

Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary #16
Thompson Park Visitor Center, Beech Room
May 8, 2015

Gateway National Recreation Area Deputy Superintendent Suzanne McCarthy, the acting Designated Federal Officer for the Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:20 AM in the absence of Superintendent Jennifer T. Nersesian. Committee chair Gerry Glaser welcomed members and attendees.

External Affairs Officer John Warren presented a summary of the last meeting on February 20. Outreach to the public (town meetings and an upcoming open house at the Chapel) concerning the three Requests For Proposal (RFPs) was discussed. The committee also considered its future after appointments are approved and how to welcome new members. Minutes were circulated for comment and were approved.

Park Updates

McCarthy gave several updates on park business, beginning with several good news stories but also covering the collapse of the roof of Building 23.

- *National Park Service (NPS) Centennial:* The NPS is getting ready to celebrate its 100 birthday in 2016. April 1 was the kickoff of a yearlong celebration, with “Find Your Park” as the theme. NPS wants to use the Centennial as a way to reach the next generation of park stewards. Visitors may “find” a traditional park such as Yellowstone, or an urban parks or coastal park, but also state and local parks are part of the campaign, so holding this meeting at a Monmouth County park such as Thompson Park fits perfectly.
- *Holly Forest Boardwalk:* Construction is almost complete and will be open by Memorial Day weekend. The boardwalk was destroyed by Hurricane Sandy; this one will be hurricane-proof.
- *Multi-Use Path (bicycle path):* Phase 3 of the Multi Use Path has passed approval process and will be built starting in June.
- *Memorial Day weekend:* Park is getting ready, hiring seasonals, gearing up on staff.
- *Food vendors:* The Hook will have mobile food service again this summer with greater variety and some new vendors.
- *Summer concerts:* Sandy Hook Foundation has released the concert list for the summer season. Beach concerts are Wednesdays @ 6 pm at Beach E in the park.
- *Signs:* All signs at the Hook will be replaced this summer as many were lost in Hurricane Sandy.
- *Open house:* On April 13, the park conducted another open house to address maintenance facilities. The first open house was in the fall; public comments inspired the park to take a second look and consider more options. We will conduct a value analysis and account for comments taken before the deadline.
- *Sewage treatment plant project:* The park will entirely replace the current plant. The new plant, approved by the Development Advisory Board (DAB), will be more sustainable in the face of storms.
- *Repair to the Visitor Center:* Preliminary discussions have begun about the Spermaceti Cove Visitor Center, which is the historic U.S. Life-Saving Station.
- *Seasonal housing:* Building 102 (originally the Ordnance proving ground barracks built around 1907) will be used as an NPS seasonal employee housing facility when it is repaired. It will also be available for use by NPS park partners and volunteers when it is otherwise available – normally outside of the summer season.

- *Telecom*: The telecom project is under contract. Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator Pete McCarthy joined in to say that the park could run fiber optic cable from the existing microwave tower at USCG station and conduit will run to phone room at park HQ. This will allow Park to move a few more buildings to that fiber optic system, including the Marine Academy for Science and Technology, a Monmouth County vocational high school located at Sandy Hook. Phase II is hardened infrastructure which provides conduit hook up potential to the Lighthouse Keepers Quarters, fee booths, buildings on Officers Row, plus partner organizations and occupants such as NOAA. Currently, Verizon wireless will be providing the services that will be served by the Conduit/hook up. Wireless is required for many operations.
- *Observation Deck*: This is being repaired (or replaced) thanks to money from the Sandy Hook Foundation. Thanks to Betsy Barrett and Gerry Glaser for supporting that project.
- *Goats*: They are coming back to Sandy Hook as well as Fort Wadsworth this summer through a procurement action. These will be different goats because the last herd was lost in a fire in February 2015. Goats will move to Battery Potter at Sandy Hook (the second of three batteries that are having woody vegetation removal).
- *History House (HH)*: For the first time since the hurricane, HH will open May 17 for Coastal Defense Weekend and Ocean Fun Days. Some quick repairs, which do not include electricity. Some repairs got it open for the season. More is needed: we have to replace electric and move the boiler. It will be open for the summer and then undergo restoration for opening sometime in 2016. NPS is excited to have it open for the summer.

Glaser commended the park on the good works. Now that spring is here and more people are going to the park we can see the things that are good signs, such as the holly forest and the plans for the Centennial. Let us look for “hooks” to connect with what we are doing with the Centennial, to remind people of the importance of the Fort Hancock Historic Post and the entire Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Landmark. There is a lot there that can put Sandy Hook and Gateway on the map, especially with the Centennial. National Geographic had an article by Sally Jewell about the Centennial and all the things she wants to do with parks. Let’s be creative and support the park. Suzanne McCarthy said “Find Your Park” is designed to find any park, from national to local.

Ospreys: Welch notes the ospreys are back on Building 80 and several other buildings along officer’s row. Welch thank the park for clearing off a previous nest on Building 80. Pete McCarthy clarified that the park *cannot* remove active nests for ospreys – only inactive nests; the one Welch thought NPS had removed actually blew off in 50+ mph winds. The birds are building a nest on a different chimney at Building 80. Welch noted the destructive effects the birds have on the buildings as well as the incongruent message they send about the importance of the buildings. Pete McCarthy stated there are plans in the works to address this during the fall and winter when the birds are absent. He stated this year’s winter was of such a character that the maintenance community only had about five days to address osprey nests this year before the birds arrived – too short a time period for effective remediation.

Signs

Michael Holenstein asked what the status was on changing the signs and if they were going to account for the recommendations of the committee related to the Fort Hancock Historic Post and the Fort Hancock National Historic Landmark, which covers the entire peninsula. Suzanne McCarthy explained that the vast majority of operational signage was swept away by Hurricane Sandy but, even beforehand, the park was working on a comprehensive plan for all units of Gateway as well as other national parks

within the National Parks of New York Harbor (NPNH). Sandy Hook was chosen as the first unit to get all of the new signs. Those signs meet specific criteria for trails, roads, etc. The signage plan will include the historic designations/descriptions as recommended by the committee in previous FACA meetings.

Pete McCarthy compared it to taking down all signs on the Garden State Parkway including rest area, directional signage, speed limit, orientation, etc., and replacing them with consistent and clearer signage. It will eliminate any confusion about orientation/locations. The park is very excited about it.

Linda Cohen asked if that signage will include dune and piping plover signs that used to be out on beaches. Pete McCarthy explained that most wayside/directional signs will be replaced under a different project. He also reported that 20 plover enclosures have been put up. The plovers are doing well at the Hook and in both New York Units.

Shawn Welch asked if the front sign at the park gate is part of the signage plan. Pete McCarthy says we will do an adjustment on it. Suzanne McCarthy stated that the entrance sign will be in line with the recommendations of the committee regarding the addition of the Fort Hancock NHL designation. She further stated that not every sign will be replaced under this plan. The new sign plan is a revision of sign locations. Some signs will be revised and replaced, some signs will be new at new locations and other signs will be removed from the plan..

Building 23 roof collapse

On April 17, the same day that the Requests for Proposals were due, the roof of Building 23 suffered a partial collapse. There were prior problems with the building, as reported to the committee during the December 2014 meeting, so this was a sad event but no surprise. A simple rainstorm was the last straw. The building is very unsafe right now. The area had already been cordoned off with snow fencing but since the partial collapse, we have been working to get more stable fencing erected to keep visitors out and address safety. The park will bring back the structural engineer who recommended the stabilization last year to take another look at the facility to see what options are possible and what those options may cost. The committee saw photos of the building. This facility was on the list of buildings available for lease developed by FACA; for now it remains on the list.

Welch stated that while the collapse of the roof is an eye-sore and safety hazard, it does present a potential lessor with a “clean slate” opportunity as there will be fewer historic structure compliance requirements than if the building were essentially complete. Saunders concurred with this observation. Welch also asked if there is a very, very remote chance the building could be shored up as a result of previous interest by a non-profit. Suzanne McCarthy replied that the park will see. Welch commented on the excellent engagement with the media concerning the collapse. He mentioned Pete McCarthy’s use of the term “Fort Hancock’s Historic Post” to refer to the main post area and that it was a step towards clarifying the components of Fort Hancock as outlined in the recommendation of the committee regarding historic context in August 2013.

Karolyn Wray commended the park on the way the collapse was addressed with the media.

Holenstein remarked that, when you put up a barrier such as snow fencing, the way the fence looks changes the perception of whether the problem is being handled well or badly. He encouraged the park to make the fence look better than temporary and more attractive. Suzanne McCarthy replied that the park understands this point and has had a lot of discussion about fencing and appearance. The area will

be protected by a chain link fence as soon as it can be installed. Pete McCarthy added that French barricade fences are currently in place, not orange snow fencing. Hostenstein commends the park on turning the collapse into a positive message about urgency and preservation. It is a standing example of the importance of the mission of the park.

Dan Saunders believed that the park needs a building in that location at the end of the day. It forms the back side of the parade grounds. Saunders explains that it is a historic landmark district; the row of buildings in the back help define the parade ground boundary. It is part of the character of the whole landmark.

Welch noted that the historic post area is one of the very few intact main post areas from the start of the American seacoast defense construction program from the turn of the Twentieth Century. He observed that it appears the center core area retains load bearing capability and may provide stabilization opportunity for the entire building pending future lease potential.

Saunders noted that removal of that building gives developers more of a free hand in determining what may fill the space left by the historic structure. He also noted that in its current state, Building 23 provides greater latitude from the historic standards for deviation from the original floor plan than a building that is historically intact such as Buildings 22, 25 and possibly 24.

Glaser emphasized that the primary goal is to ensure that no one gets hurt regardless of what happens there. At the December meeting, Superintendent Nersesian pointed out that the cost to stabilize was \$1 million. Costs will only rise from that earlier estimate. The park has difficult decisions to make.

Welch said he foresees opportunity within this event. He also said the resources for this effort should come from outside of Gateway's basic facilities budget; this is a problem for region and national to resource.

Sandy Hook update

Warren presented an update not only about the Sandy Hook Unit but also the ways the park and committee publicized and prepared for the RFPs.

- *RFP open house:* Approximately 60 visitors attended the open house, held at the Sandy Hook Chapel on Sunday, March 22. Several partner organizations and members of the committee greeted visitors, while park staff provided information about the RFPs. Three Fort Hancock buildings were open for tour: Building 2 (lieutenants quarters) on Officers Row, Building 25 Barracks and Building 27, the former Bachelor Officers Quarters. Oddly, the people who attended the open house were different people from those who came in for the RFEI. News 12 NJ covered the event.
- *Cleanup of Building 27 by New Jersey Youth Corps:* Young adults from NJYC groups in Phillipsburg, Asbury Park and Jersey City came to the park to help clean the floors of Building 27 before the open house. Only one of the dozen or so youth who came out for the project had been to Sandy Hook beforehand. This was the first event between the park and NJYC of which we hope will be a long, fruitful partnership.
- *Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs):* The park kept updating the FAQ list and posting new versions until the deadline. This document is still available on the park website. Many questions focused on the "rent" FAQ. NPS representatives explained why NPS has not stated a rent figure in the RFP. Identifying a numerical rent is a term subject to negotiation. Rent = FMVR –

Investment, i.e., what you put in is what you will pay for rent over many years. Warren reviewed the hypothetical example of rent/investment over a period of 20 years. Holenstein asked if that explanation helped. Warren said the questions stopped after this example was added to the presentation, so maybe so. Pam McLay, chief of business services, added that the park welcomes members of the public to ask questions if they do not understand something. Welch stated the FAQs are very helpful and thanked McLay for working with committee members on pulling this information together.

- *Building 26 porch restoration* (with Pete McCarthy): The park hopes for a mid-June start date to rebuild a porch to the Unit Headquarters building. Hands-On Preservation Experience (HOPE) has done historic restoration work at other national parks. The program is meant to provide youth with historic preservation skills that they can translate into future employment opportunities.
- *Holly forest walk*: The Holly Forrest boardwalk was ruined by the hurricane. Contractors are building a new, hurricane-proof version that should be done before Memorial Day.
- *Multi Use Path (MUP)*: The third phase of this popular bicycle and walker path will begin near Nine Gun Battery and run about 1.5 miles. Pete McCarthy explained that there will be trail head at the northern end of the area. That phase of the MUP gets you to a bird's eye view of the four batteries that comprise the 9-gun battery and allows for pedestrian access without sand trails. This phase brings the trail up to 7 miles in length.
- *Mobile food vendors*: They are returning this summer. One unexpected benefit of losing our older beach centers in the storm is that the Hook now has a lot more food variety to choose from. Linda Cohen asked what the future is for the Seagulls Nest, a restaurant formerly located on a platform by Beach Area D. Pete McCarthy said that the unit is in the midst of releasing a contract for beach center rehabilitation. At B and C, we are putting in mobile food service. At D, we are looking to adjust the building and determine whether we will lease, and whether we will use the first and second floor. At area E we will continue with mobile. Gunnison and Area I will be used in what we hope is leasing and the open ended use will be determined. We hope for food service at G. McLay said that we will always have mobile operations so we can be nimble and resilient in the face of another Sandy-size storm. We will open up the larger areas for leasing opportunities but we will always have mobile food vending as a resilient solution. Pete McCarthy added that mobile vendors make more sense in some of the smaller beach areas. The park areas had been "on the hook" for the maintenance of those facilities by a concessioner. Now we can direct our funds into much more sustainable use.

Welch asked if the park would have permanent physical structure food services within the Historic Post area. Is it open to potential leasing for food services? The short answer is yes, possibly. Wray and Cohen want the Seagulls Nest area back as a restaurant. Suzanne McCarthy believes there will be a demand for something similar once the leasing opportunity opens. Glaser asked if there is mobile vendor requirement to be at a certain location. The answer is yes: each area has a particular schedule and all areas are supplemented by vending machines. McLay and Pete McCarthy gave specific info about the types of vendors we will have offering mobile food vending. It was observed that Building 114 (Officer's Club, built in 1878 as part of the Proving Ground) would make an ideal high end restaurant in the future.

Glaser asks if Seastreak, the ferry service to the Historic Post, is back. Answer: Yes, beginning Memorial Day weekend on Saturday, May 23.

A 15-minute break took place.

Joshua Laird, National Parks of New York Harbor (NPNH) Commissioner, remarked that he was returning from an urban parks alliance conference in San Francisco. The topic of a panel he participated in was “why can’t we all just get along.” Joshua used this Committee as a case study. Group talked about challenges in managing park lands and finding common goals. It is clear that the approach of the Committee in dealing with all issues, even when those issues are difficult, leads to success. He presented it as an example of what can happen when parks bring all their issues out into the light for solution. Glaser replied, that is important to hear.

RFPs: what we can say so far

McLay began by saying there is little that the park can currently say about those submitting RFPs, including how many we received. There was some specific information in the RFP that the park hopes to build on. Under the RFPs, the park proposed to lease two buildings in each category: residential, bed-and-breakfast and not-for-profit.

The park is able to share the news that **only residential proposals were received**. The potential lessee is supposed to provide the costs of rehabilitating a facility in this RFP. This is information that will be useful in the next go round, as is information concerning flood insurance. We will be able to share it with the next round of lessees. This round of RFPs allows us to learn about lease length: should it be 30 years, 60 years, inheritable? Also, the responses to the current RFP will tell us what people are willing to pay for rent as Fair Market Value Rate (FMVR).

Next steps:

- Region is reviewing the proposals and will confirm whether proposals meet required criteria, one of which is proof that any applicant has the ability to make the financial investments.
- The NPS Director is the deciding official. Once he makes a selection (based on the panel’s recommendation) we will negotiate the lease terms, incorporating the elements of importance to the extent allowable (such as inheritable rights).
- The time frame is hard to know.
- The evaluation panel is a group of four that make their decisions behind closed doors and the park is not involved.

Saunders asked if we have to wait until the leases are negotiated to know whether there is the ability to get flood insurance prior to the award of leases? McLay said that we will get the proposals once the selections are made by the Director. Then we can extract out data and use it for the next round. Saunders said that we need that information for the next round. NPS agrees.

Glaser asked, will the panel forward only the two proposals that are selected? If that process fails is there a next tier? McLay answered that Region will share all proposals and tell us which two applicants we can negotiate with. The park cannot share a lot of the information due to privacy issues but we can share general information. Glaser: but if the two that are forwarded to your office fail, is there a new process? McLay: If negotiations fail with one of the top two, the park can consider the next proposal that was considered sufficient.

Moving forward on residential bids

McLay discussed how the park might streamline the solicitation process. The committee has considered some of these ideas before. Should the park issue a Request for Bids (RFB) as a “rolling” solicitation, for

example, with proposals open every six weeks until such time as all buildings are full? Every time a proposal is open, the park will learn something and can use that information to revise. Many members of the committee thought the idea of a rolling proposal was a good idea.

Holenstein is concerned that: 1) the panel needs to be engaged multiple times – are there resources to have a panel sit in this capacity continually—and 2) how will we evaluate the baseline if we are not comparing groups of proposals? Will we compare them to earlier versions? What will they be based on?

McLay explained the difference between an RFP and an RFB. Base line requirements under a lease must be established. There would be minimum requirements of the lease – such as rehabilitation in a prescribed dollar amount (a range of investment requirements which we did not know prior to the RFP). The applicant would have to agree to pay a minimum FMVR and meet the minimum requirements of the bid (financial capability). FMVR would be offset by the investment as an established standard process. Thereafter a potential lessee might be successful on a high bid.

Saunders: How would it work if there are different requirements? McLay: With residential proposals, we can extract out enough information to identify minimum bid requirements and incorporate basic requirements other than rent.

NPS has had internal discussions about this, and after Building 23 it became really clear that we do not have any advantage with time.

Knowing that we have demand for residential use, we should concentrate on a streamlined process for residential and focus on that use. We can talk about the other uses and the proposals as RFPs (rather than RFBs). Welch asked if we are still considering residential/office – i.e., like a doctor's or consulting engineer's residence with use of one or two rooms as an office. This is as the buildings were originally used by the Army with the officer having an office with a separate entrance in the house. Suzanne McCarthy said this was the intent for several of the officer's row buildings on the western side near Bldg 18 – because there is additional parking to accommodate a professional activity in that area.

Glaser: How are RFBs submitted? How are they selected? McLay: We would leave RFBs open and pick from the submissions every month (or whatever the stated period might be) and solicitation would remain open and rolling until all buildings are filled.

Glaser asked if that rolling quality remains the same whether we use RFPs or RFBs. Holenstein asked, isn't that what we are trying to address by streamlining—the idea of a high bid versus the idea of a proposal reviewed by a panel? McLay: Yes.

Holenstein is concerned this is a bit optimistic. He is not sure that people will compete at a level beyond the establishment of initial criteria. It seems to him the variable is the differences among the properties. If the process is served by addressing streamlined review, it is an appropriate means.

Moving forward with not-for-profits

McLay stated that non-profits (used interchangeably here with not-for-profits, regardless of legal distinction) have challenges meeting the RFP requirements. They cannot approach an institution for funding until they show there is an agreement in place with the "owner." Non-profit negotiations usually require a Letter of Intent (LOI), which they can show a financial institution, before they can

commence negotiations. That may be a reason we did not receive proposals from non-profits. McLay suggested to the committee that the park should begin direct negotiations with non-profit organizations, several of which did submit responses during the RFEI stage in late 2013. The park believes that the reason it did not receive proposals from non-profits is the challenge to non-profits of being able to show cash in hand. That is why we issue them LOIs as part of the process.

Holenstein: Why couldn't non-profits designate that their funds will be obtained from a list of enumerated sources? McLay: Just the fact that you can secure funds is not sufficient to meet the RFP. There has been criticism in the past regarding leasing efforts where NPS has taken property "off the market" and the proposed non-profit lessee could not obtain required financing. The park has had some negative feedback about issuing proposals where the applicant is not required to show cash in hand.

Holenstein: So you are removing the nonprofits from the solicitation process? McLay: Yes. The law allows the park to negotiate directly with non-profits. We would like to go back to those non-profits and see if we can do so; if they are interested, and negotiate a lease (with an LOI as the first step).

Holenstein: Is it appropriate to ask the park to begin negotiating with non-profits? McLay: Yes. The Committee can make a recommendation that the NPS commence negotiations directly with non-profit organizations to enter into leases. Glaser agrees.

McLay asked the committee, is there a process that you want us to consider? Do you want to reach out to non-profits and find out why they did not put in proposals? We are OK with moving ahead with non-profit partners. Saunders said it makes sense to approach that community separately. McLay noted that the park has not had problems with LOIs, but has encountered delays in getting cash in hand. That is why the LOI allows the non-profit to fundraise (get cash in hand) while we take the property "off the market." Welch: So there is a measure of risk here? McLay: Yes.

Welch asked if the park can do all three RFP, RFB, and non-profit negotiations at the same time. McLay answered, that is the model we are looking at. We'd like to take proposals that came in and come up with baseline for residential RFPs, we'd like to speak with non-profits and see if LOIs make it feasible for them to come up with funding and moving forward. We'd like to refine the RFPs for other uses. We will continue this discussion after the public comment period.

Public comment period

As stated in the Federal Register, the committee paused at 11:30 AM to take public comments. There were no commenters signed up for public comment period.

Betsy Barrett of the Sandy Hook Foundation used the opportunity to ask a question related to the discussion: Let's assume you have 18 Officers Row homes that are in various stages. Let's assume that you manage to secure LOIs for some of those facilities and as a result, those facilities are unavailable for 2 or so years. So time ravages those facilities while they are under the LOIs and the houses in best condition are gone and subject to additional deterioration. I agree that non-profits are a good way to go but we had a non-profit that took a very long time to come to a conclusion that they would not pursue the project and that precluded use by other parties.

Wray asked if the park can reserve options or rights of first refusal to avoid such situations. McLay said no. NPS law does not allow us to do that. This is why we ask that applicants demonstrate the availability

of funds with respect to the RFP. Do we want to develop some time constraints on the amount of time it takes to get the money?

Glaser notes that the committee was still officially in a public comment period. Those points get to our discussion as a Committee.

Gail Hunton, Supervising Historic Preservation Specialist for Monmouth County Parks, spoke. Monmouth County Parks is undertaking historic preservation of Battery Lewis built in 1842. They just moved a 16-inch gun up to Battery Lewis in Hartshorne woods the park and are investing \$1 million in the restoration of the Battery Lewis. The Coast Defense Study Group (CDSG) and the Army Ground Forces Association (AGFA) have helped make this possible, as has the collaborative process with NPS. (Hartshorne Woods is the former Navesink Highlands Military Reservation and was a sub-post of the greater Fort Hancock – the entire Sandy Hook peninsula.)

Holenstein asked her to summarize approvals of agencies with which she has worked. Approvals seem to be a scary thing, especially when it comes to SHPO. Hunton: We have a really good relationship with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection in getting review and approval, but we understand NPS has a far more detailed approval process. (SHPO is within NJ DEP.)

Holenstein: We get wrapped up in things we need approval for that are never quite nailed down. Assuming that NPS acts in its own best interest, how do we get SHPO or other state approvals required in connection with this process? It sounds like Hunton is saying it is not a big deal. Hunton said, no, it is a big deal. We have the public trust. We are under a microscope. What NPS is undertaking is more complicated than anything Monmouth County is undertaking. This project is a different animal. When she visits the Presidio in California (part of Golden Gate National Recreation Area), she understands the potential for Fort Hancock. She encouraged all parties to “just work through it.”

Holenstein: Do you have a core group that works through the County for approvals? Yes. The only thing that makes us different is that we are smaller.

Barrett asked Hunton: Who comes to you about replacing windows? How do you handle that? Hunton: I am the historic preservation specialist, I have worked on these types of projects for 30 years, I know what the Secretary of Interior requires, and I make the decision.

Barrett: Let’s assume you are a regular person trying to do something like this at Sandy Hook and I am asking why can’t I have Gail’s windows that she has used at Thompson Park for example? Hunton: You have to make a determination. The windows here are wood but they are not ropes and pulleys. When we restore windows at the [Monmouth County] park buildings, we use comparable materials but that does not always mean we use ropes and pulleys.

Glaser thinks this is one of the thorniest issues we have come across. Should we declare this the end of this discussion?

Sanders: Hunton is one of the people who is qualified to handle these sorts of questions because that is her profession. The NPS has the same expertise in place on their end and that representative absolutely knows what she is doing. The question of windows keeps coming up. Windows should be evaluated as part of the whole. The whole should be considered when making decision about energy efficiency. I live in a civil era home. I have had an assessment done. If I focused my efforts on windows, I would have lost

a lot of the energy efficiency. There are ways of dealing with that. There is insulation; there is caulking. Energy efficiency is about movement of air. We should not get lost in the discussion of windows.

Glaser: What the potential leaseholders are concerned about is what to do if they are on site and must make a decision. He wants to be able to let leaseholders know when and how to make quick on-site decisions.

Holenstein addressed the difference between fear and fact. It is easy to talk about how difficult something is. Often facts can be obtained by proper application of some factor. Proper selection of windows as fenestration or as an energy efficient component can be resolved by making a proper inquiry. We do not need to be afraid. There is a defined process that is easy enough to follow and requires a certain amount of work. Holenstein relies on McLay's comments that those applying need to rely on qualified individuals when ascertaining their costs. At least two people have told us today that the issue of windows is not impossible to get through. We should not dwell on conjecture. We need to be guided by facts. If you had a question about windows, you would go to your professional and get their opinion. That professional will say here is what you can expect if you choose a, b, or c. It is pointless to "fear the ask" when you can rely on a professional for those answers.

Welch points out that there is an expert at the park who can answer these questions and that she has been there to assist AGFA and provide answers (referring to the park's historic architect).

Public Discussion officially ended at this point. Suzanne McCarthy recommends we proceed with the slide show and save questions for later.

Changes to the Use Map?

McLay continued her presentation. If we are to make changes to the Use Map, we should do so before we execute any leases. We can keep the Use Map the same except that NPS had to remove one of the facilities for its own use (facilities maintenance). McLay asked whether the building next to it should remain residential based on the fact we know that building 47 will be used for park maintenance. Do we want to revisit the map? Once we start executing leases, it is based on the presumption that the neighbors will stand for the uses identified in the use map. If we change it after the lease, we will have to include those lessees in the discussion. Or, do we want to be bolder and retain the residential facilities as they are and make all others "compatible use"? We also considered adding Building 114, the Officers Club.

Mary Eileen Fouratt believed that more compatibility is better. Linda Cohen agreed. McLay: This means you will have to keep in mind that your neighbor could be any compatible use.

Saunders: At some point you might want to consider a commercial use such as a convenience store. Would you want a 24/7 store open next to your residence? McLay: Should we keep the purple commercial zone? Saunders: Opening up to more flexibility is a good idea.

McLay: Are we comfortable opening up to compatible use in all the orange areas? Welch: Would it be appropriate to limit the percentage of each so they don't all become stores? Saunders: This means that someone can take three buildings at one time and determine they are all for commercial use.

Holenstein: We put this together for harmonious use in planning. Holenstein does not wish to restate the purpose of the use map. If you wish to use a facility at Fort Hancock, you have to be vetted by the park. McLay: If you are living in this community, these will be your neighbors based on the current use map.

Holenstein: Future uses might warrant considerations by existing parties. McLay: Perhaps we can ask the participants in the RFEI to negotiate for buildings that are zoned differently in the current use map.

Glaser: We built this map based on information in the RFEI. This is what the community told us they wanted to see. It was a somewhat arbitrary process and was based on information we amassed. McLay: It was based on information we extracted. We don't know why proposals for other types of use were not received.

Wray believed that Bed-and-Breakfast/lodging is appropriate in the residential row. The buildings along Officers Row is where there should be 24/7 occupancy and none of those residential occupants would want commercial neighbors.

Lillian Burry mentioned that the Marine Academy of Science and Technology (MAST), which is located within the historic post area, has approached the county for funding for a gymnasium. The Committee should issue MAST an LOI for the gymnasium (part of Building 40), which MAST can rehabilitate and MAST's separate use of Building 57 should be addressed pursuant to a lease.

Cohen: We should address why non-profits were interested in the RFEI phase but not the RFP. Also, we should go back to the parties interested in RFEI for a B&B and find out why they did not compete for it in the RFP. (A specific inquiry by Cohen about one B&B applicant was answered by Warren.)

Saunders: It seems that locating residential areas along the water makes sense. There is a character to the place that we want to preserve. We may have to do something different along the back rows.

Holenstein: We have to keep in mind the approval process and be realistic about what we are approving. I would be surprised if NPS considered use of an Officers Row house for kayak rental. But if you are talking about a B&B interspersed among residential, I see no difference between the live/work arrangement as a harmonious use. Realistically, someone might want to live on Officers Row and exhibit art or use their home as an office too. The use is driven by the appropriateness of the structure for its purpose. Having a commercial zone suits that purpose. You are not going to have activities that will interfere with other uses. So if you want to call Officers Row "live/work/B&B," there is no conflict. It is not likely kayak rental is a use that will be supported here.

Welch: If we look at the timeline, we want to have flexibility and want to have the buildings occupied. We probably have three or four buildings that are in danger of failing. Welch supports a model that achieves the objective of getting the buildings occupied, setting aside Building 23 which is an opportunity for those with the resources to tackle it.

Glaser: People will be attracted to former residential buildings because they retain their original flavor. McLay added that park has had proposals for museums or hospice facilities on Officers Row and needs to know whether those were compatible uses for those areas. We need to describe what we are comfortable with and we need to do that before we execute leases.

Holenstein: We are starting with an environment that is nationally significant historic property, where the occupants only have control of what is on the inside. No one is going to have a pristine private environment where you can kick people off your front lawn. The idea that a museum is next door is not offensive to the residential context, neither is hospice care. It is not a raucous use – it is a quiet, private serene use. In terms of the noise and traffic, it is not a dramatically incompatible use. You have to keep the overall context in mind and see what is being offered.

McLay: So that becomes “all compatible uses.” Holenstein: Business and commercial uses should be historically where those activities occurred. We should identify those as for commercial use. A discussion ensued about what is considered community commercial use.

McLay: If we label an area all compatible uses, it does not exclude commercial. Saunders: What is “all compatible uses”? Compatible with the buildings around it? Compatible with the use of the Fort?
McLay: Compatible with the mission and values of the park.

Holenstein: Do the applicants trust you to make a decision about what is compatible? Can an applicant live with the determinations that will be made by the park and the Committee?

Saunders: Maybe we could have some examples. “Commercial” might mean a bakery.

McLay: It looks like we are comfortable with the purple and the yellow uses [as depicted on the use map]. It is the Officers Row uses for which we need more context. Are there some things we want to exclude? Holenstein: Business/Residential is ok. Business use is not commercial use.

Wray suggested combining green, blue, and red zones into one color. McLay: Should we come up with a new color for those and keep the educational? Welch: Historically, the back rooms of the residences were offices for the officers that lived in these houses. When these houses and the historic post were designed, there were no offices in the barracks areas for officers. They often performed administrative work in their home offices.

By consensus, the committee moved that Officers Row includes B&B lodging office as well as residential uses. “This is the new orange (on the use map).” Officers Row will be business, residential, lodging/B&B (orange).

McLay: We will approach non-profits for direct negotiation. What do we feel is reasonable in terms of milestones so that the properties are not monopolized by the LOIs? Glaser: We do not want to dictate but would like to see general terms. McLay: It is not a one size fits all. We do negotiate LOIs and will share a sample with the Committee.

Glaser wants non-profits to understand that there is an opportunity to work something out with the park, which may require more than just a phone call from the committee or park to the formerly interested non-profit.

McLay: We have ongoing dialogue at NPS with nonprofit organizations all the time. We will look towards our existing pool of stakeholders and gauge interest. We can approach non-profits existing at Sandy Hook and maybe we can expand our base after conversations with them. As for the RFEI, we don’t necessarily want to “cold-call” non-profits but want to work with those whose mission and values are in keeping with the NPS mission of preservation and recreation.

Holenstein believed the park should ascertain the logical course of action which a potential partner needs to follow, agree to it in advance, attach a timeframe and follow it. He would like to have been overwhelmed with applicants but we should just move ahead and see what we can do.

Burry: Could we have consideration accompany an LOI that it could expire after a period of time? McLay: We could enter into a short term lease arrangement but we cannot accept funds and reimburse them under a LOI. Burry: It is so simple to secure an LOI with nothing backing it.

Holenstein: Regarding the issue of vetting and applicant and issuing the LOI, we need some limits. McLay: Yes, but you never know when a non-profit hits a roadblock that is insurmountable such as funding commitments falling through, loss of an architect, etc. Burry thinks McLay is too sympathetic.

Pete McCarthy: Can't we do a Short Term Lease and then a longer term lease? McLay: Yes but it would require us to ascertain Fair Market Value Rent (FMVR).

Saunders expressed concern that there are no non-profits coming forward with interest for the building and wanted to know more about LOIs. McLay: We end up with studies and evaluations when we enter into LOIs. Once we start seeing investment and positive change at Sandy Hook, the model change. Right now, it is a really uncertain venture.

Burry: You have to believe in your product.

Wray: Should we limit the number of buildings we are offering that will be off the market as a result?

Saunders: We haven't talked about commercial use and the fact that we got no commercial interest. If we had more interest, we might be able to support it. Maybe if we have more to offer, we have more interest. Maybe if we have a limit on the number of LOIs, we will have more to offer in terms of growth related to facilities we take off the market. Fouratt replied that it may not be the right time for commercial.

Welch: Commercial will come as they see how the development comes along and there is a year round community functioning within the Historic Post. Meanwhile, we should look for specific non-profits that have money to invest in the facilities. Having a market that exists beyond the summer period will be important to this consideration.

Holenstein: The question is not how do we get more but how do we service the ones we have? The opportunity to determine the sincerity and capability is when you are interviewing them. There should be a penalty for failing to move forward.

McLay: We have to agree that we should go through a non-competitive process. According to Glaser and Holenstein, we did agree after lunch, and if not, Holenstein recommends that we agree.

The committee agreed by consensus to recommend that the park reach out to non-profits through its non-competitive process.

McLay: We will start outreach with some of our NPS partners from the past (on a national level). We will incorporate milestones in the LOI, i.e. within a certain amount of time they develop plans and specs, within a certain amount of time they secure funding, etc.

Cohen expressed concerned about tying up good buildings. Holenstein, Wray and Cohen want to be able to revoke the letter (or not renew) if the milestones are not met. Glaser recommends that they have a condition assessment to us within 30 days as a way of showing they are vested and invested.

The committee agreed upon one condition: LOIs will have six months to start (term) with an extension possible for reasonable cause. The park wants to incorporate milestones into the LOI and that would satisfy the committee’s concerns.

Glaser worried that the park will soon run out of people that have been contacted or who have contacted the park in the RFEI or RFP. How can the park winnow down the collection of non-profits that are more likely to be viable partners? Does the NPS have a list? Who should we call next? Cohen believed that the harsh winter may have reduced the time for groups to visit Sandy Hook and put in a proposal was not sufficient. Perhaps if the date had been June 19, there would have been more interest. McLay asked for committee members to pass on any non-profits who might be interested or have them call the park’s business division.

Holenstein said that the park needed some signage at the entry to Sandy Hook for the 1-2 million people that come in during the summer if it wanted to attract more potential leaseholders. Welch proposed running banners at the park entrance which direct people to the Visitor Center using the existing electric banner sign.

Wray recommended that we have a **QR code on a post at the entrance plaza. The committee endorsed this idea; the park will work on this.**

Keith Kilgannon, head of the Romer Shoal Lighthouse, recommended a sign that said, “You could be home now.” Someone else recommended a sign saying, “Why leave – you could live here.”

McLay: We will look at our banners and signs. Some of this language is in it already.

Glaser thanked McLay and park staff for pulling this information together. He believed this information would be very helpful and looks forward to further updates in June.

Annual Progress Report

This report was emailed to all members before the meeting. The committee adopted it by consensus. (Attachment B)

Contributions by members

Glaser observed that many members feel like they want to contribute at all stages of this process. We should have a deeper discussion about this when both Superintendent Nersesian and Suzanne McCarthy can be at the table in June. What do we think we can do to help the park with a successful reuse process? Glaser would also like to ask the park what they think we can do to move forward and be supported. It is not necessarily to get more money, and it is not to interfere with the park’s business but

to help the park, and make the park's work easier. Maybe there is a connection between the Centennial initiatives and our work that we can contribute to.

Suzanne McCarthy responded that those are very broad important questions which require deeper conversation. We want the committee to feel as though they are committing to a successful product and that is the ultimate issue.

Welch stated that he was previously involved with the Army Science Board, a congressionally chartered Federal Advisory Committee. One thing he thinks the committee can help with is "red teaming" for the park. The park gives the committee several options to review and provide recommendations. Military officer's are taught something called the "Military Decision Making Process", or MDMP. It states the best planning requires at least three courses of action (COA) to choose from that are reasonable, acceptable and executable. The park can build these options, and then ask the committee to "red-team" the COAs (pulled them apart in order to uncover additional considerations and alternatives) and come back at the next meeting and either recommend one of the COAs, modify a recommended COA or develop an entirely new COA for the park to consider. In his experience red-teaming and providing an alternate vision has worked to provide new ideas that were not previously considered.

Suzanne McCarthy: The committee has a charter. We have ideas about what we are trying to do. Everything we do is provided openly and publicly. Welch: So we have to think deliberately about what we believe is appropriate to red team vice a simple quick review of COAs an on-the-spot recommendation to the NPS.

Holenstein: This meeting has been productive in a lot of ways. The committee has been used as an approval board for concepts that have been already vetted. Holenstein thinks the committee works well in this role. Giving the process a public face is important, but using the committee to hash out ideas that were considered by the park prior is a very effective method of making progress.

Burry: Jersey Shore Partnership (JSP) is having their event at the Shore on June 8. Some of those folks are people of means. Handing out postcards with a QR code, stating that you could live here, could make some inroads. Wray is concerned that JSP will object but Margot Walsh is in charge of it. Burry thinks we could even have banners up there.

NPS has just purchased two banners which should be provided to Pete McCarthy and JSP before the event. The park has cards to hand out, which can be printed.

Cohen says she will bring out the same materials for New Jersey Sea Grant's family fun day in mid-May. Welch states that the Army Ground Forces Association's Coastal Defense weekend also happens at that time, which provides another opportunity to hand out postcards.

On-Boarding New Members

- We should know who our new members are by the next FACA meeting.
- We need to provide packages including the Charter and other documents to new members
- We should have orientation meeting and member meeting prior to the next FACA meeting
- We should have a mentoring meeting where we can address what the committee has already done and what can be done to build on that success.

All committee members in attendance volunteered to mentor new members. Warren plans to match newcomers with members who have similar interest unless the mentors want to mentor someone with different interests.

Suzanne McCarthy asked if the park would have an orientation meeting before the next meeting. Warren replied by asking if we wanted to schedule a meeting before we knew who would be approved by Washington? Wray asked if their terms begin right away. Warren said he would look into it from Washington. (The answer is yes, terms start upon appointment, not when terms were “supposed” to start, which was last summer.)

Warren also reminded members whose terms are expiring in August must apply for renewal this summer. This will requires submission of a letter to the Superintendent, plus a resume and some specific information for Washington, including date of birth and all former names, such as maiden names.

Suzanne McCarthy adjourned the meeting at 2:30 P.M.

Attachments

- A. List of Attendees**
- B. Annual Progress Report**

Meeting Summary approved by Committee Co-Chair Gerard Glaser

Signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX A

Attendees

Committee members: Lillian Burry; Linda Cohen; Gerry Glaser (co-chair); Michael Holenstien; Dr. Howard Parish; Mary Eileen Fouratt; Shawn Welch; Karolyn Wray.

NPS staff: Business Management Specialist Karen Edelman; NPNH Commissioner Joshua Laird; Deputy Superintendent Suzanne McCarthy; Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator Pete McCarthy; Chief of Business Services Pam McLay; External Affairs Officer John Warren.

Public members: Betsy Barrett (Sandy Hook Foundation), Gail Hunton (Monmouth County Parks), Keith Kilgannon (Romer Shoal Lighthouse), Oliver Spellman (National Parks and Conservation Association), others.

APPENDIX B

Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Committee¹ Annual Progress Report

It has been more than two years since the first meeting of the National Park Service, Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee. Over that period the Committee has worked with Gateway staff to meet its charter to help guide "...the development of a reuse plan and on matters relating to future uses of the Fort Hancock Historic District of Gateway National Recreation Area." This community-wide process has produced an extraordinary opportunity for the public to lease buildings at Fort Hancock's historic post and launch development of a vibrant new community. It is noteworthy that these results have been accomplished in the face of significant disruption caused by Hurricane Sandy.

The Committee oversaw a comprehensive effort that produced a formal Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) designed to illuminate adaptive reuse opportunities that the public desired at the park. In developing this RFEI, NPS and the Committee have clarified and promulgated the premises' historic context, setting forth recommendations regarding the Sandy Hook peninsula's 1982 designation as the Fort Hancock & Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark (NHL). This work has resulted in recommendations and changes to current documents, websites, and signage that have helped NPS reshape understanding of Fort Hancock's historic standing.

The RFEI process was critical to informing the Committee and the park about adaptive reuse of its historic structures. More than 40 formal responses were received in response to this RFEI, as were numerous informal comments about how the Fort's resources could be used, preserved, and protected.

Results from the RFEI and extensive community outreach initiatives revealed high levels of interest in uses that would support educational and nonprofit organizations, short-stay lodging opportunities, and individual residences. These efforts also revealed the public's strong support for uses that would contribute to building an active and accessible community while simultaneously preserving the cultural, recreational, environmental, ecological, and economic vitality of all of Sandy Hook.

The successful community outreach effort and RFEI process led NPS toward approval and publication of a formal Request for Proposals (RFP – see <http://www.nps.gov/gate/learn/management/fort-rfp-2015.htm>) The RFP was initiated as a pilot effort offering leases for six buildings. Based on information received during the RFEI process, those six buildings include two designated for use by nonprofit organizations, two for use as bed and breakfasts, and two for individual residences.

In addition, the Park has indicated that it is seeking internal NPS resources for rehabilitation of at least one structure. The Committee is strongly supportive of this internal effort as the need for and appearance generated by direct NPS investment is seen as foundational to successful partnering with private investors who are committed to rehabilitation and reuse of historic structures.

¹ See <http://www.forthancock21.org/> for complete details on Committee activities, structure and work products.

The Committee allocated significant time to learning about infrastructure and property management issues at Sandy Hook that would impact successful development of the new community. The Committee appreciates and supports the efforts, both underway and planned, that are intended to ensure the availability of robust electrical, water, sewer and telecommunications services that are essential not only to the Fort Hancock historic post, and its successful redevelopment, but also in support of all visitor experiences throughout the park.

The Committee also solicited information from experts about additional factors affecting the leasing process, including: financial incentives for preservation of historic structures; historic preservation construction standards; property valuation; insurance requirements; community governance; taxation; common area maintenance; and related matters. The Committee looks forward to creating opportunities for continuation of these conversations and assisting the park in offering appropriate background information to potential lessees.

Additional perspective about the challenges associated with the Committee's work, and its most probable avenues toward success, was gained through presentations and reports about other NPS sites that have undergone adaptive reuse efforts. Sites discussed included Fort Baker (Cavallo Point) at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area; The Presidio in San Francisco; NY Governors Island; Virginia's Fort Monroe; and Massachusetts Lowell National Historical Park.

Valuable context for this work was also provided by the Park's completion and publication of a General Management Plan for the Gateway National Recreation Area ("GATE"). This notable accomplishment highlights the synergy among all GATE units and outlines the critical role assigned to the Fort Hancock historic post and the Sandy Hook peninsula as regional and National models for adaptive reuse.

Efforts were also made to facilitate input from and cooperation with those organizations that already have a presence at Sandy Hook and thus form the nucleus of the new community envisioned by the Committee. These organizations include: New Jersey Sea Grant Consortium; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Rutgers University; the Sandy Hook Foundation; the Sandy Hook Child Care Center; the Marine Academy of Science and Technology; Clean Ocean Action; the American Littoral Society; the Army Ground Forces Association; and the New York 56 Nike Volunteers. The Committee recognizes and supports the need for prospective uses at Fort Hancock to compliment and otherwise enhance the existing operational facilities.

In consequence of its activities to date, the Committee has operated beyond the appointment terms of approximately half the original Committee members. Recognizing that the goals set forth by charter have been pursued, but as yet not met, the Committee has redoubled its efforts by seeking additional and replacement members. This process is nearing completion as the Committee proceeds into its third year of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerard Glaser

Co-Chair, Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee