes, as far as you're allowed to go past, you're not allowed to start before.

BENNETT BROOKS: Then I quickly want to gauge from the committee members first Jen, are you able to stay on longer.

Jen Nersesian: I can stay on for a little bit longer. I don't want us to run too far over because, you know, I'm concerned people scheduled around this, members of public who joined us.

BENNETT BROOKS: Same here. Is there any committee member who has to jump off in one minute. Okay. Let's give ourselves ten minutes more and not more than that, I think, let's say quarter after but not a drop beyond that. So, let's go back up here (to the recommendation). We have a couple of different ideas being put on the table whether what we have now is sufficient or whether that needs to be expanded. Anyone else want to weigh in?

Chris Doxey: The public knows the term privatization due to all of the news articles they've read over the years, They're not going to understand this last paragraph. You need to somehow incorporate the word privatization for them to understand that.

Shawn Welch- How about this Chris, put after leases- privatization (in parantheses). Good link.

Jen Nersesian: I'd also call out for folks on the line to and look at the chat. We're having a dialogue about the questions of privatization and it shows how some people view it. What that word means to certain people.

Chris: It shows how it's perceived. They need to see the word privatization. It was a lovely way to write the paragraph- but won't be understood.

Jen Nersesian – I don't mean in the chat, I mean in the Q & A.

Gerry –I don't think it's appropriate to put the word in parentheses It implies that the leasing activities are is privatization. And I know that word has been thrown around to describe it, that's not what it is. I would prefer we find some way to note that creation of private (I don't know) if you want to use the word privatization we have to say that privatization is not the goal of the leasing program.

Shawn Welch: It's confused with that. It's often confused with privatization. I understand where Chris is at, that folks are globbing on to the word privatization and smash that into the conversation. We could say this is confused with privatization.

Gerry Glaser: Chris I don't think it's accurate to assert that it's a privatization project, but I do agree that that's what's in all of the headlines.

Chris Doxey- That's what they've been fed

Gerry Glaser: I'm trying to find a way not to feed that anymore. But that's a challenge to insert that word.

Chris Doxey: Previously referred to as privatization

Gerry Glaser: That still implies the leasing activities are privatization, but they're not.

Chris Doxey: Even if we said previously?

Shawn: What would you confuse with privatization? What is it if it's not privatization?

Bennett Brooks:

Jim Krauss- Privatization is the P word – it should not be used. In the environmental world used to use Dredge spoils – bad word now use dredge materials– leasing program, leasing activities – not the p word in any form. If anyone talks about privatization, you should tell them this is a leasing program.

Chris: Okay- then they'll have to relearn

Linda Cohen; You could say the National Park Service should increase its efforts to address the public's concerns about privatization.

Chris – yes

Bennett : as needed and any misperceptions that public access to Park resources and facilities would be unduly limited by leasing activities.

Gerry agreed that this was better.

Karen Edelman: Need to include a sentence that explains that leasing is an action to adaptively reuse historic structures that we have an obligation to preserve and protect.

Shawn: Leasing is a statutory action. This implies that it is backed up in law, which it is.

Karen- Leasing is an action governed by law and regulation which allows the park service to ...

Gerry – This is why we have a lawyer

Pete McCarthy: Privatization -people look at leasing and get caught. We should be talking about hammering home and pairing it with reuse. Leasing is how we can bring in reuse- reuse to preserve and protect. Leasing is the tool.

Bennett Brooks – 8 more minutes. We have something close. We want to be careful that the committee is developing the recommendations. Formed by expertise from the park service.

Pretty good as is. Are you all good with this?

Agreement from committee members.

Last one- NPS should work with the Department of the Interior to ensure it's using the best available methods to reach out to communities not now benefiting from the park.

Chris asked if this would open the flood gates?

Shawn agreed that this was good.

Chris said it's one more option for advertisement and to leave it in.

Shawn- agreed.

Bennett- I'll send these out. Are folks good with it?

Two other next steps – post and share the slides- Daphne or someone from NPS will do that. Stillman will get back with min/max number of residents. I almost forgot about the general updates – Jen, do you want to share those?

Jen – general updates.

Next week tomorrow is our birthday. 50 years to the day when Gateway was created with enabling legislation.

We have had special programming, events, and activities for months to mark this milestone and will continue to do so for months to come but wanted to call that out.

I just wanted to quickly give updates on projects. The Roofs stabilization project for Officer's row bids are due today. \$2.5 m investment into these Officer's Row buildings.

We have some other major projects are the chapel seawall and Officer's Row seawall, two contiguous pieces of infrastructure protection nearing end of design. They represent – a \$28 M investment in long term resiliency of the main post area of Fort Hancock.

Also in design is the wastewater project at Sandy Hook. That's a \$11.5 million investment. We replaced the sewer plant after Hurricane Sandy so this is specifically about the pipes underground

Another \$7 M for the water well project a \$9 million project to put electrical lines underground. Should help with long term resilience as well, if you are at Sandy Hook often you know how many times there are power outages.

We are queuing up a project heading into contracting for repairs to the MUP addressing cracks and holes, and have some other smaller projects.

These coastal infrastructure, water, electric projects not only support the visitors but also have an impact on the leasing program. That's it.

Bennett Brooks: At time- Gerry or Shawn, do you have anything to share?

Gerry Glaser Farwell and thank you. Sorry I missed some of the meeting, but my friends will fill me in.

Shawn Welch: absolutely

Bennett Brooks: we'll work to figure out the next full committee meeting but also workshops. Thanked the working group members.