

Job#5989628
Federal Advisory Meeting
11.09.23

CONFIDENTIAL ROUGHLY EDITED REALTIME FILE
Compliments of Birnbaum Interpreting Services

This file was created in real time by a Realtime Captioner. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. A consumer should check with the presenter for any clarification of the presentation.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you. Welcome, everybody. To Both our committee members and members of the public who are joining us. To keep moving forward on the preservation of these historic resources at Sandy Hook from our leasing program. We are at a new point in this process today. We have a lot of news to share. Some ideas to mull over and advice we are looking for. I am anticipating some robust conversations. Looking forward to having you to chew on these issues as we chart the course together.

As always, we are very appreciative of your time and participation. Both the opportunity to collaborate together around this virtual table, as well as to help keep this transparent process that the news can go out on about. Welcome any ideas from anybody in the public.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to our cochairs Shawn and Gerry.

>>GERRY GLASER: Thank you, Jen. I can emphasize what Jen said about thanking you all for help. I'm looking at the first slide that we need to address. It points out that this is public meeting Number 42. That is a lot of community and panelist time that's been dedicated to this effort. It is quite remarkable. We have more to show for all of that than we think. Thank you all very much. We are looking forward to hearing more about the next steps and what you think about that today.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Echoing and fellow members. See participation from the public. There's a lot happening on the peninsula and it's very active. We will hear good updates from the Park Service. We want to keep moving this forward. Welcome.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, do you want to lead us in the pledge.

(Reciting Pledge of Allegiance)

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. For those of you who do not know me, I am Bennett Brooks at the Census Building Institute. I'm joined today by Nitsan. Who's been getting all the Zoom invites and helping us with the technology. To make sure it all goes smoothly. Thank you for doing all that. Much obliged.

It has been half a year, or something like that, since we last talked. And as Jen said, there is a stack of things to talk about. Having a really rich conversation today. Before I orient to the agenda, I think we need to take two minutes and invite all of our advisory members to do a quick around the table. You can just give your name and affiliation. So the public knows who is here. I'm just going to call you in one by one.

We've already heard from Gerry and Shawn. Bill, how about you?

>>BILL KASTNING: I am with Monmouth Conservation Foundation.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Michael.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: I am retired after 45 years from the financial industry. Including a period of time when I was with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you. Welcome. Dorothy.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: I am Dorothy Guzzo. I am the executive Director of New Jersey Historic Trust.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Mary Eileen.

>> MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I'm a program officer with the New Jersey State Council of New York.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Do go back on mute after you come off. That would be helpful for background noise. Patrick. Patrick, you are on mute. You can come off mute. Now, we want to offer you-- I will let you wrestle with that for a minute. We will go to Howie.

>>HOWIE PARISH: Good morning, everybody. I'm Howie Parish. I'm the vice chair of the New Jersey See Grant Consortium Board of Trustees.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Patrick, you're now off mute.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: Hello, I'm Pat Collum. I am off mute, but I do not see my face. I'm Pat, superintendent of schools, and I represent the educational interests.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Linda.

>>LINDA COHEN: Hi, I am Linda. Marine science educator at New Jersey see grant, and I have been for 31 years. I also represent a new organization called Save Coastal Wildlife.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Tony.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: I'm Tony Mercantante. I am an administrator for Middleton Township. Former planning Director. Professional planner. I've been on the committee for a long time. It's a very fulfilling experience.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Last, I think it's Jim.

>>JIM KRAUSS: --

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I think I have everybody. Did you want to introduce any staff today?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: We have a bunch of staff on here. I think most of you know Pete McCarthy, our unit manager. Karen Edelman. From business services. Patti Rafferty, resource stewardship.

I do want to bring on and give you a chance to say hello. We have a brand-new staff member that is particularly important to our endeavors here. This is a new program manager for cultural resources for the park. Caridad de la Vega started with us this week, and we are so excited to have her on board. Caridad, would you like to say hello?

>>CARIDAD DE LA VEGA: You see me?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: We hear you.

>>CARIDAD DE LA VEGA: Good morning, everyone. I am the cultural resource program manager. I'm excited to be here, and I look forward to learning more about this endeavor.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Welcome. Good to have you in the mix. Today, what do we want to do? We have a full agenda. We will start with some updates on Mast Buildings 23 and 56 for general leasing updates. We are going to carve out a good amount of time for an update and discussion on the Stillman project.

We'll catch you up on the latest. On updates and progress and challenges. Really create a space for the committee to get in discussion around those buildings and the directions we want to head in. We've set a good check of time for that. We will then have general Park updates.

Then, we will revisit the leasing program recommendation that you gave the Park Service at your April meeting. If you recall, we had a very full report from the working group. You all then turn that into half a dozen recommendations. We heard from Jen and her team on where those gone with those recommendations when we last met.

We will also update you on a most recent working group and where that's going. And as well, have a quick catch-up on the social equity initiative that we started a number of months ago.

A couple of other notes, just to think about for the agenda. One is we will be holding public comments between 11:30 and 12. Always, the time that we do that, it'll give a chance for the public to weigh in. We will also take a break at 11:15. We are going to break 11:15 AM, and then public comments. And we aim to adjourn by 1:15 PM.

Let us go to the next slide, please.

Ground rules. Two sets of ground rules here to talk about. One for the committee members and one for the public. Hopefully, the call is pretty familiar.

For the committee members, as always, we ask a few things from you. Big picture, which is to contribute, that's why you're here. You have a perspective and is super important for our Park Service to hear that and understand the thoughts, concerns, and suggestions you have.

At the same time, we need to share time. There's a lot to cover. So be succinct and ask questions. Make sure you understand stuff. As to the extent that the committee is talking about potential recommendations. Try to find ways to integrate different views and perspectives of each view putting out there. And develop recommendations that reflect the committee as a whole.

The chat function, which is at the bottom of the screen is available to you. You can chat to a committee member or the whole committee. My recommendation is that you use that very sparingly. People are busy in the chat, and then not busy listening. I would ask you to mostly focus on the conversation.

Again, if it's helpful if there's a question feel free to use it. I know you all know how to raise your virtual hand at the bottom of the screen under "raise hand". If that doesn't work, you can wave at me, and I will probably see you. You can throw something in the chat. Something like "Hey you, I want to talk." Something that gets my attention.

If you can keep your cameras on. Most of you have on right now. It's great because we can see you a little bit more. A humane way to go about this, is be on mute when you're not talking.

I will flag that we are recording this meeting. I want everyone to be aware of that. We also have live captioning available. At the bottom of your screen, you will see the CC for captions. Click on that, and you'll be able to do that. The next slide please.

Go back one. For the public, I will talk without slide. Let me just say, first of all, it is great to have you here. We really do appreciate public caring about the issue and taking time to listen in and weigh in. So, thank you for that.

As I mentioned, we will have public comments at 11:30 AM. I do not think we had any sign-ups in advance. We will go to folks in the room that have a chance to weigh in. We typically ask you to limit to a minute or two. If they are things that are coming up over the course of this of the advisory committee conversation that you want to make a note to yourself. The conversation stays around the table and the advisory committee members except for when we have that public.

There is a Q&A function at the bottom of your screen. For members of the public, if you're having technical issues, or a short question, and you want to throw in the Q&A, that is fine. I do ask you to refrain from making your comments in the Q&A until we get to the public comment period.

If we were in a room together, people would be standing, and we're just trying to mimic that and keep that going. To the extent of there's a question that the Park Service staff can answer on the fly, they will endeavor to do so. However, it may be better answered afterwards.

As always, we invite emails, comments, thoughts at anytime to send to Daphne, etc. So, thank you, for being here.

I think that is all I have, by way of instruction. The ground rules, Jen, Gerry, Shawn, did I miss anything?

>>SHAWN WELCH: You are good.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: If not, let's dive into the first building. The first topic. Which is the update on the MAST building. We will be joined by Dr Charles Ford along with the Monmouth County Vocational School District Superintendent. With Kelly Brazelton, Business Administrator.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: --Thank you. We want to celebrate Building 56, which is now in use. As most are hopeful all of you remember several years ago we entered into an agreement with the county to take two of the buildings on our leasing portfolio to rehabilitate for use for the Marine Academy of Science and Technology. Which is a high school located at Sandy Hook. Otherwise known as MAST.

Building 56 has moved forward, and like I said, is being used by the school. It is another success of our leasing program and efforts. We really want to acknowledge the county in this for stepping up and taking this project on. Which is a win for the park, and a win for the school. A real win for the public at large, as we have another piece of our history preserved.

Building 23, the large barracks building is also the part of this project. The part that is still moving ahead. I just want to welcome in Dr Ford and Kelly Brazelton from the county to say a few words about the partnership and the look ahead.

>>DR. CHARLES FORD: Good morning, everyone. How are you doing today? Can everyone hear me? For some reason-- Ms. Brazelton, can you send her an invite? She did not get in.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: It looks like she's in the attendees and has not been promoted to a panelist yet. We need to promote her.

>>DR CHARLES FORD: I think the fact that she's in Florida on vacation. I think we should punish her for that.

>>KELLY BRAZELTON: I am home. I am home actually.

>>DR CHARLES FORD: I liked to say thank you, everyone. It's been a great partnership on the two buildings we are working on currently. We are currently, as you stated earlier, the 56th is now open. It is a fully, with all our uniforms, and

it's being operational at this point. We did a ribbon-cutting with it. A couple months of the school year the County commissioners.

I like to thank the county commissioners for supporting us through this. Because it's been a long journey. And we are now continuing to move forward with Building 56 that we will be starting Building 23. That we're going to start working on now. What I'd like to do is, I'd like to turn things over to Ms. Brazelton, so we can explain where we're at right now. In the process we are moving forward in twenty-three.

>>KELLY BRAZELTON: Good morning, everyone. Right now we are developing specs for Building 23. They have been developed but we are waiting for NJD approval on those plans. And in the interim of that, there had to be code changes and code compliance updates.

And so, that's taken some time to do for us. In addition to that, we did have some changes when it came to Building 56, in regards to cause. Post pre-COVID and post-COVID pricing, so that has change. The amount of money that we had available to us to be able to do the project.

We are going to be moving forward with the good specs. They are with our architect now. Getting updated. They have been attorney reviewed an insurance reviewed on our side. So, we're just waiting for architects to get back to us on that. Doctor Ford?

>>DR CHARLES FORD: We hope to send that out once everything's been approved, and then we will get them out the bid. Once the bid will go through, the bid process and notice to proceed from there moving forward in Building 23. Hopefully, we will be able to move forward on 23. We'll get that open, and do we need to do. That will depend on where everything in the process is going through the process. We know it's a lengthy process. We just have to let the wheels turn.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Dr Ford, do you have a sense of the timeline here?

>>DR CHARLES FORD: We hope to be out for bid. It is what we're hoping on. That is just running the bid process and then

go from there. One of the things that we're looking at that and think that is going to be a problem, is will be supply chain and those types of things. That's delayed everything right now. I have a HVAC project that's been delayed for over a year. We can't control that. It is COVID that put a monkeywrench in everything.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Understand. Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Tony.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: Just a question. You have a sense what the intended use of the building is once it's completed?

>>DR CHARLES FORD: It is going to have classroom, and it's going to be a marching hall for us. Currently, the students do not have a place to march to do their drill practice. They practice everything out on the parade field. We all know with weather at Sandy Hook, that sometimes can be complicated.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Yeah.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Any other questions? For Dr Ford or Kelly?

>>SHAWN WELCH: Looking forward to seeing a bid out in February.

>>DR CHARLES FORD: Thank you very much. If you have any other questions, feel free to reach out to my office. We will have anything you need to know. We will update you as we move forward. We will make sure Mr. McCarthy is in the loop. That way we can keep open lines of communication.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you for making the time to be here.

>>KELLY BRAZELTON: Thank you. Take care.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, too.

Let's hand it off to Karen to give us leasing updates.

>>KAREN EDELMAN: Good morning. On the heels of the success of the building of 56, we have some additional news to announce. That is many of you probably already know that the Mule Barn is open. That is Building 36. It is a tavern. A restaurant. This is one of the few buildings that has outdoor space associated with it for use by the public. And the hours differ. Between seasons. We will talk about that a little more.

I want to give you a little recap of all the other buildings that are subject to the leasing program at Sandy Hook. Most of you have heard this. Those of you that do not know, I'll take you quickly through.

On the left side, you will see the buildings that are currently leased or subject to some sort of agreement. In use or will soon be in use. That is the two buildings we talked about. Building 23 and 56. Building 53, the cafe, Building 21, the duplex is for use in lodging. Building 104 is used for office and residential. Building 52, quarters. Short-term lodging. And Building 36, the Mule Barn.

We are hoping to have a number of buildings come into this column in the next few months. I hope two - four. I cannot be sure. There are a lot of moving parts to address and finalize for the leases for buildings twenty-four and twenty-five. In the last meeting, we shared some of the renderings for Building 114. We are very excited about the progress. We will keep you posted as to any additional signatures in the first quarter of the upcoming calendar year.

We'll talk later about the buildings that are subject to a general agreement. One of the things I wanted to talk about in a leasing update, is how we are managing the use of the buildings. Especially in light of many of the comments and recommendations we've been receiving from the group and faculty community.

I will take you through some bullets, showing you where the concerns are in the lease and what we call the operating plan. Which is what we are requiring. We are putting it together with them. It is collaborative.

We will see in the table there workgroup recommendations. Then we identified where that's addressed in either the

operating plan or elsewhere in the lease and considerations. I'm not going to take you through all of these point by point. This will be available for you to look at.

Some of the things we've talked about, in prior meetings, such as parking and traffic. We all know the park is undertaking a study. That this is a real concern that we have to address. On a practical level, most leases do not contain exclusive parking. Associated with the facility unless there is a driveway.

In case of the Mule Barn, for example, that lessee was obligated to construct the handicap accessible parking areas required for the building. But the parking is not included as part of the lessee's land assignment.

Other considerations are things like typical day-to-day operations. Those have to align with the compendium. In the case of the operating plan, we are tracking the hours of operation, visitation, alcohol management plan. And there's a reservation of rights of NPS to require the lessee to modify operations if we find them not compliant with the park mission values or operations themselves.

There's always room to correct or modify as necessary, in light of any noted impacts that arise in connection with use. As always, the lessees are required to protect the park area. The resources and visitors. They are required to comply with all applicable regulation and policy.

Many of those laws and regulations, and policies are cited in the lease. Many of the law regulations and policies are addressed through the compliance review process. That bring us to the final construction drawings. There is a lot to understand and to know. We will talk more about how we're going to manage that later today.

We also address some of the climate vulnerability prevention mitigation considerations on the most basic level in the lease. That is storm and disaster repaired plans that are required.

We also have a requirement that lessees follow OEMs, Office of Emergency Management instructions. To keep abreast of any park instruction, regarding closures or activity that is

related to stormed operation event.

We'll talk more about adaptive reuse in terms of public access later. We are working to ensure that the facilities are compliant, and you will see those changes as the buildings come online. There are some features have not been there before that are now there. For example, ramps to some of the buildings. That is just one aspect of how we are working to address law regulations and policies with our lessees. To bring historic buildings online for current use.

Again, all these points will be available after the meeting. You can go through them in more detail. If anyone has any questions about how we are managing the lessees and practical use of the buildings and light of the larger projects, I would love to hear from you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Karen. A great time for a few questions or comments if folks have any for Karen?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I just want to highlight for the group, you saw a number of those things that Karen was going through are being addressed in the operating plan. Each lease will have its own operating plan. I just want to point out this is a fairly new process. Putting these operating plans in place. I think it's a really useful tool for us. It's a direct result of the discussions that we have been having with the working group and the advisory committee questions we've got about how we're addressing this and how we are addressing that.

That highlight the need for getting these all in one place. We have common expectations. Clear how things are going to be run. With the ability to enforce those. These operating plans are things that it is not a lease. It's not fixed terms in time. Can adapt as conditions change, as we try things out to see what is working and what is not. Again, keeps a clear record of what the expectations are.

I just want to highlight this as another success of our joint efforts here, and how we are upping our management of Sandy Hook and the leasing program. Frankly, making things easier, both for us and the lessees. So that we all have clear communication and expectations about how things are going to move forward.

>>KAREN EDELMAN: Thanks, Jen. These are very fluid and like Jen said, there's always room for improvement and modification as necessary for the operating plans.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Committee members. Gerry.

>>GERRY GLASER: I just wanted to add a commendation. The developer of the building (MULE BARN) have done an extraordinary job. A number of us were at Fort Hancock recently and had a special opportunity to walk and look around. It is really amazing what they have been able to accomplish. And to do it in a way that is respectful of the area and the building itself.

As Jen said, the operating plan is extremely thoughtful, in terms of making sure that it supports the people who use the facility, as well as the people who are out and about at the park walking around. I cannot say enough about how well this has turned out. Congratulations, Karen and Jen, and everyone else. It is quite a lovely thing.

>>SHAWN WELCH: I'm going to jump in on that. And say the organization that I'm part of the Association has had several meals there. I personally have eaten there about eight times. Dance team is phenomenal. This is one of the few restaurants I have seen, where they open their doors in the morning and they are busy all day. Their last seating is 8 o'clock at night. That place is jammed and hopping every day they are open. This is a big win for the park. It is a huge win.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Shawn. Any other committee members with comments or questions?

>>LINDA COHEN: My question is why isn't there pronounced signage in front of the Mule Barn? That logo we showed in the upper right hand corner would be beautiful. People, honestly, people get there. But it is not from the outside

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Good question.

>>LINDA COHEN: Is there reason we do not have clear signage there?

>>KAREN EDELMAN: Can you hear me? The short answer is

because signage has to comply with the park signage plan and signage has to be consistent across the National Park Service. What we're trying to do is find a balance between the beautiful view barn signage that Dan wants to hang above the entrance. Where sign protocols.

Additionally, we are also working on consistent signage for all our lessees throughout Sandy Hook throughout for Hancock. The parking has to be uniform and accommodate everyone. And has to comply with a Secretary standards. We are trying to find that balance, and we are not quite there. That is a short answer.

>>LINDA COHEN: Okay, Karen, thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Jen and then to Michael.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Did you say Jim or Jen?

>>JIM KRAUSS: One of the questions about the buildings that I saw a day or two ago. It might be the MAST building. I believe it's a barracks building. With just exterior walls. No roof. Is that the mast building on Number 23?

>>KAREN EDELMAN: Yes.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: We talked about signage for the Mule Barn. Also we talked meetings ago about signage done at the entrance to the park. Also the gateway to the Fort area. I know there's signage. Are there plans to add signs for the Mule Barn, because I'm a local. I live in Fairhaven. Not everyone knows-- it's surprising that people who have not been down to the end of the park. It would be great to put people in from the get go.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: We do have that digital sign by the entrance that has messaging. We talked about over time having a fixed sign that has little plaques on it for different entities at Sandy Hook. That is not off the table. We have largely been relying on the digital version.

I will say, too, one of the good outcomes of the Mule Barn is we've long wondered, we've long heard that the northern end of Fort Hancock is kind of remote. Are people going to come? Are they going to find it? Based on how packed the Mule Barn has

been consistently, people will make the trip out. That is very heartening to see in a very positive harbinger for the future.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Your hand was up.

(Crosstalk)

>>SHAWN WELCH: -- I would like to get this one in. In terms of signage, the rotating sign, the big one, your issue with it is the more you queue up into it the longer the cycle time. If you've got fifteen things up, the majority the people will drive past will miss what's in it. That becomes the tough part with that. I watched that play out in previous years when we had the folks coming in. So it's something to add to the mix as you are working forward in this issue.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Shawn. Pat, I think you're trying to get in before. Do you want to jump in? You are on mute.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: I have not been out to the new bar after Labor Day. There is not an issue of going through the front gates. How is that handled now? Someone's going to go swimming, as opposed to going to the Mule Barn. There are fees involved to get out there?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: The fee only applies if you're parking in the beach parking lots. Anyone going to the historic post area, if they tell them at the entrance gate that that's their destination, they are not subject to the fee.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: It's an honor system?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Yes.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: Okay.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: We will see how well that works in the future. Whether we need to adjust.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: Okay.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Any other questions for Karen at this point? Okay. We have an attendee that just has a phone number of 732-946-2624. I knew were expecting going to be calling in.

Could you just throw into the Q&A may be who you are, and then if it's panelist you can be in the mix. While were waiting for that we should push to the next topic.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: If their calling in by phone or are they able to type something in the Q&A. If they are not accessing by computer?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: That's a good point. Again there someone calling in from 732, you need to take yourself off me. Which I believe is *six? If you it *six you should be off mute we need to know if that's one of our advisory committee members.

>>NITSAN MACHIS: They do not seem to be responding.

>>BENNETT BROOKS:--

(Cross talk)

Let's push ahead then. The next we want to talk and spent a good chunk of time on the Stillman project. Obviously it's been a focus of conversation for several years now. A lot of work has been done. We've had a lot of time to talk about.

At this point, really want to catch what that project is at. I wanted to hand this off to Jen, who will share some updates. Share some thinking from the Park Service. Then open it up for discussion, to get a feel for the committee spots I'm moving for. Jen, over to you.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you. I will start with a teaser that we are at a real crossroads. This is going to be a really important conversation for us to head into together.

To go over a little of the history of this project and what has brought us to this point. I mean, it's been three years now. We first got the Stillman proposal just as the pandemic was hitting. You see all the buildings that are listed there. There are twenty-one buildings. It was pretty much all the remaining buildings on our leasing portfolio that were yet, spoken for.

It looked like a possible, viable proposal at the time. There was a lot going on, again, it was when the pandemic was just

hitting. Then we had objections raised, concerns raised, by our local congressman. Congressman Pallone. As well as, then a number of local or statewide environmental groups.

And so we stopped, we listened, and looked at what the possibilities were for moving forward. We had her own questions about whether this project was feasible from different standpoints.

And so, we set up a little bit different structure for this project to move ahead other than just the letter of intent for the entire project. Once we've finished all the due diligence, we move forward with construction. We signed a general agreement with Roy Stillman and his group. That was phased.

The first phase was to take two buildings and do designs on them, to see, again, remembering his proposal is a lease for the officers row units and some of the others. Not all of the buildings were focused on long-term residential use. Looking at each of these officer row houses. Putting a number of apartments-- 4 5 apartments and each of them.

We in the Park Service were not sure if you could do this and meet the Secretary standards for historic preservation. This phased agreement provided the opportunity to do designs on two different buildings. Two officer row buildings that were different building types. To see if in a design perspective that if it was possible. To find a way that satisfied our mandate for historic preservation.

Also, provide a chance to look at the business model. Understanding the condition of the buildings. Really ground-truth whether there is a viable opportunity here. Understanding that for any private investor, or any of our leases, there has to be an opportunity for profit. That the money they are investing has to come back, plus some, to generate the interest in investing that money in the first place. Nonprofits, other government institutions may have a different mandate. For any private investor that is generally the bottom line.

We went through the design process, to our delight, they did a great job in demonstrating how you could divide up these houses into multiple apartments in a very historically sensitive

way. That really met what we were looking to see, in terms of the Secretary standards for historic preservation.

In the past couple of months the Stillman groups has been looking at the business model and the condition of the buildings. I will say that they have continued to deteriorate even since the past three years when the proposal initially came in. Cost of escalated. The Stillman group has been looking at the cost for rehabilitation versus the potential for return on investment in the marketplace.

In that, they have been evaluating. And for putting in their proposal, they looked at all the various uses. Short-term lodging, long-term residential from their perspective, and best on the analysis, their best potential use here from a market perspective was for long-term residential.

I will cut to the chase that what their financial and instances at this point has shown that this project is upside down. We have a large financing gap. By their estimates-- we were heading into this, or think in terms of this might be a \$30 million project. From their business estimate, the bottom line are being able to break even, the point where the money you invest will come back to you, without a profit. Just a break even point. It is about a \$50 million investment. You could do something for \$40 million and still make a profit.

However, the cost of the project, based on the current condition of the buildings (this is for the entire twenty-one buildings you see listed there) is over \$100 million. I will caveat this that these are estimates. Not based on thorough condition assessments of every single structure. They are based on looking at the structures and extrapolating based on the very thorough information from the two pilot buildings.

Looking at the comparative conditions. What we do know about the other structures, other condition assessments that we in the Park Service have done over time, as well. Looking at what that implies for the entire portfolio.

So we have at least, and I do not want to imply this is a hard and fast number. It gives us the sense of scale. At least a \$50 million gap that needs to be addressed, in order for there to be a viable leasing project here from a private investment

perspective.

I'm going to pause for second. Because that is a big piece of information to take in. As we have been thinking about this, this is going to call for an entirely different model of how we approach getting a project like this done. It is why we need all of your thinking now more than ever.

I will say that-- we have been at this as a committee for over ten years. This is our forty-second meeting. We have had huge successes; two of which we just saw earlier in the meeting today. This is a big, daunting gap. We are still committed to the preservation of these buildings. It just means that we need to figure out what this next phase of our strategy is going to look like.

Now, there are a few things and ideas we been kicking around that I want to share with you. To get your thinking on, as well. There is going to come I think, for anything to see here we're going to figure out how to get additional government investment in here.

Hopefully, those of you who've been out there and seeing the roof work that's been going on. I will talk more about that in our park updates. We have been making some investments to stem the deterioration on the buildings. Including all the roofs on Officers' Row. There's going to need to be bigger investment.

\$50 million isn't the kind of money that the Park Service usually has to put into projects. Even under the Great American Outdoors Act. Which is brought in larger chunks of money for deferred maintenance than we've ever seen before.

Currently, this project is not funded for Great American Outdoors Act. In all that money is spoken for. It did not-- it accomplished some really important things, but it was only five years worth of funding. Those five years happened to fall at a time of great cost escalation as we went through the pandemic, and came out the other side. So that money has not gone as far as anyone was hoping.

Now, there is talk on the horizon of potential reauthorization of the Great American Outdoors Act. Folks are advocating for second five years. The Park Service certainly

needs that maintenance and investment. I think there's a lot of support in the agency that this would be a great poster child project for that. With partnerships and private investment really leveraging government investment. That is not guaranteed. There is no reauthorization in place now.

At best, the earliest that something like that would hit is 2026. We need to look at multiple pieces of a solution. Another piece in a very positive and welcome recent development is the Sandy Hook Foundation. Our philanthropic partner at Sandy Hook is indicating interest in playing a role in the solution here.

It remains to be seen how this evolves and what that means. Within the foundation, they have formed a committee to look at how they can be a partner in our leasing efforts here. I do not want to imply that they can or will raise \$50 million. I mean, that's not going to be the solution here either. They can be a part of the solution. This may need to be a three-legged stool with government investment, private investment, and philanthropic investment.

I want to acknowledge the reality that we may not see \$50 million all at one time. But that also does not mean that the project is not achievable.

One thing that I'm eager to get you thinking on today is, if we face this project, what would it look like? What is the best phasing strategy that makes the most sense? I do not know if we will be able to answer that today. But we can at least start the conversation. And figure out how to keep it moving between meetings.

So that this whole project keeps moving forward. Different ways to think about phasing, where we can make chunks of investment at a time barring being able to get 50 million or more at once. We could do it and look across systems. Like we did with the roofs. Doing all the roofs on Officers' Row. There are windows, porches, there is heating, electricity, all those types of critical systems. That is one way to face work. We could phase it with groups of buildings.

So, maybe we just focus on Officers' Row. Or break up Officers' Row into two halves, and see if we can get half of

Officers' Row done. Then the other buildings. Whatever set of groupings makes sense.

There may be other ways to think of phasing. I will say, also, in our conversations with Roy Stillman, despite all of this, he still remains very interested and willing to be a partner in this as this moves forward.

If we can't figure out a way to make this work from an investment standpoint, he won't be able to participate, and neither will any other private investor.

What were able to figure out as this moves forward. In every conversation I have with him, he really underscores how he appreciates the preservation, mission of these buildings and our efforts. He wants to help support that spirit and that goal to the best that he is able, within this being able to become an actual viable project.

I think that is all I have to share. That is a lot to take in. At this point, I want to open it up to your questions, reactions, thinking about the strategy ahead.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Jen, for that update. I can put a finer point on that. We have a few specific questions that we would like to walk through and build off of. The comments and sort of what Jen just teed up. One is to explore how you feel about the development. What that might look like. What sounds like it makes sense or doesn't.

The second is, any thoughts you have around what different funding models might look like? What is of interest to you, and what isn't?

And the third is, around banking or financial expertise that we would want to bring to the table. Invite to the party? Help us think through these challenges and think about how one might tackle that?

And a sort of fourth, broadly, what are other information to shape our next steps. I'd love to take this a little bit sequentially. So we're not bouncing all over the place. For better conversation.

I'd like to just first of all for a general-- you have questions for Jen on anything she just presented. So you understand where things are at, what supply? Let's start with some general questions. And then step into that development question.

Mary, I saw your question go up? A general question? I'm not seeing any hands for general comments. Let's just her to open it up and take up this question of phase development? Just see what folks are thinking. Mary Eileen, your hand is backup.

>>MARY EILEEN: I just wonder if there's any potential for ARP (American Rescue Plan) funds from the county? Or the town? If there's any availability? I think it has to be spent by 2026? If any of would be available for a phased to help with a phased plan?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Maybe that's a question that Tony can help with. I'm not familiar with those funds.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: I can address that partially. All the towns had allocation. They were typically had to use for one of two things, something directly related to a response to the pandemic, essentially. In the issues that they raise. They could use it for, essentially, making up for expenses that were incurred during the pandemic and putting the money aside.

That is what I think most towns have done. I could also say, the amount of money that the town and even the county get are not going to put a major dent in his what is needed here. With things that they and the possibility we talked about the issue before in housing and whether that's a potential option here. I met recently with the Affordable Housing Alliance and had a discussion with them about it.

And I think everyone agrees that traditional affordable housing doesn't make sense when you're putting people six or seven miles away from their jobs and basic services. So this location does not lend itself to that. It may lend itself to homes for special needs populations. Which there is a big, big need for in Middletown regularly working with agencies or buying homes and communities and converting them to that use.

We provide financial subsidy for them to do that. That would be a possibility for one or two buildings out here. That

we could give a contribution to the renovation of the building. If it was going to be used for that purpose. That is one or two buildings, probably, for the most. Have a potential for that.

We still have the issue of the overall building. I think the fundamental issue here if you remember Congressman Pallone's concerns he raised initially, had to do the whole concept of privatizing public buildings and the park. That is a fundamental question.

Maybe we need to reengage with his office about that. Unless you can come up with substantial amount of money to step in and restore and rehabilitate these buildings, there is no other option than private investment.

Once you get past the threshold of the issue whether you privatize these buildings, then you can get into the issue of looking for funding opportunities and financing. And then someone like Stillman could be willing to make the investment. I think that's the threshold issue is if you try to start to lock the concept private investment into these buildings, that is going to be a game changer. There are no other viable options.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Tony. Mary Eileen, did you want to come back in?

>>MARY EILEEN: I just wanted to mention maybe Tony would be able to help with the county money. It would certainly cover the money. But some of the money is for COVID recovery. But some is for economic recovery and tourism. Things that bring people back to places. There is potential. I do not know for sure. It would be worth exploring to see if any of that could be accessed.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: I know in the government budget last June there was a whole list of historic preservation project totaling \$10 million. We are supposed to be making our projects that got hung up during COVID whole again. I cannot speak for all of this. I do not know all the details of the COVID money.

I think there is still money that has not been allocated. It would not be at my level, that is my point. Somebody would

have to open the door at higher levels for something like that. Then may be able to come in and match private financing.

As well as some other philanthropic ideas, Our money is the (NJ) historic trust money is nowhere near what you need. And ours has to be matched anyway. It's a potential for nonprofit applicants. Maybe trying to figure out who to contact at the state level.

I could probably help you with that. Maybe that is worth exploring. Again, that wasn't to go the COVID money did not have to go to a nonprofit it could go to government. To deal with the issues that came up during COVID. To make the state whole again. It was very broad, put it that way. In terms of how they can allocate that funding.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, you want to jump in on that?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: It sounds like there's the potential for both state and county level funding. We in the Park Service are not terribly familiar with the specific kinds of funds. Maybe this is an area where the advisory committee wants to set up a subcommittee or some kind of working group to help us explore those. To know who to talk to and know what funding is out there at the state, county, and local level. That might be really useful to us.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: I'd be happy to follow up if a smaller group wanted to brainstorm a little bit. Just in terms of not trying to open up some doors. I think the Congressman would be very helpful in a conversation like that, as well.

I cannot speak for the state, is my point. I could be helpful in a smaller conversation about what the potential is out there. Even in terms of the trust has funding and could potentially be used for some stabilization. It's nowhere near what you need.

Perhaps, for some smaller things, like how you did all the roofs. Maybe if we looked at windows, for example, are some like that when looking at phasing. That may be something that you can work into the plan.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Is there anyone else who would be interested in partnering with Dorothy on that? Mary Eileen. I see your hand. Thank you. I do not think it needs to be a giant group, if the two of you are interested, that is awesome.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: Do we still have Gerry Scharfenberger on our committee? He would be good with this.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: He is no longer on the committee. If we had a working group. I don't think it has to be all committee members. If the committee wants to invite other people in the working group itself wants to invite other people in.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: I was trying to speak. This is Commissioner Burry. What I want to know is, is the state any way involved in what is happening here?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: They have not been.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: They have not been. That is really a travesty. I was very involved with the homeless veterans. If any of you saw what the final results have been, it has been remarkable. I got \$15 million from the state. That was really quite remarkable. I m not sure my contact is still alive. I am willing to try. I need the facts. I need to know where we are at? What are we doing? Okay?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you, Lillian. We absolutely don't have contacts and don't know who to talk to. Nor we in the federal government are in a position to advocate for funding. I think the committee can be really helpful there in building those bridges. This is an area where we need your help. And I think to your question about needing the facts, how much funding and what specifically is it going towards this part of what we need to work out with the committee too.

If we are going to face this, how can we break this down into discrete smaller portions that we can go for funding for? I think if we can figure out what one of those was, we could package it up into and ask to whoever you could take around.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: Jen, that's exactly what I had in mind. That we really do need to get our ducks in a row here. We cannot go in all different directions anyway. That's what you got for me.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you, Lillian.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Commissioner, we appreciate it. I have a question, and I don't know if it's to Dorothy or I'm wondering if state funding were brought in, with that . Point is in a certain direction of use? Is there something that

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: It depends. There's different HMFA. There's COVID money. There's trust funding. Because this is owned by the Federal Government, and there's a nonprofit organization that is your plan to be on there. I think of all this can be worked out. It would change the structure of the project.

If there is another meeting to talk specifically about funding, I think somebody from Stillman needs to be there, as well. I have no idea how he's going to finance. Also, don't to do this to begin with. There are different agencies and different pots. It does depend on what the structure is and is about. And yes, there's also tourism, too. Which is what we find doing that as well. Conversation. A smaller kind to figure out what makes sense. I'm just getting hit with this new today. This morning, in terms of this. I think it has to be. I think there's other pots. I think it's going to be a higher-level conversation for me.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: To reiterate what you said, there's a I don't think if done of here's the challenge. Makes sense or what we want to talk about to be Tony, when it come in and then I think one of the issues we have to address has his federal money. One of things that is a duplication of funds here? A federal agency supported by federal funds be able to utilize COVID funds. Not sure about that.

TONY MERCANTANTE: That's definitely a threshold question that needs to get resolved. I can investigate that a little bit and see if that's a deal killer. That's definitely a potential issue. Already funded by federal money. Are you also able to use state COVID money?

GERRY GLASER: there a relatively small group that can help us some of to make things that I'd like to see the group focus on.

One, let's just be as creative as we pop looking at all the different scenarios that might. Much of what we've talked about now, rightly so, is where one can go for external funding sources. Things that we can bring to the table.

The other piece that I think is missing, and I think we have some people on the committee who can help with this creative private sector find I that market. Has some if we could also just add to the list off the charts creative ways that one could resources, if you will. To make this a viable option. I'd like to add that to the agenda.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I'm hearing, appointing together some small working really trying to figure out what our funding that might be able interest in think about that. If it would make sense to have Roy Stillman his inside be folded into that. Like you're saying that to explore creative private funding. We are at a point of throwing arms wide, but in a tactical and strategic way. We do not know what capacity looks like. So we need to explore several different paths to do that efficiently. Tony, is your hand back up? Is that a left over?

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: Do we knew specifically what is stopping the developer from making this profitable. Is it the required materials? Could the specs be changed?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I think that we have our fair share of government requirements. Interior historic standards are important in embarking down the leasing pathway. That is our funded mission to preserve use and the public can come out experience what this area looked like in its historic heyday. But, within that, is there room for more flexibility if the only other option buildings fall down. Maybe? I don't know? It is certainly something we can explore.

Particularly in this case, within the interior maybe there's more room for "I'm not promising that or committing to that." Saying that is something that we can look at. I would say could yield some savings that that was nibbling around the edges of the gap that we are talking about. It's not going to sign multimillions of dollars in a way that makes this \$50 million gap more manageable.

Again, if the buildings were constructed out of new material it would be cheaper than a historic preservation project. It would not accomplish our goals. Our goal here is not to have something to rent out or provide housing. If we could do some things that complement park uses is a win. Our fundamental goal is historic preservation. An ability we can turn viable. That much larger gap that will still remain.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Michel

MICHAEL WALSH: It's great putting that together in a small group to explore avenues of going in stages? I would advocate focusing on the exteriors. In particular the Officer Row buildings.

I would suggest that the next step would be to redo the roof and the windows. Doing it at each stage will improve what we are talking about earlier, which is the public's experience of what these buildings looked like as an operating base.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: I think we had Chuck Ford here today from MAST. He's in charge of the entire vocational program for all of Monmouth County. He would maybe be a good point of contact to say what do you think about that?

I do not think they have a carpentry program anymore. Maybe something specialized like this. He could maybe convert one of the buildings to a shop that does preservation carpentry. A result of those could be used in the buildings. I think Chuck would be a good point to start with.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Pat. Let's bring you back in and see if there any other folks on the committee who would like to jump in?

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: I just want to know about the huge gap. Does this have more to do with the lower density use of the residential use on the buildings when they came in with the cost estimate?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: The use informed that break-even point that \$50 million because that use is predicated upon market rate rentals. That is the part of the equation that the use

influences. That is the greatest return on their investment that they see the potential for.

And so, if they invest \$50 million, they will make no money on it. They will break even. If they invest \$30 million there is a margin for profit there. That is based specifically on that long-term residential use. The cost for rehabilitation of that hundred million dollars plus-- there may be some of that that involves the interior fit-out for apartments.

I do not think any other use is really going to change that scale of cost too much. Rather than breaking it up into apartments, like one of the Officer Row houses, if you rehabbed it in its current configuration, it may be marginally lower. Not significantly. The amount of work they are talking about doing for the reconfiguration was pretty minimal to begin with to comply with a Secretary standards.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: During any part of this, just a follow-up, because I was not part of earlier conversations. Did they look at any creative hotel use for those buildings?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I think various people have looked at that over time. It is challenging. We have looked at other models like Cavallo point in San Francisco, that comes up. Were all the officer quarters were rehabbed into hotel and long-term lodging. There are various factors that make Sandy Hook and Fort Hook at very different. It's remote it's extreme seasonality. They lack of ability to do major new construction to help subsidize the preservation aspects of the project.

Those all really set it apart from similar type models that we have looked at. Just the risk involved, given those factors in investing short-term residential lodging, hotels. We haven't found a viable solution. A developer willing to go down that road. I will put out for context, too, those of you who've been with us a long time know how long these buildings sat on the market before we got anybody to put in for many of them.

We have had some individual success stories, and that did not mean to minimize those by any means. We are thrilled to have the eight or so buildings in operation that we have now. For the rest of them, we were not able to garner that larger hotel interest.

I do know that Stillman looked at different market opportunities for uses in evaluating the level of business risk and level of market risk. Compared with the level of investment that was needed. In that analysis, settled on long-term residential as the only really viable use for them, moving forward.

I do not know if that assessment would be different with the different investor. I suspect they would have similar considerations.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Again, his work was all focused on market rate housing, right? And couldn't pencil it out at market rate housing?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Yes. The numbers I am quoting is based on market rate housing. And all along he has expressed a willingness to look at other models, if we could help create other models, if it was affordable housing in whatever flavor. Whether that's for veterans or disabled population or some other kind of affordable model. Understanding that that is a different economic model that would need subsidies, partnerships. Some other kind of financing model to help make the equation work.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Let me bring back Tony and then over to Bill.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: A couple things, I deal with developers all the time. There's no question that rental housing is the big winner in most types of uses. It is just the reality rate. Residential rents are very high. They're very attractive. It's probably the only thing that's viable for financial support in this type of project.

The one thing I will say about affordable housing, again, there's a threshold problem with the distance and the remoteness of the location. Putting that aside for a minute, there are options. The HUD issue or housing choice vouchers. You can get project-based badges. It's what used to be called the Section 8 program. They do not call Section 8 anymore, because people don't like that term.

So, now it's called housing choice vouchers. But if you

have a building, and it had five units in it, and you have five housing choice vouchers to the building. The owner and developer would get market rate rent.

That program delivers market rate rent to the owner. It's a difference of what tenant pays. The tenant only pays 30 percent of the gross monthly income. That form of affordable housing, if you will, is just as attractive to a developer is getting market rate rents. Not a formal housing. There are ways to that.

I'm not suggesting that's the way to go. That is an option to look at. Since you are the federal government, you can talk to your sister agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I would not be surprised if it could convince them to assign to get some vouchers assigned to one or two of these buildings, if you wanted to go that route.

That is one possibility. The other thing that we need to think about, and I know we talked about this on and off over time. Just imagine if you took twenty or twenty-five of those buildings and made them into five units or five apartment units. You're talking about the need to create probably 250 or more apartment parking spaces. Which really don't exist right now.

The other fundamental thing we need to resolve is we need to maybe someone can help us with this, it's done, I have not seen it. Give us a concept plan of how if you are to do what they want to do and convert these buildings the way you want to, is it practically enough space for parking that you need. Not just for the tenant, but also for visitors.

You're lucky if you get two cars per household anymore. It's usually three or four cars per household in the states. That's a practical problem that I think needs to be solved. Whatever a number of units you are creating here are you going to be able to set support and on-site adequate parking it doesn't conflict with other uses.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Tony. Bill.

>>BILL KASTNING: I'm looking at this from the philanthropic angle. Are there opportunities for the owners to get naming rights? Let's say one donor will help with one or two

of the structures. Lots of time they like to see their name posted. That is a question for the park.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: There are very limited opportunities for that within the National Park Service. National Parks there are a lot of laws and policies that are pretty prescriptive about what you can do. We could not name a building after somebody. It is narrow as-- we could name an interior space after someone for a period of five years. We could do bricks. It's questionable. We could do benches. Sandy Hook foundation does have a program that they kicked off recently, where they are doing rocking chairs on porches. And people can get their names on the rocking chair. Not permanent fixtures like that. We have more flexibility to do. We cannot named buildings after people.

>>BILL KASTNING: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Can you get ten or 20 million for a rocking chair, Jen?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I sure hope so.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Dorothy, you may ute.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: As we're thinking about this, going back to the idea that these are iconic buildings. The interiors are important, and once you stabilize the interiors, you can argue about and look at solutions for interiors.

Is there a nonprofit organization that can potentially take on this idea of the exterior of the building? I say that, because it's easier probably to find funding for nonprofit organization, than it is for the National Park Service, for example.

Like I'm sort of looking at this as, can the exterior of the buildings become part of a mission of a nonprofit organization. And then, the private developer comes in to save the interior. I think that was mentioned earlier by somebody in conversation. Again, what I know is the historic trust and funding. We find nonprofits and other buildings out there on the hook. It requires matching and fundraising to do this.

I'm using the word stabilization, just to make sure that

these buildings are going to last longer, while this other discussion goes on about what is viable use for the interiors that's going to make some money. That would also take a big lump of money out of the equation.

So, that we are talking about profit margins. You've already fix the exteriors of these buildings, now what you're doing is a fine-tuning in the interior and reconfigurations of this. Is there a nonprofit is or would Stillman be amenable to creating a nonprofit? Because lots of times projects get done with both.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Yes. I'd say the nonprofit partner could be the Sandy Hook foundation. Who we have a philanthropic partnership agreement already. They are primary friends group for Sandy Hook. Have already indicated an interest in playing some kind of rule here. It remains to be seen exactly what that role is, but that is exactly the kind of conversation we can have with them.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: So could they come to this meeting with them when we set up a smaller scale. Let's dive into this. I would think that would be important to have them.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: We certainly could invite them.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks Dorothy. I'm wondering when the questions that Jen was having a conversation, I don't think I heard it to be weighed on or not. Is there any banking or financial expertise we can bring to the table to help the group understand what the financial stumbling blocks are and what the opportunities are? Any thoughts on that that we should be exploring? That could potentially be tied into that group or its own group? Any thoughts on that for those of you who have worked in our world? Michael.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: I think people come and talk about the availability of financing know that that can be difficult. We could try to find someone who's been in the banking industry in Monmouth County. He would understand what this is. If we were talking about financing through the traditional bank system, I have a lot of doubts that's going to work. If we wanted to we could find someone connected to local banking, I would not hold out much hope on that.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Just before Michael goes off and goes off into mute any other thoughts you want to throw out on that that might be helpful for Michael and others to the thinking about?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Did you say Jen?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I did.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Private financing from larger--

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Not so much-- other question that you have that you're thinking about when you think about that expertise? Anything that you're looking for that might be helpful?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: No. I do not know even know enough to ask the right questions.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Fair enough.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: That is what we need you guys for.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Fair enough.

>>JIM KRAUSS: Unfortunately, I hate to be negative. I think it's more important to be accurate and truthful. I think what Michael said is very true. Having worked for 40 years as a certified public accountant. I had many clients that were financed by banks. Banks want interest and want a return.

So, that is not much different than Stillman wanting a profit. Private financing is the same thing. I think Shawn said it well. Private finance or whose investing in an equity manner wants a return on investment.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: You are just swapping out one return for another.

>>JIM KRAUSS: There might be some banks some philanthropic money. Not if they are looking for a return on their interest or investment.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Go ahead. Lillian.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: I have a question. It seems so obvious to me. There must be some very lovely ex- military person who would be willing to put forth some money, if you will on this project. Does anyone have a connection like that?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Good question, Lillian. Any thoughts on that. Any Angel funders with a military background. This would be a meaningful project and opportunity.

>>LILLIAN BURRY: Yes. I do not hear anybody.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I think Shawn is going to jump in.

>>SHAWN WELCH: There is a group from New York that came out a few years ago in the 2015 and 2016 timeframe. Maybe a little earlier. That there's a bunch of West Point graduates. Ten guys a couple of them were rather well heeled. They looked around and stepped around and chatted a lot and disappeared into the woodwork. That's the last time I've seen anything from the military. Unless somebody has anything that I missing. That was the last group.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Gerry, we have not heard from you. Then Tony. We've got about ten minutes left here. We should think about where we are heading.

>>GERRY GLASER: A few things about what Michael is saying. If we look for financial or financing experts who work within the current world of mortgages and finances, and so forth. I think we're going to run up into all the problems that have just been raised.

What I was suggesting earlier, is that we try to break past all those traditional barriers. Just as kind of a creative thinking model. Just to see if anyone has a bright idea that could say, if only the park didn't do X, Y, or Z, we might be able to make this work. Never mind I understand completely that we can't blow past the current restrictions and rules and guidelines and so forth. That are in place. It might be useful just to explore what some of the options might be.

I'm going to give you five second example that is totally off the ball. I was listening to some work not in this country, I think it was in in New Zealand somewhere. There were some guy who is given the charge to replace fossil fuels in the country. In the logic in the office solutions that is let's put up wind turbines. There were a thousand rules why wind turbines could be put up.

Once they started thinking about it, one of the things they discovered was that people didn't want to pay to have a wind turbine installed and build on their property. So, what this guy said, don't worry about it. We will build it and give it to you. You will get a cut of the energy that is generated. Fast forward, that's the primary source of energy for this particular country.

I'm only throwing it out there as an absolutely crazy sounding idea which defies all the current models around how you finance stuff like this. I think it be fun to have somebody with that kind of creative thinking capacity to talk to.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thank you, Gerry. Tony.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: On the financing part of it I know banks generally have community reinvestment act accounts that there always trying to see. I'm sure there's some banks would be interested in this. They're only going to be interested in it if Stillman is there who has a track record and has a portfolio that they can demonstrate that they can do the project.

The best opportunity to get financing for these projects are through a developer of Stillman size. That is the reality of it. His company has the best shot of finding a realistic financing entity far more so than we do. I think Stillman needs to be involved in this conversation about the financing component of it.

The other thing to pick out one individual. I do not know this person, but Pete Dawkins lives in Rumson, and he has strong military history, as well as many other endeavors. I do not know him. I do not know if anyone does. Lillian might. Maybe reach out to him. Asking for his own expertise on this committee. Pete Dawkins. Just google it.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: He is ringing a bell. He also had a long military career. People I know who down, say he is very community orientated guy. I do not know him at all. I don't think I've ever met him. He has a good reputation. He is legendary from a military standpoint I think is a Westlake graduate, I believe.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Tony.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: Pete moved out a number of years ago. I think he's in Montana.

>> He just owns his house in Rumson.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: He sold his house a long time ago.

>>DOROTHY GUZZO: I do know him. He did leave the area.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: We are starting to come up against time. I think a few things that I heard here, to try to summarize this a little bit. One is, yes, it's a big challenge and I think everyone on the committee graphs this challenge. It is one that I'm hearing a tremendous amount of energy to tackle.

It's not easy but we need to sharpen the thinking and take it on. A lot of support for creating what I'm going to call some sort of small tactical group to really dig into the options. What would it take to get state and county or state or county funding into this? What pathways would you like to explore?

Part of that is making sure that double dipping and governmental funds are considered in making sure that these pathways are available. I've heard interest around the group thinking about is there and nonprofit potential for the Sandy Hook foundation? Is there philanthropy out there that could potentially support this type of type of effort.

In that group I've heard talk about Dorothy and Mary, Eileen raised her hand to spearhead that. I also had suggestions that Sandy Hook Foundation should be in the mix. Maybe other philanthropies should be in the mix? I think the bigger advice there is we do not want to limit that to just advisory group committee members. There's probably other

expertise that you want to be able to bring in. And also that Stillman needed to be part of that conversation as well.

So, that feels like a concrete extent. There's also a couple suggestions for the Park Service to be thinking about are there standards that could be loosened and relaxed and flexible in a way that doesn't undermine historic preservation mission. Makes a difference. I think we've heard from Jen that that might be and look at it in it doesn't close the gap, but certainly to explore.

Similarly, there's a couple comments around if there's going to be phasing, what would that look like. From the folks that spoke, starting from exteriors to how do you and how could you put in to stabilize the building? Focusing on that. And focusing on Officers' Row. If are going to make some choices on a phased building, that would be the way to go at it.

Then a couple fundamental questions that are out there. The trade-off between getting dollars in versus private an understanding that in usage and parking and what is that mean. As the committee thinks about this, and the smaller group thinks about this, these are questions that don't go away. That need ongoing consideration and thinking.

I will also just know, there's another sort of individual uses that came up. Is there potential or solution for some sort of flammability from someone with a military veteran connection. Nonprofit partner for exterior or hotel usage or housing choice vouchers. Naming rights. The potential for special needs supportive housing. Again, none of them are surprising. The answer that's going to do it. Maybe something to explore or in bits or bites.

So, that is what I have heard. I do not know how that strikes folks? I'm not hearing, necessarily, any sharp recommendation that needs to be nailed down today. We can certainly visit that and looking at the cochairs Gerry and Shawn to see if there's any recommendations that they think are emerging from this or more conversation of exploring ideas. I've heard, yes, establish this small group.

>>SHAWN WELCH: The working groups are not out of the realm of what we do. We've done them a number of time over the Request

for expression of interest started as a working group. Historic context cost working group. We can do it again. We can ask for volunteers here in our community. Who wants to be part of that and explore it offline between meetings.

Frankly, if we're going to do it we need to get people involved now and create that working group and let them chug until our next meeting. Maybe they can update us with their findings via email. To tee up for the next meeting. If we're going to do it, we're going to do it today. Read put some names on paper, and do some coordination. Everybody just wants to have meetings at of Hancock, anyway, right?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I've heard two names. I've heard Dorothy and Mary Eileen raise her hand. Do you need a formal recommendation to do that? Or cannot be the next step that comes out of this meeting?

>>SHAWN WELCH: If we put names on the list. You can put my carcass on it too. I'm not great with private money. We will see. The key is to just start brainstorming and looking at places to go. Being able to talk to. There's also going to need to be summary close coordination with Jan Steen. Jen is going to have to figure out what the belly button issue in which you want to be part of that.

At the end of the day, is going to have a connect to the federal government to Gateway. Because if it doesn't have a connect, we are wasting our time. They are authorities considerations that are substantial. I am eyeballing Mike to sign up. Put his name down. We could probably sit here and think about who else wants to play in this cable.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Given us a second?

>>GERRY GLASER: Just what Shawn said. Relatively small group. I think if we don't identify people on the committee who have the kind of experience we are looking for in financing. I'd like to hear some recommendations for a place or person we can go to outside. I think we need a person with that kind of banking and other expertise.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: He's not at today's meeting. We may also want to pull Mike Holenstein into the discussion.

>>SHAWN WELCH: That is a great point.

>>GERRY GLASER: Excellent, Jen.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Michael Walsh, I do not know-- I can see you at the moment. I don't know if you volunteered. I have got Mary Eileen, Dorothy, Shawn, and Mike Walsh, and reach out to Mike Holenstein. And then Gerry suggested if there's any other expertise that would be good to spring in. I'm sure Mike would be a good person to talk to about that.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Everyone needs a Marine on the team.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Again, I guess my question is, can this be a next step? What I'm hearing is yes, and go forward and do this. I have names down. Is that sufficient or do you need a formal recommendation? Do you need a formal recommendation to this.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I think it is kind of recommending itself. It will set up the work. The recommendation that really puts us on the record saying we are setting up this working group and want to work with the Park Service exploring these issues. It would be very helpful.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Put Lillian on that. Because she's got some background that we may get benefit out of

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I put together a little draft language, thinking you might want to go in this direction. Very simple. The advisory committee recommends that the Park Service establish a small working group evolving advisory committee members and appropriate external parties as needed to explore the potential financing option for state and county funding. Created private financing. Philanthropic sources, etc.

>>SHAWN WELCH: That sounds good.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Committee members, want to hear that again? I know we need to go to a break here in a moment.

>>BILL KASTNING: I think that covers all the bases.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Let's see here. Gerry?

>>GERRY GLASER: I did not want to let Tony off the hook if he's willing to participate. I know or try to keep the small.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: We're trying to give a small. We keep going. That's okay. Tony, are you feeling neglected?

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: I'm happy to.

>>GERRY GLASER: Thank you, Tony.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: It's rapidly becoming a committee as a whole. I've got Tony, Lillian, Michael Walsh, Shawn, Dorothy, Mary Eileen, and Mike Holenstein, if he is willing.

Okay. Anything else on this before we go to break? Thanks all for the good conversation. I know we all wish that we heard back from Stillman was that it works. That is not what we got. We now need to think and be more clever. And figure out more options. Thanks to everyone for being so open in the conversation and willing to push at this.

Let's go to break. We will go till 11:15 AM. Then, we will come back and have some general park updates from Jen. Then, members of the public who are on. Then, we will go to public comment at 11:30 AM sharp. Thanks, everyone, for the good conversation. See you in a little less than 15 minutes.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks to those who are flickering on your cameras. If others can get their seats and get them on as well. That would be much appreciated.

Jen, when you are at your desk, can you put your camera on? You are up. I cannot start the call without you.

I think we should probably get going. We have public comment coming up. I want to make sure Jen that you have your update. I will hand it off to you.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you. Let me get organized here. Let me get the right notes in front of me for our Park updates. We actually have a lot going on, in terms of projects and

investments. At the historic Post area, Fort Hancock, and across the peninsula.

One of the project that alluded to before is the roofs project on Officers' Row. I will start there. We are about 70 percent complete on this project. The project encompasses 15 buildings. It is a bigger scope than where we started. We want to do and use the money we have to stem the deterioration and seal up some of the buildings. We were looking at first for temporary roofing to buy us the time to get to the long-term rehabilitation or replacement that some of these buildings needed. We were able to put more money into it.

Under the philosophy of do it once, do it right. We are doing 15 buildings, 2 through 15 on Officers' Row. And Building 27. The Bachelor's Officers Quarters. We are doing the permanent roofs on all of those buildings. That is the work you have seen going on if you been out in that area over the past few months.

Again, it is about 70 percent complete. It should be done-- I do not have an exact done day. It has taken too long. Like many projects. Hopefully, by January or February at this point we will have that done. This was an over \$3 million project. We had identified this together as the highest priority in terms of who we could chip off needs for the buildings to help keep them standing and stabilized and stem further deteriorations.

Some of the work that went into that deteriorated wood rafters were replaced in kind. Structural Valley rafters were replaced in kind. Same thing with deteriorating roof sheathing. The tongue and groove sheathing. All new copper flashing was replaced in kind.

A new weather barrier was put on the entire roof surface. We used Costar deposit shingles on the entire roof surface that is crafted to look like the historic slate. By the time we next beat we will be done. We will are very close to it. This is the kind of project that we can think about doing across buildings, as we think about and talk about phasing. This is one potential direction for that going the system by system.

You also and anyone who's been up there have seen us working on the MUP. This was over \$1 million investment in rehabilitating the seven miles long stretch of the multi-use

path at Sandy Hook. The one that all the bicycles are on, as well as pedestrians. Resurfacing that. Doing patching or full replacement of the asphalt in the areas that were most deteriorated.

That should be done in the next few weeks. They're starting painting now. This is getting to the final punch list stages. That is a really, really popular visitor amenity. I think it's popular with all visitors, but I think it's particularly popular with the locals. I'm sure lots of people on the call will be happy to use that once it's done.

We are replacing the water well. We talked about these major projects before. I'll give you a status update. I'm not going into any projects that are under a million-dollar. We also have smaller level things going on. Just wanted to give you the big highlights. The water well replacement rehabilitation is \$4 million project. Construction is underway on that.

We have a pair of seawall projects along Officers' Row. By the chapel. These are coming from two different funding sources. One is the Great American Outdoors Act, the other is our National Park Service major construction fund. Together, that's a \$36 million investment in those shoreline protection features. I want to be clear, the purpose of those is to really keep the shoreline intact. It is being designed with future climate change sea level rise predictions in mind. It is not a protection from all levels of storm surge. We will keep that shoreline along the Bayside from eroding out well into the future.

Rehabilitating the water and wastewater systems at Sandy Hook. This is another Great American Outdoors Act project to the tune of over \$14 million will be starting construction in December. In the context of a lot of those initial Great American Outdoors Act are focused on utilities and protective infrastructure, not on buildings.

This is true across the National Park Service. Not even that many of the things the visitors will directly see. Investing in the really deteriorating critical infrastructure that supports those other uses that there is no way to find funding for any other way. I think we have done pretty well at Gateway, in particular, at Sandy Hook and some of these

investments.

Another one is rehabbing the electrical network at Sandy Hook. We are taking those electrical wires and putting them underground. That is currently moving forward, as well. It's not in construction yet. Hopefully, heading towards that point soon. It is close to \$9 million project. That will make the electrical system much more sustainable.

And if you've spent time out there in buildings, offices, residences, know how frequently we have power outages. This will eliminate a lot of that. A lot of those outages are caused by deteriorating infrastructure or the weather, or things of that nature. Getting them underground is going to be help, as well as, be a lot more aesthetically pleasing.

I think those are the major highlights at the big level projects. We have lower level we're going on. For those of you been out there lately, you also know their stretching going on off the tip of Sandy Hook. There is an Army Corps channel dredging project that they do on a periodic basis. That should be done within the next couple of weeks. Access to the areas at the north tip are closed off. We are almost there to the end.

With all that, any questions about things happening in the park?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Questions for Jen? Anybody?

>>SHAWN WELCH: One question for you, seawall. If I remember right, the start point is the original Army wall, and then you are applying new information. Let's call it new information to the design and the construction of the wall. Your baseline starts historic and moves from there. Am I right?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Maybe. I don't want to answer this wrong. I know that the portions bulkhead that were by the chapel are definitely historic. I am not sure if the entire length down Officers' Row is historic. I do not want to misspeak on that. The project will address all of that.

>>SHAWN WELCH: I think I remember that it is a start. There are also other things that would not be put in that would be historic breakwater. I don't think you're going to put

breakwaters back in. I do not remember that. It is historic.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Gerry?

>>GERRY GLASER: That is all fantastic news. We all recall from the early deliberations of this committee one of the things potential lessees commented about was the adequacy of the water system and wastewater system. These are huge investments that we should not be shy about letting people know that those are being taken care of. What you said about the roofs. That is a very large percentage of all the roofs that need replacement.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: That is really good news.

>>SHAWN WELCH: All we are missing is a couple barracks, and that is it. Those are under potential lease, anyway.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Any other questions or comments from committee members. Anything Jen just shared?

>>GERRY GLASER: I just had one left. That just occurred to me. None of those investments are going to make it easier on the potential on the lessee for the Officers Club. Are there any infrastructure?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: No. In terms of investment, the utility investment will serve the whole area. If people aren't able to hook up to the water system, because it's failing, that impacts everybody. No, there is no work. We are not doing the Officers Club roof. Or anything of that nature.

>>GERRY GLASER: We have a very brave lessee who's taking that on.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Michael.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: Just a quick question. With respect to infrastructure my recollection is the buildings-- called them the Officers' Row buildings. That they have the ability to have gas and propane putting, if they do that, and assume that the alternative would be heating with electricity. If they put propane, do they have the ability to bury the tanks?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: This is something we have gone around.

Karen, are you jumping in on this? Are you going to save me?

>>PATTI RAFFERTY: This is Patti jumping in. Since Hurricane Sandy, we have been burrying propane tanks out there. Pete may know if there's been any exceptions. By and large I think that is been the practice that we have been going with. Any installation since hurricane Sandy.

>>PETE MCCARTHY That is our current practice.

>>KAREN EDELMAN: And in terms of lessee, the opportunity is there in lease subject to compliance.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: I think it's looks a lot better than having tanks sitting around.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: We have one minute before we go to public comment. Is there last quick question for Jen?

In that case, let's go to public comment. I think we may have a slide for that. If not, let me just remind folks that are here we always make an opportunity for public comment at every advisory committee meeting. It is really important that the committee hears from you and understands any thoughts you have, related to any of the issues under discussion.

I invite you to please "raise your hand" if you like to come into the mix. Again, you should be able to see a raise hand icon at the bottom of your zoom screen. If you put your cursor there. And for summaries it doesn't work, you can open up the Q&A and express interest in talking there, as well.

We did not have anyone sign up in advance. I have nobody to kick off the queue. So we will take it in the order that you "raise your hand" online. If you do want to jump in, we ask each public member to start by sharing your name and your affiliation. Then ask you to limit your comments to 1 to 2 minutes.

Again, if there's people who have comments but don't feel comfortable or would prefer not to make them publicly in a meeting like this. You're welcome to put them in the Q&A as a written comment. You are welcome to put them in an email to Daphne. The point is to share your thoughts. We will take them

anyway you want to give them to us.

Let me see if we have anyone who would like to make a comment. I see the first hand has gone up. Muriel, I will open up your line. Again, if you can start with your name and any kind of affiliation. So the folks know who is talking. I think your line is open.

>>MURIEL SMITH: Good morning. My name is Muriel Smith. I live in Highlands. I am love with Sandy Hook. What else can I tell you. I was terribly disappointed as much as I love everything about the Mule Barn. I share everyone's congratulations for the hard work and everything that's there. Is a terrific place. I can tell you that, as well, for visiting it.

I was disappointed that Dr Ford was only on for two minutes and nobody asked him any questions about why they haven't gone out to bid. You know why they haven't gone out to bid yet? That would be my first question to you.

My second would be, that he said that they have to re- work the architectural drawings. I'm wondering why nobody asked why do the architectural drawings have to be redrawn to a strong and got over again? I thought they were completed.

Then my third question would be, I understand yesterday at the MAST naval inspection, their biggest event of the year, that Dr Ford said on here and yesterday also, that the new building is going to have offices at the drill field. At the indoor drill field.

I hope he knows that it's also going to have bathrooms for the students. They don't have them over there. Hopefully, the building will be air-conditioned, because the other buildings are not air-conditioned.

Also, that's going to have changing rooms. So the cadets, all 272 of them, I think they said yesterday, would have changing rooms. Does anybody on the committee know the answers to any of those questions?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I do not know if we have an immediate answer for you. It might be something we would need to have

someone to get back to.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Only to say, I don't know to the answers to those off the top of my head. We can certainly capture them all and get answers from the committee.

>>SHAWN WELCH: I think we had a couple answers given by Dr Ford. I do not remember totally specific that is points about supply issues and cost issues with drive changes in drawings. He did mention that. That would drive changes.

He talked about compliance issues and having to change codes and get exceptions. That would cause changes in the drawings. There was another issue he talked about on historic compliance that would've driven changes for the drawings.

He listed about five things, in my mind and my experience in my past, okay, those things are good because you to go back to the drawing board. The downside to that, every time you go to the drawing board, it's like taking \$100 bill in lighting them on fire. That's a site you're dealing with. He did lay out several things that caught my attention of why he would've done things. Those things on the surface without taking anything they're doing sound reasonable to me.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Shawn. I heard similar things. Thank you, Muriel. Any other members of the public who would like to make a comment.? I am not saying hands up. I am not saying anything in the Q&A. I want to pause another minute or two. Just waiting to see if anyone else would jump in. Okay last chance.

I think we have a pretty limited public comment period at this time. If that's the case. I'm not seeing anybody. I think we can dive back into the agenda. That sounds good. Jen, Gerry, Shawn, are you okay with that?

>>SHAWN WELCH: Let's get it up.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Let's push on here. Our next topic is to talk about the advisory committees leasing program update. You all may recall at the April meeting, the committee had a chance to take a deep dive into the 30-plus recommendations that look forward to you by the leasing workgroup. It was a rich

discussion. I was really impressed by how the recommendations came to. How they were discussed.

As a result of that conversation, you all generated six recommendations that you asked the Park Service to follow up on. We want to make time today to hear back from Jen and her team on the status of those recommendations. Jen, I will hand it off to you.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you. I think the full list-- I will walk us through them. What you're looking at here, the recommendations in blue, were your recommendations as the advisory committee to the National Park Service.

Then, you're seeing some bullets in black. One recommendation was, "Report back to us on what you doing about the working group recommendations." Those are some of the working group recommendations that were called out in that conversation. I'm going to give you an update we are looking at these issues. The first recommendation in blue to look at, again, the working group recommendations and report back.

First, we have waste management recommendation to minimize impacts to wildlife. We do have, and we have put into the leases themselves provisions about waste management, and things like trash has to be in tamperproof containers.

Beyond the provision that we are including in the lease, if we continue to see impacts, we can adaptively manage through any other further requirements in the operating plans. That is something that we will certainly monitor and keep her eyes on, if we are seeing those kinds of issues.

Feral cats and wildlife. Feral cats is an ongoing management issue in many areas of the parks. We do not want folks feeding wildlife that is not how we manage wildlife in the National Park.

Again, we can look at their specific issues with lessees in their management of the lease property. We can address through an operating plan. One of the other tools that, again, based on the recommendations that have come out of our conversations, and conversations with the working group, is we are developing a lessee handbook.

For many years, we talked about a handbook for the construction process, and all the requirements for historical considerations. We did put that together and have been using that with people who come in at the beginning of their lease into the process. Through the negotiation phase, and then into the construction phase.

This is a different kind of handbook where talk about now. This is once you're living in the park, what are the rules? How do you behave in the National Park? What are some of the considerations? Where are you allowed to go or not go and when? How do you be in the park in a way that is respectful of the wildlife? The ecosystem? And other visitors? And in conformance with the rules and requirements? Putting that together and handbook that makes it easy and understandable and collects it all in one place.

We are bringing on an intern and a Detailee that will spend a few months focusing on putting this together for us. These kinds of issues like feral cats and wildlife, will also address through this new handbook that will shortly be under development.

Mowing frequency and timing during moving onto the next bullet. In general, our lessees will not be doing mowing. The National Park Service will continue to be responsible for landscape management. In general, lessees only get their buildings. In some cases they may get small external footprint.

For example, in the cases of the Mule Barn, there was a small piece of land pertinent to the structure that was included with the lease for outdoor seating. Generally, we are not talking about any areas big enough to be thinking about mowing and impacts to birds.

However, if that were to change or there was a situation where that was a consideration, absolutely we would be looking to manage it in a way that wasn't conformance with wildlife protection and habitat management goals.

I think that speaks to the next bullet, too, about managing turf. That we will continue to be responsible for that. Impacts for campfires and fireplaces, again, generally the lessees are

getting land. We're not going to be allowing campfires next to buildings. So, that is not a consideration.

Fireplaces, so far the fireplaces are not currently in working order in these buildings. None of the plans that we approved so far have included anything about returning them to working condition. If we get something in that is looking for that. We don't currently have a prohibition, per se. I think we would be looking at that very carefully. And would consider this and how to safely manage that in a historic building.

There's still one bullet down there. Parking. Tony, I think you raise this issue before, too. The need to look at parking. We are taking a comprehensive look at parking. We had an analysis done to look at. For instance, Park shore and drive.

If we converted that the one way and had traffic loop around the parade grounds and come down the other way. Converting one lane of traffic to parking spaces. We have former plans that have identified other areas in this geographical area for potential parking consideration.

This is something that we are aware of the need to look at holistically and comprehensively. Some kind of shuttle service, some cases, is going to need to be part of the solution. We are not just going to pave over everything and put parking lots everywhere. Parking will need to be accommodated somehow. That is something for the park we will move forward, and as it does, keep you all informed and engaged.

Anticoagulant traps for pest control. I think, according to our current policies, this is not allowed in any case. Any kind of use of pesticides within the park is going to have to be approved by us with a compliance audit. We will track they use. That will be a very prescribed process with a lot of oversight.

Fertilizers. Any kind of chemical application of anything is going to have to be reviewed and approved by us. The National Park Service. Again, in general, these leases are not going to come with land assignments. If they are, they will be very small and for specific uses. People are not going to have a yard where they will be responsible for mowing or thinking about fertilizers.

Managing waste oil disposal. We may not manage it and will be out there doing it or monitoring it every day. We will manage it in terms of the rules and in terms of doing inspections. Any kind of food establishment is subject to our public health inspections. We do have a public health sanitarian on staff who does regular inspections of any food operations in the park. Waste oil disposal is something that he looks at.

PFA containing fire extinguishers and firefighting foams. We have in place restrictions on these things already. Anyone who is interested, we can send you a link to those.

Identified a dedicated-- those were some of the environmental recommendations that came in the working group to the committee. Things you asked us to report back on. Now we have some other buckets of recommendations from the committee itself, that I want to report back on. Part of it is the next one is identifying dedicated resources to manage the leasing program on an ongoing basis.

Especially, as we have more and more buildings occupied. The type of management shifts from when we are soliciting opportunities and asking for proposals. In evaluating proposals, negotiating leases. Once people are in there and on-the-ground, then the management changes a little too more on site oversight, to make sure that there are no complex and uses. Things are being managed in according to the terms and leases, and operating plans.

There are also capacities that are needed for things like calculating rent offsets. Making sure that historical requirements are met. That is something we're looking at. In the process of staffing up for.

I realize that I see Mimi's name on our participant list here. I didn't call her out when I called our staff. She is a new member of our business services team. We have several others, as well. We will be looking at ways to continue to expand that team to handle some of the oversight management needs of our leasing program, moving into the future.

Looking to maintain communication and transparency about how we are addressing environmental concerns, and recommending and providing a list of the measures in a proactive easy-to-use

online format. I think the slides today tracking some of the environmental concerns that have been raised, and how and where we are addressing them, whether in these terms. Operating plans, all that, will be up on the website and publicly available.

We will continue to look at-- we do not have anything beyond that developed yet. We are happy to talk with you further about what kind of tracking mechanism is appropriate and maintainable and provides the kind of information that the committee and the public are looking for.

We are happy to do whatever we can to meet that need. But did at least as a first step of putting together that tracking sheet to look at the concerns and the mechanisms are using to address them.

The next one is reporting back on environmental impacts and how we will be addressing them. I hope that some of what we covered between Karen's report out from the working group recommendations, and my just touching on some of those issues here. How they are dressed in our on-the-ground management, as well as our rules and policies. It helps move the ball forward here. We will continue to try and communicate these things out. If there are additional specific things you want us to report out on, we are happy to do that.

Coastal hazards and vulnerabilities. In including provisions in the leases that call out the risks with coastal hazards. That, absolutely, we can look at ways within the leases to make sure people are aware where they are at. And are taking that into account for themselves.

In terms of our own efforts, in regard to understanding what the risks are, and making informed decisions based on those risk. We continue to move forward. Maybe I'm going to bleed over a little into our next agenda item. This is one of these things that the working group was very interested in, as well. I will just update on where we are as the park are at.

We are still waiting for-- we had a comprehensive climate vulnerability assessment done. This was a contracted effort for the park. That will give us. We use climate change vulnerability data now. We are always looking at sea level RISE projections, store search modeling. When we are making investment and

management decisions in the park.

Especially long-term investment decisions. This will give us more comprehensive data that is very park specific to our individual park structures and different geographic areas of the park. Looking at several different coastal hazards related to climate change.

Once we get that data in, we will use that to inform more comprehensive climate change strategies process, that will look comprehensively at Sandy Hook. We can think about the data that we are seeing alongside future investments. What's most vulnerable? What time period are we talking about? And, either, zero in our are we going to try to mitigate some of these risks? Are we retreating from some of these risks? Or are there other kinds of adaptations to structure or other types of strategies that were pursue with eyes wide open to what the probabilities are with various climate change factors.

We have a planner that will be coming on to lead that effort. We have got some funding and support through the Inflation Reduction Act to bring on some staff who will help with this. Primarily, in this case, a climate change planner, who will be sharing with one other park. Who will lead this effort, once we have that vulnerability assessment data on hand.

This is something we continue to be focused on. As we move forward, in that strategy effort, it is our intention to be very transparent with what data we are bringing in. How those decisions are being made. Welcoming feedback and comments. And, of course, sharing the results moving forward.

Social equity. Yes, this is something we continue to talk about and look at and will continue through this recommendation. The committee recognized that this conversation started with the working group. Affirms that the committee's interest in this moving forward. Gerry will update you in a few minutes some of the efforts that are happening there.

I think that is it. I think it is a positive thing for us to be responding to recommendations and giving updates at each meeting. If there any questions on these, I am happy to take those, too.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Jen. I just wanted to reiterate what you said. I think it's one thing to give recommendations. It's important to get these and report back. Where those recommendations are going and what is happening with them? I think this is a really thoughtful and very comprehensive report back. So thanks Jen and team for that.

Committee members, any questions or thoughts about that part? Anybody? Again, these are your recommendations from April. We want to make sure you're getting the feedback that you are looking for. That these recommendations feel like they are on track. If not, getting additional feedback. Any kind of reaction would be helpful. Even if it is, "That was great, appreciated." And of course, one. Two thumbs up, three thumbs up. It's a bona fide trend.

Michael, sounds like you want to come in.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: Since no one's jumping in. The reaction by the Park Service is great. Pretty much appreciate the work putting into it. Thank you.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Michael.

I am not seeing any hands up. Jen, I think you must have been very comprehensive. Thanks to you. I know there's a whole bunch of people who are behind you doing a lot of that work. Thanks to the whole team on that.

Good. All right. Let's push on to the next topic. Which is the working group update and status. I will hand the soft to Jen in a second. I will just say by way of teams, working group set up by the advisory committee back in spring 2021.

While I would've said, if asked nine months ago, it's actually more than two years ago are almost two and half years ago. That group has done a tremendous amount of work. It has met 14 times. It's really dove in headfirst into this.

You've got the benefit of all their thinking. There recommendations. We just want to spend a little time catching up on the latest working group discussion. I think I checked in

last week. Also, getting your thoughts on the working group status and future direction. With that, Jen, I'm going to hand it back to you. To take us through that topic.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Sure. Normally, although I sit on all the working group meetings. And benefit greatly from hearing firsthand the conversation that goes on there. Normally, it is not me reporting back out to the community on the working group.

It should be when the working group has issues or recommendations that information should be flowing from the working group to the committee. So the committee can make recommendations back to the Park Service.

For instance, all the ones I just responded to that you recommended previously. This last meeting we had with the working group was different, though, it was basically a check-in to see on have we accomplished our goals now that we've been at this however many years that Bennett just quoted. Are there items still outstanding? What does this mean for the working group moving forward? I will share with you just the highlights of that conversation.

Starting back from way back when we formed the working group. We had the foresight to put together a charter and a mission statement. We had some-- as we asked people to contribute their time and thoughts to this. That they were clear on what we are asking them. What we are trying to achieve. As we went through this, we would know when we achieved those things. It would be clear what we had set out to do.

We said that we wanted to pull together representatives from many other groups that it spoken up after the Stillman proposal came in. Expressing concerns. So that we could really make sure that we understood those concerns, and hopefully, work together to see if there are ways to address within the context of our leasing process, and our historic preservation goals.

Our mission statement said that we are establishing the workgroup to move fully understand concerns related to the Stillman proposal. To maintain open dialogue with interested external entities, so that everyone is working from the same information's. Concerns are being communicated directly to the committee.

Thirdly, assess alternatives and develop recommendations to the National Park Service in ways to incorporate strategies in the leasing project that addresses those concerns.

I can say that throughout the process, that has remained what we have been really focused on. We also had some specific charges that were in this charter. That were to evaluate the concerns, raise to understand, which are based on misinformation, or misunderstanding. Which to relate to issues with proposal and leasing framework.

For the former and form of communication strategy that helps dispel miscommunication, for the latter, the issues that really relate to the proposal leasing framework. Assess whether there are modifications to leasing proposals that can help to address these interests and formulate recommendations for the advisory committee.

We had a really good conversation with the working group on have we accomplished the goal. I think we have accomplished a whole lot for many environmental issues-- it has strengthened our leasing instruments. It is led in part to the development of these operating plans for a lot of the terms and conditions it will continue to inform as we create this new lessee handbook. To help with our management of having more people out there and trying to minimize the negative impact the opportunities in this area.

We addressed social equity with the working group is clear a lot. I think many of those things are done. The recommendations have been passed along. We have acted on many, there a few outstanding issues.

One is the issue of social equity, and Gerry, we'll talk about that in a minute. As well as over the past few meetings, as we talked about conceptual and how to that the working group alone is not the right group to address this.

We started to bring in and talk to other experts or people with connections with communities or with experience in this area. Every talked about advisory committee level, that may be a different working group or different process that continues to move forward with the committee.

Then there's a strong interest by the working group and climate change related issues. As I just outlined, we have a bigger process in the park that will be looking at this. Certainly, as we move forward, all of the members of the working group are going to welcome them into this. We would be happy, as we have more information in that process, to have a return to the working group and have a conversation about those things, as well. That is on the to do list. We are not quite at that point in the process yet.

And then, one of the other things that was flagged in this recent discussion with the working group. Things that are still hanging out there, is the notion of privatization. This is what stoked a lot of the opposition many years ago. With the old leasing process that, ultimately, failed.

It was something that was raised three years ago when the Stillman proposal came in. This fear or concern or opposition to the perception of leasing park buildings to a private developer. The public may not have access to inside. That constituted privatization of a public good.

As we discussed and as we lease out these buildings, people can't get inside them right now. They can get in representative buildings. Like the history house or any number of other buildings we open to the public. But if we are not able to do something with these buildings, nobody will ever get in them. They will fall down. We then lose the cultural landscape and the exteriors of these buildings.

What the leasing program will accomplish, is restoring those exteriors and giving the public full access to the site, to the cultural landscape, and to the experience of what this place look like and felt like in the heyday of its history.

No land in general, you know, maybe in some cases. A small pertinent footprint. Were not leasing land. We are leasing buildings. The public still has access to the site. We have talked about these issues before. Despite all this, there are still is this gut reaction out there in the public to the perception, notion of privatization that remains.

I think the working group recognizes that this is out

there. Recognizes that it's something beyond the working group. And in the context of leasing, too. What we are doing here with private leasing and even private residential leasing, is no different than what is happening in many areas across the National Park Service with our leasing authorities. To accomplish our historic preservation goals.

We do not want to get to a point when we're going to start construction with investor and there's a public outcry again about privatization. This issue is still hanging out there. On the recommendation of the working group, we are bringing that now back to the advisory committee for you to think about, be aware of, chew on, and talk about how we want to watch what our strategies are for a that the committee that, moving forward.

Those are a few loose ends and their big ones. We will come back to it some form of the working group. Or someone else to address. We want to flag as beyond what the working group is going to address needs to address.

Additionally, we've also talked about with the working group, as we hit different points in the project. What we're doing is as the specific charges in the charter that I just read to you a moment ago. Part of the goal there was also communication. I hope that all of our representatives on the working group are communicating with their own organizations and memberships, and contingencies. We want to keep those lines of communication open. Their reactions flowing back into us.

As we hit different milestones in the process here, we are happy to pull these groups back together, to give the working group an update and get any additional feedback reactions from them.

None of what I'm saying leads to any type of recommendations from our part that we want to disband the working group. Just recognize that many of these things have been accomplished. There's those three items that are being set back to the committee to keep on the table, as things that need to be addressed by the committee itself, or through other means. That will all stay in touch, and come back together as needed in the future.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Jen.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: I welcome anyone from the working group. We have a couple committee members on the workgroup. If I missed anything, please chime in. That is my overview and takeaway.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Jen. Super helpful. We have some committee members who are on the committee here. If any of you want to amplify your way into to add anything Jen said. If there's any question from the committee. Jen, that would be great. If there's any reflections on the last point that Jen raised around privatization, certainly happy to entertain any conversation on that.

>>JIM KRAUSS: From my viewpoint, Jen just covered it extremely well. Covered everything.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Jim.

And, Jen, I'm hearing from what you said. I want to confirm. The working group is not being disbanded. It is there to be drawn upon as a resource as it has been. As issues are coming up. It will just be reconvened. I don't think I'm hearing the need for any necessary recommendation or formal action. I just want to ground truth that with you.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Yes. Where there may be need for some mom formal action, I don't even know. We really want the committee to think about that privatization. Keep that within our focus, as we continue to move forward with the leasing program. This is been something that continues to rear its head. We want to understand how to address that concern.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks.

Let's go to Tony, and then over to Bill.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: On the issue of privatization, my thought is this, we talked earlier about popularity of the Mule Barn already. You can't get in there almost any day. I waited there over an hour to get a table to eat there. I ran into Shawn there. It's a really nice place. It's a great bar and a great restaurant with great food. People driving six miles out there because it's the best restaurant the world, no.

Are they driving six miles because they just want to drive six miles, no. People in this area to the region love Fort Hancock and love the idea that buildings are being saved. That's the reason people are going there. They are not going there for any other reason. They think it's great.

In fact, if it weren't for privatization, nobody would ever set foot in the Mule Barn. Since they have been open, thousands of people have set foot in the Mule Barn. They wouldn't have otherwise. So, from private investment, these buildings will never be accessible to the public. Some will have residential uses. They will be hundred percent accessible to the public. They will be accessible to families. Their families and relatives will visit them. Many hundreds of people will get to visit these buildings, who wouldn't have otherwise. That's what I think we needed.

In this part of Monmouth County, this part of the state, there's a great affection for Sandy Hook and in its entirety. And Fort Hancock, because of its historic significance. We should not lose sight of that. We should respect that. That's the only way to realistically save that the buildings, and I think that should be our message. That's more accessible to the public than it ever was.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Tony. Bill.

>>BILL KASTNING: I would like to second the fact that Jen has done an outstanding job of helping us to make important conclusions, and she expressed those well. I'm sure the press is listening to this presentation here today. I would hope that they would reach out to Jen and others for comments, or thief questions, get those answered before they published in the local newspapers. Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Bill. Shawn.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Adding to what Tony was saying about the Mule Barn, and why people go there. You are right. Love Fort Hancock. 99.9 percent of a lot of them are coming out by word-of-mouth.

The organization I'm with, the Army Ground Forces Association, at least three separate occasions we've had people

walk up to us and donate right there at the bar. Wherever we happen to be in the restaurant. Knowing what we're doing restoring gun batteries out of the blue. They walk up and stuff a wad of cash in hand and say, "Go get a drink." We're putting that to materials.

The impact of that tells me where people are at. What they are thinking. We need to continue to feed that. That's the beast that's going to grow very positively into the future.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Shawn.

Any other comments from anyone or thoughts on how you think you might want to keep this conversation on privatization going forward? What that might look like. I'm sure that Jen, Shawn and Gerry will think how to carry this forward into next meeting. We welcome any thoughts folks have. Linda.

>>LINDA COHEN: Since the inception of this committee, my idea, dream was to see some kind of focal point out at Fort Hancock. I have always imagined it would be art and science facility for attracting families. The Mule Bar has done that. It has created this initial presence.

I think that Jen illuminated it perfectly. And for me it spells it out in a way that I hadn't quite seen in my own mind. That was that although the public will be getting into every building. They will be getting into representative buildings. And the concept that all the buildings will be restored gives the cultural landscape the revitalization for everyone.

I think those are beautiful, crucial points that you made, Jen. That's what I have to say. Thank you. It is very impressive.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Linda.

Its access, of course, is essential. Access to all essential is what you're creating a larger landscape. Thanks.

Anyone else carried away on this? Jen, are you looking for anything more specific at this point? Just sort of flagging this with something that we are going to have to be thinking through?

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Is something we need to keep thinking about. Not just talking about in meetings. Whatever our next steps are, we have to keep this issue and focus, lest it come back to bite us, yet, again. Have some communication strategy that goes along with every milestone that helps underscore the public good that comes out of these kinds of investments.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. I am not seeing anyone else jumping in at this point. Jen, again, if there's something you want to hear from the committee, I think we can close out this conversation and shift to social equity at this point.

Our last topic for today, which will be a brief update is to hand it over to Gerry Glaser, who can catch us up on the thinking around social equity and some of the outreach that has been going on. Maybe a little bite into what this is heading. Gerry, over to you.

>>GERRY GLASER: I do not want to start my discussion without reacting to the point that Jen just made about not wanting to close out the issue with privatization.

In many respects, the conversations we've had about social equity grew out of discussions over privatization in that people. I can't get access to things you're doing. It's two things and understanding what people felt that way. And then try to make sure that we can develop strategies that are inclusive for all of those who want access to the resources at the park.

I see the issue of misunderstanding what privatization means, in terms of denying people access to the park. I think the small group that we put together is about to tackle that. Linda Cohen has raised her hand to help us out. Linda and Nora has been called today to join the committee, plus three others, including, person from the Affordable Housing Allowance. A woman who's done a lot of outreach at Coney Island. I am drawing a blank on the third person.

What are we doing?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Professor of academics--

>>GERRY GLASER: A woman who's environmental scientist in the

SUNY system. Let me put it that way. We're trying to figure out the best way to frame the conversation. What we are also thinking, is the whole conversation can't take place just among the small group that we have created.

I think we are going to explore ways that it can be rolled into a discussion with a larger community. Because of such interest about it among everyone in the larger community. We're trying to think how we can scope this. The reach and the objectives of what it means to improve these social equity issues. We were moving a little slowly because the full committee was deeply involved in the environmental issues within the environmental working group. We now see our point of entry. We are going to be moving forward to explore with the objectives should be.

I wanted to emphasize that this is an integral part of the discussion around privatization. We are trying to show that there is equal access to all these facilities. Whether they are subject to other leases of other things like that.

Linda, since you are with us in this group, if I have left something out, please jump in and remind me what I haven't discussed? I can't hear you.

>>LINDA COHEN: I think you did a comprehensive job. We will certainly be able to add to the conversation, as the committee goes on.

>>GERRY GLASER: Jen are anyone else who would like to--

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Committee members, anything on this?

>>GERRY GLASER: Let me just add one quick thing. We are going to be struggling with, how to keep it focus. This is a huge issue. Once you start moving around the space that issue, we have to be sure to put the proper balance around it.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Which was a theme that was raised at the advisory committee in April, as well. Good point, Gerry.

If there's nothing else then, I think we are going to push ahead and start entering the final lap here. One of the things I know you always want to do and value, it is always good and

important to do. Is to have a little time at the end for around the room, and around the table, and around the zoom, for advisory committee members to weigh in on whatever you saw or heard. Key takeaways from the meeting today.

Any impressions or reflections you want to share? Thoughts on issues you might want to take up at a future advisory committee meeting? Based on what we talked about today? To create a pretty informal and open time for you all to talk with one another and share whatever perspectives you have. I will leave it at that. I will invite members to come off mic and raise their hand. Weigh in on whatever is on your mind at this point.

>>DAPHNE YUN: Brand-new policy. I sent everyone the minutes. Someone needs to approve them. Then it needs to be seconded. Like any other meeting, now that's an requirement for this meeting, as well.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Daphne. You want to have that happen right now? We need someone to approve the minutes from April, and someone to second.

>>DAPHNE YUN: Yes. So, Pat, Michael. I don't know if that's why you raised your hands. Whatever it is.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: I approve the minutes.

>>DAPHNE YUN: I think that is fine.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you both.

>>PATRICK COLLUM: Does someone in the committee have to accept it, though?

>>JIM KRAUSS: I.

>>MICHAEL WALSH: Put forward the proposal.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Anyone not approved?

>>SHAWN WELCH: These are the ones. A few minutes ago, right?

>>BENNETT BROOKS: This is the April one. Very good. Thank you, Daphne.

Any comments around the committee? Any general reflections or observations? Issues that you want to flag for discussion at the next meeting? Always helpful, too. Anyone care to weigh in? Gerry?

>>GERRY GLASER: I do not know whether this is going to be possible, or not. I'd like to keep out on the table the idea of us getting together in person at Fort Hancock.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Okay.

>>SHAWN WELCH: I second that.

>>LINDA COHEN: I second that.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: For an actual committee meeting is challenging for us. We do not have a set up where we can fit enough people into a place where we can do a hybrid meeting. So, that is the challenge with having an on-site meeting right now. That isn't to say that we couldn't set up some kind of less formal outing to tour the buildings. To spend some time together on site.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Some in-person gatherings, but maybe short of it.

>>SHAWN WELCH: So, why can't we do something, now that we're ADA compliant. Doing something in a large room.

>>DAPHNE YUN: What I was told, it's not the connectivity. Which is the main problem. It's also even the places where we have connectivity, we only have connectivity for DOI. For the Park Service sites. The computers. No one else would be able to plug in.

Tony, I see your hand up. I know that you also offered your space earlier. That might be something that we can explore down the road. Just like we used to have at Thompson Park. Then maybe we can have an in-person meeting that is hybrid in your space.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: We could do that. We're not at Fort Hancock. But we're pretty much as close as you can get. We do have a facility similar to size and shape of room. Much more media friendly. So, we do have that ability. For a future meeting here. Just let me know, and we will schedule the day.

>>SHAWN WELCH: If you're worried about private nongovernment connectivity, I will tell you this, when you're outside the summer. Hotspot off my phone out there. I can do anything, and I get push files. I get good service and good coverage in the post. Since that cell tower went up, that changed the world out there. Not in the summer though. In the summer, with 50,000 people at their site, it suddenly goes to a crawl. Outside of that, for private conductivity hotspots, it's pretty good.

>>LINDA COHEN: I am familiar with Tony's offer. His building is really ideal for us. I think we should certainly consider it. It would be wonderful to meet again. That is ample space for all of us.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Linda. Gerry.

>>GERRY GLASER: I'll just modify my suggestion. If we have the meeting virtually, so all who wanted to attend can. Tony, it'd be fun to take you up on your offer. Then just have a field trip out to the park, for those who can make it. If that would fit with the rules.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: That would be good.

>>LINDA COHEN: I think we can do that.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: We can nail down a day. We can certainly send that up.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Meeting at Middletown. Then lunch at Mule Bar. Some such thing.

>>GERRY GLASER: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Anyone else want to jump in on this? Anything else at the top of mind? Tony.

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: I had one other thought. I've been thinking the last couple times a minute. I do not know if we discussed this in the past. I do not recall. Again, dealing with this issue and concern about privatization. Closing this area off to the general public. While there are buildings at Fort Hancock, that are closed to the public.

You've got MAST, and other organizations with offices there. They are not generally wide open to the public. You just cannot walk in and check them out. I'm wondering if maybe we should think about moving into plans. One building that can be turned into some sort of cultural resource Museum, local history facility. I know you have a little bit of that.

I think the lighthouse provided that to some degree. I know in Monmouth County built the third terminal in Milltown. One of the requirements for the DBP was that they include in the plans at some point a local history facility. We are actually working on that with them now to get that to become a reality.

We might want to include in our plans, and I don't want to call Museum. A museum-like space where people go and learn about of the four. It would be open to the public on a regular basis. That gets to the equity issue to some degree.

There's an educational component that comes along with this "Privatization" of the buildings. That would ensure that there is a place the public can always go to. If they want to go and see something or learn something.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: In reply to that, I will say that's certainly something we always want to see too. As a National Park Service bread-and-butter. We do have facilities already, in addition to the lighthouse keeper's quarters. We have a history house.

Over the past few years, we opened up the old jail on the other side of the parade grounds, as a little Museum. A space for smaller meetings or events. That is there to serve that purpose, as well. I will say from the National Park Service standpoint, there are only so many places we can staff and maintain.

Not every building can be or needs to be a museum. If there

ideas for space that is beyond what we currently offer, at least 4 or 5 different publicly accessible Museum-type visitor service type spaces that were talked about, we are open to it. We just need to find someone to operate it. It would be beyond our capacity.

That is actually the conversation we had about the Spinnaker Cove Center, which used to be a Park visitor center. We put some investment into the old Coast Guard lifesaving station. It's also a start. It's not what we've been looking at the lease program. It was impacted by hurricane Sandy. We put a lot of money into stabilizing it. Repairing some of the hurricane damage. Operating it without shutting one of the other facilities down and moving the stuff over to them. Isn't something that we in the Park Service can take on.

We are very open to any partner that could. That's what's led to the Sandy Hook Foundation coming to the table with interest and operating there. If there are opportunities like that, that are part of any kind of rehabilitation strategy. We are open to that.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Linda, it looks like you're eager to jump in there.

>>LINDA COHEN: This is finally my goal out here. I did have an artist who had approached me and told me she had a family foundation, and that she wanted to have a studio. Exhibit out at Sandy Hook where people could come in and see our work and make our work. She even got a building by the Mule Bar. That she was interested in. It wasn't on the list. We actually went through the Sandy Hook foundation, and they are very on board with her art idea.

Then I have a person who wanted to do a science center, which Jen, you know I've always spoken about. The children's Discovery Center for children of all ages. We showed her the space at North Beach, that's right at the buildings there. That is really not even very bad shape. She was quite interested in starting a science center there. She had plenty of people to work for her. And to work with her. She would have to write grants for. I just had to introduce that at this point.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Linda.

>>SHAWN WELCH: Jen, to tack on to what you're saying about the guardhouse. The Park Service does have some exhibits in there. It has been often on a museum. There's some capacity the park services had having partners help them out would be absolutely fantastic. There are cells in there. It's not a jail. Those were designed specifically as holding areas for troops.

In the years before you had motion sensor alarms, your motion sensors were troops. There was a Lieutenant who would sit in the building every day of the week 24/7 and run details of soldiers of about 40 people all over the fort. Their job was to be the motion sensor alarm to secure the fort. That was what was ran out of the building.

The holding cells were for the local sheriff calls up the Garrison sergeant major and says "I have one of your knuckleheads." And the NPS would go out and get them and bring him back there. He goes in there and then help him they spend their weekends painting stones. That is your short, goofy history of your guardhouse.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Shawn. Linda, I wanted to come back to you for a minute. Was there anything immediate next step that you are hoping to see for either one of these expressions of interest that you mentioned?

>>LINDA COHEN: Of course, I would love some feedback. So that I could offer it to these people. Yes. The science Museum could very well have. I've even spoken to math teachers. Some of their kids that help man it, as well as people and volunteers interested in Marine biology.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Any feedback from Linda on any of these interest? The artist studio concept or a science center concept? Any feedback from Linda on that? To talk to where she would go with that?

>>MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I think it's a great idea. The difficulty is always the funding. If this person is an artist has funds available, then shouldn't she be speaking to the park system about what is possible, or what she'd like to do?

>>LINDA COHEN: Yes.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: She has been.

>>LINDA COHEN: She has been contacting me. I have been in touch with these people. I'm now bring it up to you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Thanks. Any thoughts or questions for Linda?

>>SHAWN WELCH: That sounds like that is already moving with the Park Service? Linda, you guys are already chatting?

>>LINDA COHEN: No.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: No.

>>LINDA COHEN: I think the Sandy Hook foundation put her in touch with Pete. I thinks Pete is communicating with her somewhat. Not too much.

>>PETE MCCARTHY: That's correct, Linda. That is correct. I have met with Caitlin. I met with Caitlin. She has passed some information along to me.

>>LINDA COHEN: Is there something that interests you, Pete? Do you think you possibly come to fruition?

>>PETE MCCARTHY: That something that is a Park-wide decision. Linda, she's got a very interesting idea. That's something that needs to go forward to the business office and the superintendent. As they are making considerations on that.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I would just like in the chat a comment from Tony. To see if the Jacques Cousteau Society might be interested? Where are they based now?

>>TONY MERCANTANTE: I do not know where they are based. They have a facility at Tuckerton. It's kind of a small aquarium type facility. They run a lot of educational programs out there. Run a lot of school programs in that facility. They are an organization that has resources. I don't know if anyone has spoken to them. It might be worth a shot.

>>GERRY GLASER: Before, I used to know the guide that ran

that and Tuckerton. Mike Deluca, so I can make the connection for whoever wants that.

>>LINDA COHEN: Great.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Any other comments on this? I think maybe we should start to close here. To get you all out early to your day.

Just to remind you all that there was one recommendation generated today. It was really focused on the follow-up from Jen's update on where we ought to go with the Stillman proposal and the recommendation.

The advisory committee recommends that the Park Service establish a small advisory to be group.-- External parties as needed to explore potential financing options. To create private philanthropic sources, etc.-- Streamlined and trying to get its arms around. What might those potential pathways be? At the other steps.

The PowerPoint that we share today, I think we'll get that out. Information you might look at. There were some questions raised in the public comments about some questions on mast place. Funding. I don't know if there's some follow-up there. I flagged that. Jen, Daphne, for you all. A very strong interest in having an in-person meeting. And/or an in-person gathering. A possibility of an in-person meeting at Middletown's might have its basic use. Then follow up for a more informal community gathering at the Mule Barn.

>>SHAWN WELCH: You are on mute, Bennett.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: I do not know what happened. Linda, I was doing that, so I could feel your pain the number of times I've had to tell you you are muted.

>>LINDA COHEN: Thank you.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: A little solidarity there.

A flurry of ideas here at the end. A possible artist studio, science center, Jacques Cousteau Society, interest there. Sounds like there's already a connection with you and

Pete and the Park Service on some of this. I will leave it to you all to discover that.

It looks like you extended a hand here for an introduction, in terms of, the Jacques Cousteau Society. Again, I will leave that to you to follow as appropriate.

That is what I have got for recommendations and next steps, and outcomes. And to mention a lot of good conversation. I think this issue of privatization, there are some interesting comments here. And around communication strategy. Part of this is about understanding what the concerns are and how to address them.

Also, how do you talk about what is happening there? How that property can have not be fully public and still be adding value, and provide benefit to the greater public. I think there's an important conversation to be had there. Maybe something you pick up in the next meeting.

That is all I got. Other than to say thank you to all of you. Thank you to our captioner, who has been working. And thanks to Nitsans, who has kept us technologically going here. I just want to hand it off to Jen, Gerry, and Shawn for last words you might want to offer here.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thanks, Bennett. I do want to take a moment. I called out Mimi. I saw her in the participant list. I'd like to have Karen come off and call out all the new business services staff there on the call today. We have some others that are huddled around the same computer.

>>KAREN EDELMAN: Recently, business services have been able to hire folks. I'd like you to meet Matt Hankin, Mimi Berfield, and David Jordan. All who come here with a wealth of related experience in different areas. That business services required support.

Matt comes from the MPI program. Which is a very competitive program within the NPS. We have acquired him as a graduate of that program.

Mimi comes to us from the PMF program. Which is a Presidential Management Fellowship program. Also, a very competitive program within the NPS.

And David Jordan comes from us from judiciary. He has a lot of expense managing real estate issues within the federal government. I am looking forward to ramping up and having more bandwidth.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Karen, I will notice that Nitsan has prodded Mimi. All three of them on the same camera? There we are. Nice and close, so they can see you.

>> Thanks, so much.

>>KAREN EDELMAN: We have our work cut out for us. And I'm excited that we have staff in business services.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: That is great. Thanks.

>>JEN NERSESIAN: Thanks, Karen. On behalf of all of us at the National Park Service, I just want to really thank all of you for continuing to pitch in right alongside us to figure out next steps. How we keep our eyes on a long-term goal and figure out how to incrementally keep making progress towards that. Knowing that the circumstances continue to change, and the challenges are money-- many. That was a slip of the tongue. We sure do appreciate the wealth of experience and knowledge, and skills that you bring to the table in helping us navigate through this.

I'm glad to get you all looped in on our current set of circumstances and challenges. Looking forward to working with this new working group in looking at some different strategies and models. Thank you again.

>>BENNETT BROOKS: Great. With that, just thank you all. I'll let you go on today. Thank you to the co-chairs. We will see you all at the next meeting. Thanks, everybody!

>>LINDA COHEN: Thank you!

>>MULTIPLE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Thank you!