

FORT HANCOCK 21st CENTURY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
7 December 2018, 9 AM

Recommendations- to DOI Headquarters

- Related to Deferred Maintenance
 - GATE has the largest deferred maintenance portfolio of any park in the country and Fort Hancock accounts for a major share of that deficit. Members of DOI's Fort Hancock's 21st Century Advisory committee have been working since 2013 to support park efforts to grapple with this problem. To facilitate the implementation of action-oriented solutions to address deferred maintenance requirements at Fort Hancock and other NPS sites, the committee recommends that the Fort Hancock Leasing Program be formally designated as a site to pilot, test and measure outcomes of new and creative NPS leasing initiatives.
 - A key component of this recommendation includes the delegation of various leasing-related administrative authorities to the Commissioner, National Parks of New York Harbor.
 - Prospects of new budget appropriations for NPS to address deferred maintenance backlogs are exciting and necessary. However, proper and efficient administration of those resources requires ensuring adequate supporting human and technical resources. The committee recommends that NPS take whatever actions necessary to ensure that new budgetary resources be accompanied by administrative authorities and staffing resources necessary to accomplish the deferred maintenance goals.
- Related to Officers Row
 - Fort Hancock's iconic Officers Row buildings are the most visible (and most challenging to restore) of all the properties in the leasing program. To encourage greater interest in these structures by potential lessees the committee recommends that NPS prioritize its own investment in critical building infrastructure. Such investment would signal the strength of the agency's commitment-and improve their marketability.

Recommendations – to Gateway Leadership

- Designate a single NPS point of contact to facilitate and expedite responsiveness to the needs of the prospective lessees and others interested in pursuing leasing opportunities.
- Meeting Process Recommendations
 - In recent meetings, the committee invited lessees and potential lessees to speak about their experiences and interactions with NPS as they consider rehabilitation projects. This engagement has been extraordinarily informative. The committee has agreed to restructure the meeting format so that Lessees and/or potential Lessees are included with a comment period as part of the FACA meetings on a consistent basis.
 - Review the recommendations at the end of each meeting for clarity.
 - At the beginning of each meeting, the committee will receive and record member comments related to prior meeting minutes and action items.

- Co-chairs have mandatory rapid turnaround minutes review requirement prior to Gateway staff forwarding to NPS Washington Headquarters.

Action Items:

- Post revised meeting notes for September 7, 2018 and links required to redirect as necessary. Historic Context Briefing with corrections to the recommendations from the September 7, 2018 meeting are already posted to the committee website for the September 7 meeting. At that meeting, the report was referred to the Superintendent, GATE for consideration and action as appropriate. The recommendations themselves (Historic Context Briefing) have been corrected and are posted on the Fort Hancock website.
- Post the Middletown Inspection, Permitting, and Fire Safety Agreement on the FACA Website
- Post renderings for Buildings 23 and 56 on site (coming soon)
- Include the following in the Agenda for the next meeting:
 - Participation by Lessees and potential Lessees with items on the agenda critical to their interests
 - Technical Review Committee
- Gateway should consider a global application for Part 1 of the Tax Credit Application for the Fort Hancock buildings included in the RFP.
- Co-Chairs will follow up with applicants who submitted bid or requests in connection with recent Golden Gate opportunities.

NOTES: Meeting #31
FORT HANCOCK 21st CENTURY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
7 December 2018, 9 AM
Bldg #74 (NOAA administration)

9:08 am Meeting called to order – *Jennifer T. Nersesian, Gateway NRA (GATE) Superintendent and Designated Federal Officer (DFO); Shawn Welch and Gerry Glaser, Committee Co-Chairs. Committee members in attendance include: Gerry Scharfenberger, Dan Saunders, Mary Eileen Fouratt, Anthony Mercantante. Katherine Stevenson, Monmouth County Freeholder Lillian Burry, Dr. Howard Parish, James Krauss, Linda Cohen, Guy Hembling. From NPS: Chief Business Services, Pam McLay; Business Services, Karen Edelman; Public Affairs, Daphne Yun; Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator, Pete McCarthy; Chief Resource Management, Patricia Rafferty. From Congressman Frank Pallone’s Office: Dawn Rebscher, District Field Representative. New Facilitator Bennett Brooks.*

Pledge of Allegiance

Introduction of new Facilitator – Superintendent; Facilitator

Overview of new Minutes Process and timeline – Superintendent

- Changes at the departmental level require that we review and post minutes within one week. Comments from the Committee are required quickly.
- Department of Interior (DOI) is very interested in the on goings of this Committee and are looking at the meeting generated materials
- NPS Washington Services Office (WASO) approval is required in order to post FACA meeting dates in the Federal Register. WASO expressed concern about the meeting planned for January 2019 being so close to this one. We cannot proceed without WASO approval.
- We will get back to the committee with new meeting dates. Not clear whether we will be able to publish multiple dates at one time in Fed Register but we will plan to the best of our ability.
- Comment from Co-Chair: The record of this meeting is now our best way to communicate with SOI. That is a huge change of what we have had over the past five years in the way of communicating with the most senior member of DOI.

Review meeting outcomes of the last meeting (minutes, recommendation, action items)

- Correction to last meeting: Historic Context Briefing recommendations from the last meeting required correction. Recommendations to Improve Alignment dated 09-06-18 is supposed to be replaced with an updated version (remove B and D from the 09-6-2018 version). The recommendations themselves (Historic Context Briefing) have been corrected and posted on the Fort Hancock website.
- Agreed that Committee will issue corrections by bringing them up as topics in the meeting and noting them in the record.
- Regarding the Historic Context Report, Committee agreed with the report and recommended the report be referred to the Park for action the park thinks is appropriate. The Army Ground Forces Association, in alignment with their interpretive agreement with the park, has offered to work with the park regarding the new sign recommendation.
- Going forward:

- 1) From a process standpoint, review any recommendations at the end of the meeting.
- 2) Co-chairs have mandatory review requirement prior to Gateway submitting minutes to Washington.
- 3) Subsequent clarifications will be made to the minutes of subsequent meetings as necessary.

Park update and announcements – Superintendent

- Recent Officers Row (OR) building repairs include roof and porch work on Building 16, roof stabilization on Building 15, 14 and 4, and emergency brick stabilization on Building 6.
- Building 102 rehabilitation as seasonal dorm space is almost complete. The park is going through the punch list. This structure will house 38 seasonals and will be available for other use in off season times.
- The new maintenance facility project is underway. It will result in the rehabilitation of two historic buildings. The \$14 million project should be complete end of summer.
- Gateway awarded a contract for demolition of Beach Area D building. Next steps will consider some kind of pavilion, likely a two story structure with views of the beach. The structure will meet NPS resiliency requirements. Anticipated use is likely to incorporating food service. Next decision point and we will determine whether to issue a competitive opportunity.
- Fort Hancock Theater is now back in the Hurricane Sandy Recovery Program and with other funding sources some rehabilitation work could occur next sometime in 2019/2020 time period.
- Additional paving work is underway and will continue through 2019.
- Revised schematic drawings expected in connection with the Building 7 project have not yet received from Architectural and Engineering Consultant. The challenge that project has become - prolonged timeline and significant costs – may indicate limited NPS resources are better suited towards incentivizing other projects and taking care of roofs and porches of other buildings on Officer's Row. Those drawings will help us make that decision but the ongoing delay may just prove that this money may be best suited for use elsewhere. GATE will strongly consider other options for commitment of funds in the short term.
- The Building #23 and #56 project is moving forward with Monmouth County. The Agreement is with the NPS Washington Office for consideration/award. Drawings provided by the County are moving forward in a positive and encouraging way.
 - Side discussion about osprey habitats among Committee members: Conclusion: Osprey are a species of special concern in the State of NJ. Even though they are not federally protected, we are required to protect nesting habitat. We have been working internally with maintenance to find chimney covers that will blend in with historic landscape and have developed appropriate protocols to limit impact to activities during the construction season.
- Potable Water Treatment Plant is subject to ongoing rehabilitation efforts (this is separate from the sewer plant rehabilitation project). Effort so rehabilitation the Water Treatment Plant roof are underway.
- Contracting is underway for additional Moby beach mats.

- The Ferry Barge is in Brooklyn getting painted and rehabilitated for Spring/Summer 2019 operations.
- NPS just finished rehabilitating roof and masonry at two of the NIKE Radar site buildings. They will be back up and running in 2019.
- The Guardian Park restroom is being rehabilitated. This will be finished in 2019. This building was the former Army Morgue from 1890 to the early 1940s.
- We continue to work with the Sandy Hook Foundation (SHF) and partnering to create new group campsites with some former NIKE radar site barracks buildings. The park will be rehabilitating them together with Helium Act funding that SHF will be matching.
- History House Holiday Programming scheduled for 12/15 and 12/16 is brought to the park in partnership with SHF and Army Ground Forces Association (AGFA).
- It is currently deer rutting season. Please use care driving, particularly at dawn and dusk.
- Shawn Welch added: The potable water plant is a historic structure that is a fundamental resource to the landmark district.

Updates on other topics of recent importance in Department of Interior (DOI):

- Deferred Maintenance (DM) is a big priority in DOI at this time. Internally we have been trying to harness the opportunity to bring more attention to our leasing program and to get the improvements we need to the processes and the program itself.
- Gateway helped set up and participated in an agency wide workshop coming out of the NPS Washington offices facilities division to look at partnership construction processes and with a heavy focus on leasing.
- GATE provided the workshop participants with a lot of information based on our experience, our challenges, and obstacles to help the Washington Office determine how to make improvements to the process. Co-chairs were involved (interviewed, provided comments and participated in panel discussion). This involved a lot of folks from Washington Office who could make changes to the decision making process. Gateway personnel took all the participants through all the challenges of the program and discussed the remedies that could be implemented to address the challenge. Washington Office has hired consultants to move this process forward.
 - An example of the type of challenges that are being looked at is solicitor (SOL also known as legal or lawyer) review. Our documents get thrown to a pool of lawyers. We have a meeting with Washington lawyers to look at how to dedicate lawyer time strictly to the leasing process and ensure that we don't have to start from scratch in getting approvals in subsequent documents that were approved by another agency lawyer in another negotiation.
- Gateway will continue to keep the committee posted as to updates enacted as a result of this. Progress will benefit the agency as a whole and will help to streamline the process.
 - Comments from Committee members:
 - All the park updates are for funds that are being spent on non-FACA projects. Lessees are losing interest. The buildings are falling down. With winter coming, there will be more damage from winter weather. The NPS has yet to order bricks for any buildings. If they bought the bricks in bulk, they could sell them back to the Lessees for pennies. We are not getting the job done and it is so frustrating. The discussions for the process do not yield results. No one can afford to heat the buildings because we are

requiring replacing windows with single glazed windows, or order the Spanish cedar for the trim, or the mahogany for the porches, which has to be painted grey.

- The NPS is trying to address the concerns raised. The investment NPS is making to make historic buildings more attractive investment opportunities is a significant changes from the way the park operated in the past.

Leasing Update – Chief, Business Services

- Leasing Presentation can be found here: INCLUDE LINK. Highlights include:
 - Building #52 Lease has been executed and awarded
 - Agreement between NPS/Gateway and Middletown Township (MT) has been amended/executed. Inspections, permitting and now fire code to adhere to MT. NPS agreed to delegate to MT so we can use the rest of the code NJ is using instead of default to NFPA full sprinkler requirements which puts leases at a competitive disadvantage to other shorefront redevelopment.

Review meeting outcomes of the last meeting (minutes, recommendation, action items) – Superintendent, Facilitator

- Correction to last meeting: Historic Context Briefing recommendations from the last meeting required correction. This meeting is our opportunity to correct the meeting notes from September 7, 2018. Agreed: The report entitled “Recommendations to Improve Alignment” dated 09-07-18 was replaced with an updated version (removed B and changed D from the 09-7-2018 version). The recommendations themselves (Historic Context Briefing) have been corrected in the briefing and posted on the Fort Hancock website.

Committee Membership – Superintendent, Facilitator

- Reappointment and On-Boarding are underway. All members up for reappointment submitted an application. We have also received applications from local municipalities from which representation was lacking such as Seabright, Monmouth Beach, Highlands, Rumson. The nominees are sent up to DOI, where they are vetted and can be officially appointed by the Secretary of Interior.
- Recommendations from the Committee when asked what would be helpful in onboarding new members:
 - Background materials similar to the leasing presentation
 - Identify A&Es who have worked on SAHO building projects
 - Identifying the buildings by name and number
 - Requiring applicants to attend meetings prior to appointment to the Committee by DOI.
 - Review past meeting minutes and presentations as posted on the committee web page.

Committee Operating Procedures – Superintendent, Facilitator, Co-Chairs

- Committee Operating Procedures were adopted 3/12/201.
- Updates in September 9, 2015 included new Committee member names.

- Difference between the 2013 and 2015 version includes the following changes:
 - Co-chairs now work with NPS directly to develop meeting agendas.
 - Co-chairs were previously identified as the direct conduit to NPS. Now Committee members may speak with NPS directly/freely as desired.
- The co-chairs are the public voice of the committee and the only authorized people to speak to the press or the NPS on behalf of the committee. However, this does not preclude other committee members from speaking with NPS staff on an individual basis.
- Recommendation: Consider including a conflict of interest provision for committee members. Such a provision should:
 - Require members to recuse themselves from discussions which may present a conflict; and
 - Prohibit Committee members from making a profit in connection with activities related to the Committee's efforts.
 - Committee members will review the conflict of interest provisions in the Committee Charter.
- The 2015 version with the corrections, is our operating procedure as it now stands.
- Recommendation: Operating Procedures need not identify committee members. Agreed: The document will deal with procedures and members' names will be removed. The major discipline area will remain in the operating procedures. A link to the committee webpage listing the members will be included in the operating procedures document.

Update on various "Restore" legislation actions – Co-Chair *Gerry Glaser*

(Shift in agenda topics due to timing)

- Congress has introduced separate bills intended to fund deferred maintenance action for NPS facilities. Separate bills were introduced by the House and the Senate. One bill provides for \$11.5 B, the other for approximately \$6B.
- GATE is at the top of the DM list in the NPS. GATE is \$800M and Fort Hancock itself is \$200+M.
- This kind of funding, assuming the bills are passed, will bring a lot of attention and criticism. It will be a big challenge to spend it wisely. Consider also, that Gateway is one of the few parks to have a Federal Advisory Committee.
- When considering these factors collectively, it presents a tremendous opportunity and assigns responsibility for what we do not only for Fort Hancock but also as a national model and presents an opportunity for the park to receive national recognition in terms of what it can do.
- Challenges we will have to address with respect to the anticipated funding:
 - Interpretation of Historic Preservation Requirements which are extensive and subject to interpretation
 - Organizational Infrastructure available to administer the resources
 - Local Property Taxes of private interests on federal property which continue to be an issue
 - Administrative Burden on potential Lessees
 - Bureaucratic considerations such as timing and approvals
- Observations and recommendations:
 - Designate GATE as a national model for the leasing program.

- Resolve the real estate taxation issue with Middletown Township/Implement a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT/PILOT) program or NPS to seek legislative relief at the national level regarding local taxation of private interests on federal property.
- Address fundamental infrastructure questions pertaining to water, sewer, power, IT capability at Fort Hancock and connections to individual buildings.
- Incentivize really large infrastructure projects by helping Lessees.

11:30 Public comment

- Commenters will be called in the order they sign up
- Commenters will be given three (3) to five (5) minutes to speak, based on how many people sign up
- Commenters should address the Committee as a whole & speak to issues within the Committee's scope
- At the discretion of the Committee and only if the commenter is willing, Committee members may ask clarifying questions

Comment period opening remarks by Committee Co-Chair Gerry Glaser: Let the record show that we have tried to accommodate members of the public who take the time and make the effort to come to the meeting. The comment period is not meant to be restrictive, it is meant to set aside time to hear from the people who come to the meeting, whose opinions we deeply value and to build opportunities for committee deliberation. At the discretion of the co-chairs, input from the commenters in attendance may be invited.

Brian Samuelson Building 21 Lessee. These are frustrating projects for everyone. We are making progress. Brian wants us to release his contact information to any potential Lessee. His taxes went up 6%. He does not know why his taxes went up. He is still operating at a loss and it is very capital intensive project. Not sure why he has to pay taxes since Middletown (MT) is not doing anything for this program. He wants this program to succeed.

Nick Cocuzza- submitted proposal for use of Building #4: History of eight years of missteps at SAHO. He started his process in July. He has been in construction 37 years. It is really sad that NPS never put new roofs on the buildings when the base was decommissioned. All the buildings are damaged as a result of water damage due to failure to maintain roofs and windows. The façade fell off building 9, the water seepage is resulting in façade decomposition. That is a big challenge. Mr. Cocuzza is under the impression that a roof was going to be placed on Building 4 - that still has not happened. It is imperative that roofs get put on these buildings so that there are no additional collapses.

Nick was advised by his lawyers to run away from this project after looking at the website - that the bureaucracy overwhelming and so much red tape. There is no intake person at Fort Hancock, there is no one to ask questions of. Why can't someone identify the areas in which parking is allowed. What is going to happen when the buildings are fully occupied and it is fourth of July weekend.

No one has an answer, no one seems to know. These are fundamental basics to which you should have answers before you issue a proposal. Someone has to be a chief and put these projects on track.

The other consideration is funding coming from Congress. How come no one has asked for money from congress? You can't get private investment in these buildings unless you can show that you are going to get a return on your investment?

Brian [Samuelson] got through somehow. He got a lease but it seems that a lot of NPS folks were mad because of the way he did it. The construction process should only require that a lessee report to/get approval from one individual.

The other question is Common Area Maintenance (CAM) charges. No Lessee knows if there are infrastructure projects for which Lessees will be obligated in the future. The infrastructure has probably been deteriorating for years. Those should not be part of the CAM.

The other issue is the Middletwon (MT) tax situation. I don't think any other federal land has been taxed by a municipality. For MT to come in here and tax on an assessment basis, they need to provide the same services they provide in the rest of MT (school buses, garbage, leaf collection, etc.).

Dina Matteo declines to speak

Dan Ferrise –Building #52 Lessee. Would have started construction on building #52 but is having tax credit application issues. Isn't the purpose of the FACA committee to get these buildings leased? I feel like there is a lot of fluff in these meetings and we are not addressing the issues that will get the buildings rehabilitated. The format of the meeting needs to be changed, It should be an open discussion. I had twenty comments I wanted to make during the point of the discussion but was not allowed to speak. I want to be available for the next person taking on the same challenges. The committee talks about the same issues every time. There needs to be room for creativity. The committee makes the same comments over and over. We don't know who is working on what. We should put the Lease holders up front and address the issues they are facing as part of the discussion. The take away I get from the meeting is that there is not a lot of substantial material that is being addressed and we need to focus on tackling the issues – the bricks, the roofs, the porches. For example, to superintendent: What does the park want to do with Building #7? Do you want to rent it out? Is that the best use of the NPS efforts? When you look at Officers Row, the ones with the least repair to require are going to go first. You need to address the total costs of each project. Could you allocate the resources for building 7 to building porches for all the buildings?

Superintendent: That is what we are discussing. We are thinking along the same lines.

Dan Ferrise: I understand you are not a property manager but once you start leveling the playing field, so the level of investment among the buildings is consistent.

Nick Cocuzza: The historic architect should have a list of all the things you can use for each building since they are all the same (except for size). They are cookie cutter. The NPS should provide the blue prints and identify the changes that can be made.

Dan Ferrise: Additionally, as a lessee, the costs start to add up. Historic Architect costs more. There are 32 briefs you have to read regarding historic considerations. I did not use a historic architect. NPS accepted what I submitted with my architect. We reviewed the briefs and abided by the requirements. Requiring someone to pay for a historic architect hurts. Everything adds up. The cost of insurance we have to get as Lessees (vs as property owners). We need to lock the historic architect in a room for a few days so she can provide a list of approved materials and

standards. Has that process started, is there something she can do? She has been extremely helpful but she is one person. If we can get her to issue a determination as to what is required or should be done, it will be helpful to us.

Superintendent responds: I agree with you on the format of the meeting and the need to adjust in order to address Lessees concerns. It was eye opening to many folks on the Committee to have potential lessees join at the last meeting. It would be valuable to find a way to institutionalize that into these meetings and build upon what we heard. We are trying to adjust to what we have heard and are also trying to tackle process issues that are under our immediate control. The workshop we helped facilitated a few weeks ago was with folks from DC and was timely for our leaseholders because all of that information fed directly into the Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) on leasing. We have since identified 100 or so pain points and are working to address those. We are on the forefront of this effort for the agency. Golden Gate has gotten a lot of attention but they had special legislation, different marketable properties, and separate sources of funding. We are building a program from the ground up and I think we will see improvement on these concerns as change happens.

Regarding Building #7. That was a project we undertook as part of recommendations from the committee to utilize leasing money to show that we are also taking on a project. We conceived that we would have drawings to share that met the SOI Standards and could be used for the rest of the buildings, and which contained sustainability features that could be integrated by Lessees. The reality is that we have proven it costs the government so much money to take on the projects ourselves – the base costs themselves are so much greater than what it would cost the private sector. Additionally, the contracting process is slow. By the time we have architectural drawings, it will not do the potential lessees much good anyway. We are looking at ways to move funding into projects that will incentivize properties in a manner that will take them over the hump of making them available return on investment.

Dan Ferrise: If there has been work done on roofs and porches, why don't you supply a list of approved materials you used in connection with same. Also, what brand and color of composite materials did you use to repair the asphalt roofs? I am spending time chasing things around to see if they can be approved but you already have a list – just share it.

Tom Jones – LOI Holder Building #104: I have been living here on and off for a couple of years. The tendency is to slide into an adversarial relationship but that is not what anyone wants. This is a partnership effort. I have a cost list, and every time you add to that, it takes a toll on the ability to undertake the project. Also, once you start to pencil out the cost of the project vs the idea that you can offset the cost of improvements against the rent – it isn't a great deal. It is only an ok deal. You have to want it bad enough to commit to the project but if you start adding to the costs, that won't work. The cost of materials is driving project through the roof. Our opinion is just tell us what you want but your position is we can't tell you what you want. If I am frustrated, there is no one else on the planet who is not. And the SHPO thing, is very very difficult. An advisory board can get this up and running. The last point, we have to get some media on it. I want to do a show saving Hancock but you want people to put 1.5 million into a building in a historic district, in a flood zone. This place can be great and it will be greater if you can cross the street and get something to eat. The partnership notion is important. You have to look at these people as partners, not clients.

Don Stevenson – previously worked for NPS and has been in historic preservation for 50 years. He was an architect and documented the condition of multiple historic buildings. I agree with the partnership considerations and with preparing a list of fixed known issues. That does not mean telling someone how to design something. Partnership means you trade off and come to some common. It is important to keep in mind how the process works, that these rules have been in effect since the 1970s and 1980s. No one needs to come to the same conclusion all the time.

Tony Mercantante – Middletown Township Planner: The title of our committee has the word advisory. I would be frustrated as an attendee at this meeting too because the people who have the ultimate decision making authority are never here. Maybe the folks who do make the decisions need to come here and go through each lessees' status. Identify the hold ups, and find out what is required to move the applications/leases/construction/along. Maybe our frustrations can be managed if we are able to get direct communication with Washington folks.

We have also talked about the fact that a lot of people think these meetings do not need to go all day. Why don't we have all our business done by noon and let each applicant have time with a technical review committee for the afternoon portion. It is not a very efficient use of time and we would be much more effective giving applicants actual time with reviewers.

Superintendent: We have some decision making authority at the park. In terms of review at the DC level, having them come to quarterly meetings is not likely to happen. What I did not mention earlier, is that we brought the RIE team out to Fort Hancock while they were here. We are working with the head Solicitors (lawyers) on changing the process. We can sign leases with Lessees at the local level (Commissioner of the National Parks of New York Harbor) but that requires a review by the Director prior to final approval. This negates the point of signature at the local level.

Additionally, right now Gateway's cultural resources folks are working with the head of the historic tax programs in DC. We are looking at ways to condense the projects. Each project has to go to New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office (NJ SHPO), NPS Regional National Historic Landmarks Office (NHL), and Tax Credit Review. We are looking for a way to consolidate these issues.

Dan Ferrise: When you tell people there is a tax credit, you should tell them it will take at least six months. NJ SHPO submits to Washington for approval. Dan explains how the tax credit folks rejected his application for failure to submit a map and that he was not notified until 34 days later. This has turned into a 90 day delay. You would think that once it has been approved by NJ SHPO, why does Washington need a whole 30 days to review the same thing?

Dan Saunders: This committee was created to advise NPS. Prior to the creation of the committee, the general position was that the buildings were going to collapse and that did not seem to really bother people. This committee's job is to change the direction of an enormous ship known as the federal government. That ship won't change direction fast. Other things you are bringing up are "who is the POC"? That is something we do need to figure out. But those things are very different. A lot of times the decision maker on these projects is the Secretary of Interior, and you are not going to get him in the room. So hearing what you are dealing with is

incredibly valuable to us. Maybe we need to schedule a separate time for Lessee comment at every meeting.

Dan Saunders: you know the property is historic, it is located in an NHL district. Why do we need the Tax Credit program to conclude the property is historic as part of the Part 1 of the historic tax credit application,

Shawn points out that there is a cooperators meeting every month at SAHO. Perhaps we should have a Lessee and LOI holder meeting once a month – this was part of the intention with the “technical review” committee. A group like the Cooperators Group will be needed in the future to support lease holders.

After further discussion it is agreed the park will consider a global application for Part 1 of the Tax Credit Application since NPS is the owner of all the properties under consideration.

Nick Cocuzza: Why is it hard to identify the other Lessees? The NPS should put us in touch with each other.

Tom Jones: I spent \$15K on Building 104. If it does not succeed, NPS owns that information, which saves the next person in line all that money. The lease says so.

Based in the discussion, the following are considered as proposed outcomes:

- Create opportunities for conversation with Lessees
- Have higher level NPS representatives at meetings
- Consider a global application by NPS for Part 1 of tax credit application
- Look into whether Lessees can form something akin to a cooperating association
- Consider setting up a technical review committee to address SOI Standards

Additional Considerations - *Gerry Glaser and Shawn Welch*

- NPS should identify these efforts as a test bed so that the authority, responsibility, and decision making can be made a lower level and rely on this special moment in time in which we have the attention of DOI.
- Have National Parks of New York Harbor (NPNH) Commissioner designated as the POC and decision maker for this program and assign him the risks and responsibilities for this program. Do not require review by Washington before action on a signed lease can begin.
- Deeper engagement with real estate professionals and the ability to pay commission are required
- Agreed that Public comment should be a larger part of this meeting.

Public thanks to Congressman Pallone’s office for sending a representative. A lot of our discussion is about getting the word out to those who are able to make decisions or move issues for resolution.

LUNCH

Post-Lunch Discussion building on considerations identified above:

- Considering how to secure additional funding for annual routine maintenance and repair adequate for the lifecycle of the buildings which would prevent future accumulation of DM work.
- Compliance review and bundling projects for review (i.e. porches and roofs)
- Considering bundling opportunities for redevelopment of multiple structures
- Use of Real Estate Professionals to generate more interest

Committee Discussion - revisions to Deferred Maintenance Recommendation – *Co-Chairs*

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Designate Fort Hancock Leasing Program as a pilot initiative to test and track more efficient leasing measures.
- The prospect of new funds to address deferred maintenance is exciting and necessary. GATE is not presently equipped to handle the contracting and supervision to implement substantial new funds. Any new funds must be accompanied by the authority and means to employ the appropriate personnel to accomplish the deferred maintenance goals.
- Prioritize additional investment and additional resources into Officer's Row buildings to minimize risk to potential Lessees thereby improving marketability of these structures
- Designate a single POC full time at Fort Hancock to facilitate and expedite the needs of the prospective Lessees and others interested in pursuing leasing opportunities
- Restructure the meeting format so that Lessees or potential Lessees panel are included as part of the FACA meetings on a consistent basis as identified by NPS. The Co-Chairs will serve as committee points of contact for these individuals or a support group if such a group becomes a reality. Agreed, the meeting facilitator should make sure this is implemented and monitored going forward.

Corrections to Meeting Notes – Co-Chairs

- Updated notes from the September 7, 2018 meeting notes will be included with the notes from today's meeting. A link will be embedded on the page containing the back to the September 7, 2018 meeting notes page will be included to ensure people are directed to the corrected meeting notes for September.

Final go-around, review, and adjourn – *DFO and Co-Chairs*