

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.

Attendees:

NPS: Jennifer T. Nersesian, Gateway National Recreation Area Superintendent and Designated Federal Officer (DFO); Karen Edelman, Gateway Business Services; Mimi Berfield, Gateway Business Services; Matt Hankins, Gateway Business Services; David Jordan, Gateway Business Services; Daphne Yun, Gateway Public Affairs; Leo Da Silva, Acting Sandy Hook Unit Manager; Patti Rafferty, Chief of Resource Management

Facilitator: Bennett Brooks, Consensus Building Institute

FACA Committee Co-Chairs: Gerry Glaser and Shawn Welch

FACA Committee members: Linda Cohen, Mary Eileen Fouratt, Dorothy Guzzo, Bill Kastning, Norah-Kerr McCurry, Tony Mercantante, Michael Walsh

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: We will start with Pledge of Allegiance. [Pledge of Allegiance] Thank you and good morning, everybody. We have had some developments since the last meeting and have a lot to go over today in a condensed amount of time. We will also see some of the buildings together and catch up with what has been happening on the ground. I also want to note it's good to see those of you around the table and in person. This is our first in person meeting since the pandemic. This is a hybrid meeting so folks who can't make it in person can still participate. Thank you to Tony for hosting us and providing this capacity. Before we dive into anything more, I want to let you know this will be my last Advisory Committee meeting. I'm moving from Gateway after 11 years of amazing work in an amazing place. I will be the Regional Director of the National Capital region. I love working with you all and so much hope for this project. We are making real progress. I'm not going to stop keeping tabs on it and am always available to support however I can and look forward to seeing continued progress that comes out of all the efforts. With that I will hand it to Shawn Welch and Gerry Glaser.

GERRY GLASER: When we go over our accomplishments later everyone will see we have made some progress. And will continue to do so.

SHAWN WELCH: It's great to see everybody it is wonderful being in the room with everyone. Jen, I'm going to miss you personally and professionally. Jen's going into a key position. Having spent 11 years in the Army you are the right person for that job. Jen, what you have done in Gateway is huge. Today, you are going to take a look at Officer's Row. The first thing that should jump out at you is the new roofs. It happens with vision and when the proper people are at hand to execute it. Jen is part of what did that, the whole team did it. If you want to understand how you get work like this done in the government you get to the end of the year somebody sticks their hand up, and says I have money, who is ready to execute. Gateway has people who are ready execute – and look at what they did – it is huge. You started that and set that in motion.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you for that. It's my pleasure to facilitate these conversations and I'm joined today by Charlotte Goodman who made this hybrid technology work so thank you. Anyone online having any challenges please reach out to Charlotte. Let's go around the table and our virtual table.

MICHAEL WALSH: I live in Fairhaven. I've been around since 1958.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Retired from state of NJ, former executive director of the NJ Historic Trust.

BILL KASTNING: Monmouth Conservation Foundation Executive. My organization is mandated to ensure a legacy of open space and natural habitat.

TONY MERCANTANTE: Middletown Administrator. Just to give you a quick synopsis of this building and how it relates to what we are talking about. We built this building in a very unique way as a township. We realized early on we can build baseball fields, tennis courts assorted buildings and things like that pretty well, but we can't build administrative buildings. Rather than go down that path which would be inefficient, we built this as a public, private partnership in the way it has worked I think for the first time in NJ. We sold the property to a private developer and had a contractor build the structure. We have a 30-year lease, and in 30 years and 1 day the land reverts back to the township. Private partnerships are critical to getting things done, which also relates to Fort Hancock. Government isn't good at doing these things; private partnership and participation is needed.

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: retired director of NJ Council of Arts

LINDA COHEN: I've been working at Sandy Hook for more than 30 years and currently work for NJ Sea Grant

KAREN EDELMAN: representing business management division.

NORA KERR MCCURRY: Good morning, I'm Nora Kerr McCurry, Dean of Business and Social science at Brookdale Community College, the Community College in Monmouth County.

BENNETT BROOKS: Since we are going to have committee members here and online, we will try to facilitate this as if Norah was at the table with us. Let's go around and have the rest of the folks in the room introduce themselves.

LEO DA SILVA: Acting Sandy Hook Unit Coordinator

MATT HANKIN: business management specialist at Gateway.

MIMI BEHRFIELD: business management specialist at Gateway

DAVID JORDAN: Realty specialist at Gateway

AMY SEBRING: Manager of Planning, Project and Asset Management at Gateway

DAPHNE YUN: Public Affairs Officer at Gateway

JACOB JAMAL: I am a local developer.

LAUREN COSGROVE: with the National Parks Conservation Association.

TARA BERSON: Good morning, everyone communications director for Middletown Township

MURIEL SMITH: Good morning. First, I am so sorry to hear about Jen leaving. As a local resident I love how much she has done for the surrounding area. I'm glad you're going to Washington for your sake. Congratulations to you.

JOHN MACARON: Head of IT for Middletown Township. Love Sandy Hook.

BENNETT BROOKS: Welcome again. As Jen said there is a lot that has happened since we met last. We will spend a bunch of time catching us all up to speed and considering the implications for moving forward. That will be the main focus for the conversation today. I think there will be a lot of updates but also opportunity for discussion. We will get leasing updates from Karen and then a stack of these updates primarily from Jen; as well, the New Jersey Economic Development Authority will share about their new program which is very relevant. We will continue after a break until 11 o'clock for more conversation around the table and go to public comment at 11:30. As always there is a hard stop for public comment no matter where we are in the conversation. At 12 o'clock we will have general park updates from Jen. 12:15, we'll do an around-the table so Committee members can share anything that's on your mind. Finally, we will summarize where we are at, next steps, and we'll learn about the tour of Fort Hancock. which is open to anybody. We will have a hard stop at 12:30. Couple of things to note:

- We will have a break at 10:45 so if anybody has to make a phone call or anything you can do that then. We will also pass around menus at that time for the Mule Barn.
- This is our first hybrid meeting it's amazing we can do these. The main thing I think for us is making sure we are speaking up and not talking over each other so folks online can hear us. That is one thing I would ask for us to try to do in the room.
- Nora - for you - if you want to get in the conversation raise your virtual hand, we should be able to see it quickly

- Folks online -Please just use chat for technical issues as we don't want conversations going on that we won't be able to see.
- For the public that are here or will be joining, thank you, it's great to have you here. The conversation is around the table or the virtual table with our advisory team member, but we do want to hear from you and after we hear from people who signed up in advance, we will go to anyone else in the room.
- If there are any issues reach out to Daphne in this room or Charlotte online.
- We are recording, and we have live captions, if anyone needs that. Charlotte, please let us know how people can see captions.

CHARLOTTE GOODMAN: Closed captions should be on your screen you can click cc and show captions.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen or Gerry Glaser or Shawn Welch anything? Let's jump in then, and Karen, I'll hand it off to you for leasing updates.

KAREN EDELMAN: Hi, everybody. Leasing updates - I know everybody is anxiously awaiting to hear we are signing more leases, and we are in the process of working on leases for four buildings. Those are barracks buildings 24 and 25, building 40 which is the former YMCA, and building 114 which is the officers club. It seems like it takes a long time for these leases to get signed, and that is true, but there is a lot that happens before we will sign leases. One of the biggest things is that the drawings have to be completed and approved by the NPS, and we have to have State historic preservation concurrence before we will sign the lease, so that everybody knows what it is we are going to be doing once the rehabilitation starts. For buildings 24 and 25, we are there. We have received those approvals and concurrences and are navigating the last final terms of the lease and expect to have them soon. They are currently with our solicitor for review and hope to finalize them within the next few weeks and send them up for signature, Building 40 and 114 will follow shortly after. Hopefully, within the next few months, next time I hope I'm reporting I have signed leases, but we are on the cusp. And by way of comparison, I would like to point out we recently executed a lease for a very large-scale rehabilitation project in another unit of the park. It took us five years to navigate from the time the Letter of Intent was signed until the lease was executed. And then it took a few more months for the notice to proceed. There's a lot of considerations here and rehabilitation we want to make sure we address when authorizing people to start on these building. The next time we meet I'll have more news of executed leases, but I do want you to know it's moving along. The other data is building 23 - the building the Monmouth County Vocational school district is intending to rehabilitate. Many of you know they have completed one of the other buildings and is currently in use. That's building 56. Building 23 is much bigger. And many of you may recognize that building. The roof collapsed a few years ago and there were heroic efforts made to stabilize the facility. I think many of you know the county came up with funding to manage this project and facilitate this project to partner with us, and while it seems nothing is happening in building 23, we continue to work with the county and school district. The building has been stabilized and I will share with you what else has been done with the building, so you have a better idea. Hazardous material abatement has been completed. Select demolition and stabilization phases of the project have occurred. The

construction project went out to bid - I think what happened was the estimates came back much higher than anyone anticipated so the next step is for the county and school district to re-bid. I'm not sure of the timeline but we will continue to be in touch with the county and will report out when we have news.

I think there is confusion because of the use generic term lease for all of these facilities. Many of these projects are leases we are executing with nongovernmental entities. We know we have talked about this in the past this meeting I want to clarify for building 23 and 56, those are not leases. Those buildings are subject to an agreement between the NPS and Monmouth County Vocational school district. The reason NPS is allowed to enter into those agreements is the school is legislated to be on Fort Hancock. It is government to government.

Those are my updates.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Let's see if there are any questions.

LINDA COHEN: Building 56 -Did they have to comply with the historic preservation standards like all of the other lessees?

KAREN EDELMAN: Yes, it did and went through compliance review and approval and the drawings had to be signed off and the State historic preservation office had to weigh in. There are no exceptions, everybody has to comply with the secretary's standards.

JEN NERSESIAN: We are out there this afternoon, and when we drive by there, we'll see the work.

BENNETT BROOKS: Questions?

LINDA COHEN: What are the uses for 24, 25, 40 and 114.

KAREN EDELMAN: Buildings 24 and 25 are meant to be residential units, a one bedroom and studio mix. 40, the old YMCA building, is going to be a dining/food, event space. 114, the old officers club and my favorite building, will be an event venue and I know we presented in the past Federal Advisory Committee meetings the proposed drawings for those buildings in which the lessee is proposing an addition onto that building so it can be utilized as intended. There is preliminary concurrence from the State historic preservation office on that. If you give me a couple of minutes, I can probably find those renderings and put them up on the screen.

BENNETT BROOKS: As Karen mentioned we are at an interesting moment here with several pieces in play on somewhat parallel paths We want to better understand the Stillman project and its potential economics, we are interested in exploring other financial alternatives and we want to consider what a Plan B might look like. There's been a lot of activity and conversation about this. So, we are going to catch up on all of that and consider, as a group, what that means and how will we move forward. We will start with updates from the finance alternatives working group to learn what the group has been talking about and then we will hear from Aidita Milsted with the NJ Economic Development Authority about some of their programs. I will hand it off to Jen who will catch us up on these various pieces.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Maybe I will start by giving you a little more sense of how as I transition out what that looks like and some confidence in the continuity of our effort. Minka Sendich, our Deputy Superintendent, will be acting superintendent as they do a search for a new permanent superintendent. One note is that over the past few months the superintendent of Gateway - the position itself - has been elevated a level. So as they search for a new candidate, it will be somebody at the senior executive level person. That will give greater leadership and horsepower to help guide our efforts and keep this momentum going. Also, I would like to thank Shawn Welch for pointing out we have a great team here.. Daphne in communications, Karen in business, you've seen our facility folks at Sandy Hook taking on projects themselves and helping contribute to preservation of these buildings. We have a lot of effort in upping our game internally in the park. The institutional capacity is here to keep things going; it does not depend on any one person. This doesn't walk out the door with me; it's really a team effort. In terms of updates, there are a lot of parts to what we've been working on since our last advisory committee meeting. One of which is, of course, we continue to work with Roy Stillman. This is the developer with whom we have the agreement on the 21 buildings that were the remaining buildings of the leasing portfolio. (Quick aside: I want to pause and call out Miranda Peterson from Congressman Pallone's office has joined us. We want to welcome Miranda and thank their office for their continuing interest.) We do continue to work with Roy Stillman, that agreement is still active. I want to frame our conversations; we know at the last meeting, maybe at last two meeting we talked about what he had done and what it would take to do this project. Stillman did an in-depth assessment for buildings 7 and 12; they worked up full architectural rendering plans which we looked at as a group and they took that detailed analysis, looked at the process what it would take to do that work, looked at the rest of the portfolio, extrapolated out based on the conditions of the buildings and what they found on 7 and 12 and came up with an approximate figure for the 21 buildings, which was \$100 million. When they came into this project, they were intending on investing \$30 million and thought that business model made an exciting prospect. Their breakeven point where they wouldn't make money, but they wouldn't lose money, was \$50 million. As we discussed previously that left us with a \$50 million gap. Now, he has said he is still interested in doing this project and no matter who comes in there is going to be some kind of gap and additional investment. That may be true. And if there is additional financing available, they are still interested with this project with the investment they intended to make and I think they not only are interested in the business end of this, but also have embraced the preservation aspects and the public benefits of the project. That aside, there needs to be a way to close this gap. We've been working on a few different things. One is we have the financing work group established at the last Advisory Committee meeting, and we also in the park have been looking at Stillman's estimates to see where we've landed and if it's a \$100 million dollar project. I will start with the second part first. We did share a very detailed assessment for the costs, and we went through them in a very detailed way of our own, item by item. I think in the end our estimate is substantially lower which is good news. I think we are able to ratchet those numbers down by about 25%. But that does not close the gap. It still leaves a significant financing gap, so we need to figure out how to make up the difference for anyone who's going to come out here and invest that money.

As to the cost estimates, there a couple of the ways we modified those numbers. Based on our knowledge of the buildings and what we have been able to contract work for, there were individual items we were able to change the cost of that would probably be less expensive. In addition, too, there was work included in the Stillman estimate that since they started down this road, we've completed. Primarily the several million-dollar investments we made on all the roofs on Officers' Row. Taking that work out and revising some of the line items based on our experience, we reduced the estimate by 25%. That still leaves us with a \$25 million gap that we need to close, and these are still very rough numbers, but it is significant, and as we talked in here there may not be one single solution of how we are going to find that money, what is going to save these programs. Going from needing to find \$50 million to needing to find \$25 million seems much more manageable, particularly if we look at moving forward on this in an incremental way. Finding funding from various sources, it starts to seem much more feasible.

That leads me into the finance alternatives working group. As you may remember this was something we discussed at the last federal advisory committee meeting - it was a recommendation to stand this group up, to explore and talk about, think about, brainstorm what some financing alternatives might be to help bring in other sources of funding to close that gap and augment what we're trying to do. The group met a couple of times and for me I think there were three big takeaways. The first two of which, I was not expecting to find - surprise sources of funding out there b- ut that kind of is what we found in a really promising way. And I want to really thank Dorothy and Mary Eileen, Dorothy who connected us with the NJ Historic Trust and Mary Eileen with the NJ Economic Development Authority. Both of whom we've been talking to more since and have some promising opportunities that we'll go further into today. They are interested in working with us, these programs seem like they could be a good match for the efforts we are trying to do here. The devil is in the details. There are different requirements for three different programs we are looking at. There are different time frames, there are wage requirements with some. Some are grants, some are tax credits, some need a nonprofit applicant, some need a developer to be the applicant. There is a lot of work that needs to be done figuring out what is possible and how these will together. But it is possible.

I will start with the New Jersey Historic Preservation Trust, a very general outline, but know we are diving into a lot more about this. This is a grant program that gives \$750,000 a year up to 4 years in a row of matching funds for historic preservation work. This is coming through New Jersey Historic Trust which is the nonprofit partner for the state historic preservation. And in this case, it has to be a nonprofit partner that is the applicant. There is a matching requirement, but we may be able to use work the park is investing in to satisfy that matching requirement. In terms of the nonprofit partner, we look at that and we have had very preliminary conversations with the Sandy Hook Foundation to gauge if they would be able to fill that hole, I think there's definitely an openness to exploring that, but we have a long way to go to figure out how that would work. On other projects we worked on in the park where we have worked with entities taking on leasing projects, they have actually formed their own spin -off nonprofits to focus specifically on fund raising activities around the project. That's another construct that might be an option here. A lot of details and a lot to understand quickly, because the next grant opportunity will open up in January. Applications are due in April, we wouldn't find out about the award until year's end and the funding itself wouldn't be available until the next year. These

are long time frames, but the projects have long time frames, too. That gives you a sense of what might be possible from that funding source.

As for the state Economic Development Authority, they are actually joining us today to present on their historic property reinvestment program and that is one of two programs we discussed with them. There is a new program called CAFÉ specifically geared toward arts programs. It has its own requirements and strings attached. It's paid back over time in the form of credits, but those credits can be substantial; we are talking tens of millions of dollars as long as the facilities are used for arts programming. I don't know if that would apply to everything we are doing, but it could apply to some of these buildings, certainly. That is very promising as well. I will also note with all of these different programs, state programs, and state-related programs, they're also all stackable. Which coming from the federal government a lot of times you can't combine different federal monies, for the state funding they are really looking to get things done and help projects happen, and as a result have found ways, they can make it so you can use multiple funding sources together on the same project. For instance, with the tax credits that we will go over that come through the Economic Development Authority, these are state preservation tax credits they will count on top of federal tax credits. To remind you federal historic tax credits for anything that is a commercial undertaking relating to historic preservation adaptive reuse, you get up to 20% of the project cost back in cash from the Federal Government. So, the state tax credits are on top of that. You could potentially get up to 50% with some caps in it - I'm sure we will find out more about that but up to 50% back on top of that 20% so it could become up to 70% as state and federal credits are combined, money back on your investment which significantly reduces project costs.

That is all really positive. I want to thank the financing work group again and especially Dorothy and Mary Eileen. These have been fruitful lines of inquiry. Not only are these programs enthusiastic about the work that we're doing at Fort Hancock, but they've also talked about how - as they design these programs - they have done it thinking about Fort Hancock and ways to make sure we would be eligible. For example, with one program, they were developing program criteria was geared toward individual buildings and not groupings of buildings. And someone said what if someone has a project like Sandy Hook. So, they revised that so that groups of buildings could qualify. This is just really positive, and could be part of the solution, eventually a significant part of the solution. I did share all of this recently with Roy Stillman as well and they are doing their homework and extremely enthusiastic.

Just to go back to my conversations with Stillman for a moment. In my conversations with Roy Stillman and his group, they fully understand where we are at. Stillman has made clear that he needs a clear pathway for financing to undertake the project. The project only makes financial sense for their group if they can do the whole thing. That is the scale of which they based their investments and business model on. They are not interested in doing it piecemeal. They are willing to look at a few buildings at a time if the financing model dictates that's how it would work. But only if there is a clear pathway to show there is enough financing over time to close that gap and make the entire project feasible. We don't have that right now. We have some very promising leads, but they don't entirely close the gap. We have some other investments we are hopeful for, we will continue to pursue other federal level investment One of the things

we are looking at on the park level is our next investment on Officers' Row will be masonry and most recently we are talking about installing porches. As many of you know over the years, we've been grappling with the bricks falling issue as all of these buildings there is a double layer of bricks. Is there a tieback solution that we could apply to all of the buildings, or does the yellow brick need to come off and then put back on the right way? We've got about eight different assessments that had eight different opinions on that issue. This fall we are contracting for the design of the masonry that will solve that question once for all and give us the blueprints to move forward and instruct the actual work on those buildings. We don't yet know exactly how much it's going to cost until we get that design done. Ballpark is \$3-4 million, but it may be less. I think beyond that we may not have the money needed to get all of it done, but we are going to keep moving forward. Like I said while we're taking the bricks off, we are going to try to fold in the porches. Which are less expensive than the masonry work itself but still something we wanted to do. There is momentum here and that investment will be another step to close the financing gap. But there still is a gap and there isn't a clear roadmap as to where all the pieces of financing are going to come from. If we don't have that clear roadmap, the Stillman project is likely going to prove to not be doable. But if we can do it, he is all in. I want everyone to remember he's already made a \$200,000 dollars investment in the design and remains committed to seeing it through if feasible, but I think everybody is very realistic. We are going to come to a crossroad probably sooner rather than later where we are able to know if we are able to line out that long term project by its model or if that's just not possible, at which point this is where I come back to that third point from the financing committee which was a strong push for having a Plan B ready for what we do if doing all the buildings under one developer is no longer feasible. We will talk more about Plan B and thinking about that for the next agenda item but before we go further down that, I want to turn it over to New Jersey Economic development Authority and thank you for joining us and presenting this program. Bennett, did I miss anything?

BENNETT BROOKS: No. All right. I would love to introduce the New Jersey Economic Development Authority and invite Aidita to talk about the historic property investment program. Aidita are you hearing us, are you seeing your slides?

AIDITA MILSTEAD (NJ ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY): We are good here. Good morning, everybody. Thank you for having me. I apologize for not being there in person, I'm trying to wiggle too many things today, but I'm glad I'm able to give you this information. First, I'm going to confirm 100% the statement that we talked about Sandy Hook a lot when we started doing this program is completely true. The original statute defined the historic property as a single structure, and we talked many times but what if there was a project like in Sandy Hook and they wanted to do multiple buildings, that would be a problem. That is something we always had at the back of our mind. I'm happy to say starting next year we will be able to consider multiple structures, so we are very happy about that. With that, I'm going to try to go through a lot of information and try to focus on the things that are more relevant to you guys. This is a brief introduction of the program created as part of the economic recovery act of 2020. It is a huge piece of legislation created and run out of the EDA. This program in particular deals with rehabilitation of historic buildings. It is set up and meant to work in conjunction with the federal historic tax credit program, and although they are a little different,

we do think we can work with the historic preservation office to make it as seamless as possible considering they are two different programs. But we try to accept forms you would use if somebody is applying to the federal to accept those forms instead of our forms, to eliminate some of the reviews, and like it was mentioned you can stack that money with this money. Part of the equity requirements under this program if you are doing a federal historic tax credit, we can use that money you are expecting to get under the federal program as your equity contribution. This is for the buildings already identified as historic, the awards are 40-60% of eligible rehabilitation costs depending on the type of project and their location. In Sandy Hook, it would be 50% and these numbers were increased as of last month. The program is competitive, so projects are all due by pre-established deadline through applications and we do competitive scoring. The projects need to follow secretary of interior standards. We are currently in an application window open right now.

Some general changes really quick based on the past feedback we have gotten.

- In the past if you had done any work at all in your building recently as the current owner and applicant you would not qualify to apply for the program. We've now put in some exceptions to this.
- The credit amounts were increased, there is this funding gap requirement that was eliminated for projects either government restricted municipalities or have total cost of under 5 million.
- On top of that, we have changes that will take place next year. It allows for prior designation requirement, it used to be New Jersey, or national register listing, pinelands, or by certified local government. We will now accept a part one under the federal tax credit program if a project is working on getting their federal application done.
- We are also adding time for the construction, in the past you had only 24 months if you are doing a single phase, we are increasing that to 36 months. If you are doing a project with multiple phases, you have five years.
- There is this façade rehabilitation program that will be introduced as well. Again, the [historic] designation I don't think that's a big thing here because everything is listed.

Income-producing is one of the requirements. A property has to be income-producing at the end. That definition of income-producing only meant that there is some income produced; it does not mean profit generating. You can have a nonprofit apply and be using the building as long as there is some income. If a museum is a non-profit 501(c)(3) but they charge three dollars to take a tour and go into the building, that counts. Or they rent the space for events, that counts. We tried to be as inclusive as possible. There is a requirement for funding gap unless a project is in a government-restricted municipality or under 5 million and if you have to show there is a funding gap you have to demonstrate it exists and the award you are seeking is going to be equal or less to that gap. You need to show also that, without this money, the project is not economically feasible. On equity, most projects require 20% equity contribution and that could be if you are doing federal [tax credits] you can use that, but it could be also costs previously incurred (e.g., if you already paid an architect to do the drawings or an

engineer to do studies that kind of money can be used toward it), and of course cash at hand, money in the bank as well as the credits. And you have any actual value if you own the property. There is an allowance for residential projects, they must be income-producing which means it has to be a rental. If it is a residential project, it needs to have at least four rental dwelling units and there is a requirement for low or moderate income in which case at least 20% of newly created units will have to be low or moderate income. Next, as I mentioned, we created some exceptions on this commencement of construction. We looked at this a lot and tried to figure out what made sense, we did not want to be in a situation where you want to discourage “bad actors”, somebody gutting the building ahead of time so they don't have to do anything with it. But at the same token we want to make sure somebody who's being a good steward to the property, and for example, had a leaky roof and just replaced the roof, didn't just disqualify themselves for that reason. We have our exceptions now:

- If it was done by somebody else but you didn't tell them to do it and they are not your affiliate and they had nothing to do with you before you got in, that is fine. This is the applicant somebody other than the applicant.
- If it was completed more than two years prior to the application.
- If the work was ordered by a building code official because of health and safety reason, there is a health or safety concern, that could be done but, in that case, it must be limited to addressing that condition and it must meet the standards.
- Also, if the work has been approved by either the NJ historic trust or New Jersey preservation office, as meeting the standards, and we have this because we heard many times people saying but I have a grant for example, on the trust and I want to be able to do that work; my roof is leaking and I have money for that can I do that? Now we allow for that.

The last catch all is if you have completed the work within two years and you can prove the burden would be on the applicant the work was done meeting the standards then it would be okay.

The catch with all of these is any work done before an agreement is signed, automatically becomes unqualified work and would not count toward an award. We allow it to happen but theoretically you have the money to do it so that would not count as an eligible cost.

The award sizes, it depends where you are. Everybody focuses on that one on the right that is 45% of the 50 million. That practically doesn't exist; there is literally only a handful of properties in the state that if you are doing something on that property and it meets all the other requirements you will be able to get this. So, the two real categories are 50% of eligible cost and that is most properties and they have half of \$8 million for tax credits so 50% to a maximum of 8 million or if you are in a government restricted municipality or qualified incentive track you can do 60% up to a maximum of 12 million. Right now, we have in the bank about \$200 for the program. And we are open, so we are hoping we are going to be able to award a bunch of new projects. And since we all like pretty pictures, these are two projects that have been awarded under the program: the one on the left is the Loew's Theater in Jersey City is one of those special projects. And it is what is considered a transformative project as they were awarded

\$42.4 million. If anybody hasn't been there, I invite you to go; it is a fabulous building. They are looking at almost \$111 million in costs and a \$42.2 million in tax credit. They are scheduled to be completed in second quarter of '26, and Atlantic Lofts we awarded this a couple months ago. The project has not started but it's in Atlantic City under the orange loop; they were awarded \$8 million for that. That was a lot of information but if anybody has questions, I would be happy to answer.

BENNETT BROOKS: That's great. Let's start with questions.

DOROTHY GUZZO: I have a question. For the project at Fort Hancock there's been mostly a conversation about doing residential, and I was wondering if you could address ineligible costs. Because it's not the whole shebang in tax credit, there are things the program doesn't allow you to take credit on.

AIDITA MILSTED: We try to align our eligible costs as closely as possible with the federal program. Basically, eligible costs are all costs on the building itself. It is permanently attached to the building, either interior or exterior, and follows the definition of what is permanently attached to the building or structure the IRS has. That includes the ridiculous things like wall-to-wall carpet it is tacked doesn't count, it has to be glued and if it is glued it is permanent and it counts and I don't make it up that is the IRS. We do not cover any site work or any addition or increase in space or size to the building. With the exception if you have like a fire escape, an elevator shaft or staircase that we would count because we don't consider that an increase of size over length but other than that it has to be permanent; all plumbing, HVAC, electrical, finishes, tile, wall coverings all of that would count.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Not kitchens or bathrooms?

AIDITA MILSTED: Kitchens and bathrooms, the cabinets are not considered permanent, and neither are appliances. Bathroom fixtures, yes. This is our own definition because when we look at the numbers, when it comes to a cabinet for example, all the cabinets don't count. However, if you have a sink that has to be mounted on a cabinet because it's not freestanding sink, we will cover that cabinet.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Thank you.

TONY MERCANTANTE: You mentioned the regulation change that allows groupings of buildings goes into effect next year?

AIDITA MILSTED: Yes.

TONY MERCANTANTE: Can Fort Hancock start applying this year in anticipation of that or do we have to wait until next year?

AIDITA MILSTED: You have to wait until next year. The way the bill was drafted it had a number of things that took effect immediately. The application open now is for that

BENNETT BROOKS: So, when Jen earlier was talking about the application due April?

JEN NERSESIAN: That was for the NJ Historic Trust grant.

AIDITA MILSTED: Yes.

TONY MERCANTANTE: Fort Hancock would have to start 2025?

AIDITA MILSTED: We expect to open an application window sometime in early fall of 2025; we have to finish drafting changes to the rules

TONY MERCANTANTE: But it's basically a year before we can apply?

AIDITA MILSTED: Somebody could apply for a single building, or you can apply for a group of buildings; the issue becomes the eligible costs would only tie into one building. If you were doing three building as part of one project, you have to pick the one you spend the most money in to be able to cover eligible costs. There are cases where one building is so expensive you would be able to max out on one building. We have seen it for example, like big industrial complexes. It would be okay now, the current window is open until December 5, but you would not be able to do grouping and eligible costs for all buildings under a single application.

GERRY GLASER: Could you repeat what you said about the expectation of units being set aside for low and moderate income

AIDITA MILSTED: For low and moderate housing? If it is a residential project, we do have a requirement for newly created units. What this means is if you were rehabilitating a building that already had 20 residential units, and you're leaving the 20 residential units you fix and fix the outside and not creating any new unit theoretically you can do anything you want this is the loophole. But if you take a building, say a factory, an empty building where there was no residential units and you are now putting in 100 residential units, 20 have to be low or moderate income.

MICHAEL WALSH: Just a follow-up to that. Maybe we are getting too much into the weeds, but if we are talking about houses that were single family houses, that may be converted into let's call it four units, or barracks that originally housed a lot of people but would be split up, with those be because they had been used for residents not be the 20% limit or as we divide them up they would be?

AIDITA MILSTED: They would be new units and have to hit the 20%.

MICHAEL WALSH: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: This is the time to get into the weeds so if there are more weedy questions go with them. Anyone else on the table or Norah if you have a question raise your

hand. There are none right now but if you are able to hang in and little bit longer we may have more questions.

AIDITA MILSTED: One last thing I wanted to point out because of the condition here, also our leasing requirements are slightly less than under the federal program. For a project that is not owned by the applicant and the applicant is leasing, the leasing duration only has to be long enough to take you at least to the end of the compliance period and the compliance period is five years after completion. There is an extra tail end on prevailing wage so you have some compliance you have to do for five years and then from the moment you get your credit there is ten years what is called building services so it's janitorial, security would have to be prevailing wage. The last five years can be transferred to somebody else, but the leasing requirements is only for the compliance period. Takes you up to the compliance.

SHAWN WELCH: Quick question - I heard you say prevailing wages. Does that impact the actual restoration itself or is it the operation?

AIDITA MILSTED: All work has to be prevailing wage. It will be the same for any program under the EDA so the café will have the same requirement, all programs require prevailing wage rates. The argument is percentages on credit are probably the highest of every other state and because we acknowledge the prevailing wage does add some cost that is why we do 50 and 60%.

JEN NERSESIAN: I was mentioning the devil is in the details; there's a lot to work through here in terms of how we piece together what may or may not work and that's a good example. Use of prevailing wage is going to make construction a lot more expensive. Whether the credit that makes it eligible for is a greater benefit is something an analysis has to be done on. There's real homework to be done here to figure out what works.

AIDITA MILSTED: We strongly recommend if somebody is looking to apply they come and meet with us. We are happy to get into the weeds, look at what you are talking about. We cannot make your decisions but can tailor the information you need so you can make a decision. We are happy to provide you if you are looking to do RFPs with language you can use in the RFP. The only caveat we have is if you are looking to apply, for example, we cannot talk to you while the application window is open but if you are looking to next year, we can talk to anybody at this point.

MICHAEL WALSH: I just want to go back to the question of timing of application. Understanding under the current definitions, this can only apply to a single building and next year the definitions change and be multiple buildings. Could there be an application for a single building for Hancock this year and next year going with a separate application for multiple buildings?

AIDITA MILSTED: Yes. The key is, there is language that talks about we can say you are splitting this into a million pieces because you want to get more money you are trying to circumvent. As long as the projects are distinctly different, and you have different funding source for your funding staff is distinctive to that project that is fine.

MICHAEL WALSH: Thank you.

GERRY GLASER: Kind of follow-up, I'm trying to get a sense how competitive is this? What are we up against, what does the competition look like?

AIDITA MILSTED: It's hard for me to answer as the program is still in the infancy. We have been getting consistent every year and little more application or competitive coming in every time. We had some glitches we fixed with this new bill that was signed by the governor last month so we expect it will be more competitive. It is noticeable that when people come to talk to meet with us first, then as a result more complete applications are coming in. We do expect a good number of applications to come in this round based on what we see, and a big chunk of money, but because all of the bills under the economic recovery act came in at the same time, the funding all came in at the same time. That means all programs started already with extra money. So we had \$200 million we didn't expect we will be giving that out this round and - never say never - but we think we will have enough money next year as well we would not be oversubscribed, but after that I don't know.

GERRY GLASER: Thank you. I also want to highlight what you said about the importance of speaking with you, I welcome hearing that. It helps with the communication piece

BENNETT BROOKS: Any other questions. This is super helpful. Maybe you can stay for a few more minutes. I do want to see if there are any other questions for Jen?

BILL KASTNING: The assumption of shortfall of \$25 million - is that considered against the profit scenario instead of the breakeven scenario?

JEN NERSESIAN: I don't know. We haven't had that explicit conversation but yes, that is true. I can't see anybody wanting to invest that amount of money just to break even.

BILL KASTNING: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Any other questions for Jen? Any member of the public we will be doing public comment at 11:30.

JEN NERSESIAN: For the financing workgroup, one of the things we talked about internally wanting to discuss at this meeting too, was where we go with this group. This group was given a charge from the committee to try and brainstorm funding pathways, I think that was very productive. When we've done other workgroups before, particularly in the past couple of years, we have given very specific charge. We did the work group with the various environmental and nonprofit groups after the Stillman proposal to understand concerns, address those concerns through the leasing program, we set up a workgroup and we actually rolled out a charter for that group so to be clear what we are trying to do and we know we accomplished that. We didn't do that with this workgroup, so I want to touch base on do we want this group to continue and if so, what is its purpose. I don't want to leave folks to scramble, we really have it focused on what's the agenda. I would suggest, based on everything we are talking about and all of these different pieces of potential funding we are looking at, this is really complicated. There are a lot of different criteria, different applicant requirements, different time frames with these different grant opportunities. And that is aside

from any other federal funding, any considerations with different models of private investment that we may consider. I think the financing workgroup could potentially be a great assistance in helping to work through how these pieces fit together and keep on track moving all of this forward and suggest that that might be the charge for the financing workgroup and that one of the work group's next tasks may be to develop that charter for itself based on that mission. But that is my suggestion just based on the discussion we're having right now, thinking of how to fit all of these pieces together. The park is certainly intent on continuing to work on this in support as well. But this is bigger and I'm sure the park would welcome help.

GERRY GLASER: I think we have ample evidence that the folks on that group are doing extraordinary work so anything we can do to help encourage the charter and facilitate the work.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. We will take a break, come back at 10:45 for additional conversation until 11:30 am, and then move to public comment for folks in the room and online to hear your thoughts at that point. Just in case people are scratching their head why we can't meet together this is a federally chartered committee. There are rules that come with it as it should, to have the meet in public so there is transparency and what is going on so we are eating and chatting that would not in the spirit that is why we are thoughtful and careful. Any other questions about logistics?

JEN NERSESIAN: Can I remind folks in case they wanted a room especially for folks on line if they haven't been following us for a long time. The Mule Barn is one of our leasing success projects was a historic rehabilitation on one of our buildings at Fort Hancock. It was the old mule barn at the post. And now for the past year plus a couple of months has been going gangbusters as a new restaurant now that the preservation work has been done. It's a real asset. We can celebrate while we eat.

BENNETT BROOKS: A couple of extra minutes we will come back come back ten of.

BREAK

KAREN EDELMAN This building plan is from one of our prior meetings and very quickly I will show you what the drawings for Building #114 (Officer's Club) looks like now. Proposed layout. This is the area that is proposed for the addition. And then, again, some more renderings. And what it is supposed to look like from an aerial view is the proposed addition. And again, one of the final renderings.

BENNETT BROOKS: What's the timing on that?

KAREN EDELMAN: I'm not really sure. That is going to be the third or fourth lease we sign with this lessee so right now we are working on Barracks 24 and 25. We are still going back and forth with the preservation office. We have preliminary, I don't want to say approval, that might not be the right term, but there is consensus there is no issue with the addition. That is what we were after and with that being out of the way the road is clear for us to continue with the actual formal, the entire compliance review process.

BENNETT BROOKS: Again we have until about 11:30 to digest what we've heard. What are the general reactions to the various updates. The financial working group, what should they focus on. The working group itself to develop its charter. Thoughts on how we regard these different pathways. We've heard that we should have a backup plan. How do we make sure we continue to make sure we have progress. Jen, do you have a couple of things you want to say before we continue?

JEN NERSESIAN: First, I wanted to talk a little bit more about thinking about Plan B, and getting the group's thoughts on that. As I was mentioning before we still have the agreement with Stillman, we are still looking at all of these different financial pieces that may all come together, to lay out a financial plan that gets us to the finish line, that everyone can be on board together on. But it may not work so if we see that that's not going to happen, we want to be ready to move on whatever the next steps under that scenario will be....and that is what we call Plan B. That would mean we would be putting buildings back out and there's a lot of questions around that, and I want the committee to think about that. How we do that, when we do that, what we have been talking about internally just as a strawman or food for thought, this is not a plan yet but is just our evolving thinking looking at how to group buildings together.

One question we've had - are we looking for someone who's going to take all of the buildings or are we going to do individual projects for every single building. From a management perspective that kind of scenario one project one building is not ideal. It's more complicated, more time consuming, needs more capacity - we've struggled with some of those in the past for various reasons. We are more disposed toward groupings of buildings and want to think about how we can be really strategic around that. I will tell you some of the buildings out there we still get regular calls on backup proposals on, people are interested in the ones that hold the most potential. Building 80 is a prime example. It is the one close to the chapel, it's great ancillary, you could spend the night here when you have your wedding in the chapel. It doesn't need quite as much work as some of the other buildings. We have several backup proposals on that. For people who are interested in building #80 it is in the grouping that is covered by Stillman's general agreement. But strategically some of our Officers' Row buildings are in pretty bad condition and need a lot more investment than Building 80. Is there a strategic way to think about grouping Building 80 with some of the buildings with greater investment needs so that we are getting them all. In essence, we'd have some loss leaders that draw people in and they'll have to take on some of the buildings that need more work. And do we try to salvage some buildings, with a group of buildings and see how that works with others or do we put multiple groups out at once? We're not quite there yet to execute on a Plan B but want to be ready. So there's a little room for thinking and I would like to get the committee's perspective on that. How such a plan would work may be in the weeds for the financial workgroup to discuss. How does that Plan B scenario - whatever it shapes up to be - work with these various other financial opportunities that have their own requirements, and criteria and schedules. We wanted to game-plan this out. Bennet, Dorothy is raising her hand, Tony is raising his hand, I want to give folks the chance to jump in but I also want to mention, too, we have Pete Izzo on the line, I don't know if we formally introduced him. He is the head of Sandy Hook foundation who is our official friends group for the park and nonprofit partner who has expressed interest, support, and willingness to be part of this project in whatever form that may

take moving forward. I just want to call him out, and then I think we will elevate him to participate if he wants. I don't know.

JEN NERSESIAN: Just in case anyone have questions for the foundation? We did not ask him to present today, but know the foundation is out there and is interested in being a partner. We had talked at the last meeting about potentially a symposium this fall that has shifted and we don't seem to be quite where we want to be to start something like that. But maybe in the spring and so we are still talking about that. And just another supportive partner.

BENNETT BROOKS: So, let's open it up. It would be good to come out of this meeting with a recommendation on where we see the work group going, do they have a charge to create a charter and what does it mean to get ready for Plan B.

DOROTHY GUZZO: I just have a question about getting the money together. You mentioned projects for the masonry and the porches. Is that real?

JEN NERSESIAN: That is real.

DOROTHY GUZZO: That is going to influence how we look at Plan B because it's making the project more appetizing. It's also going to influence anybody who wants to put in for tax credits, since that will be work that's already done before a tax credit application, so that's something to think about.

JEN NERSESIAN: That's a really good point. We are taking on some of the work, taking away some of the work that would be tax credit eligible. A real focus right now is stabilization and making sure as we work out what Plan B is or what the long-term future of an investment model looks like for these buildings in the meantime, we are keeping the buildings standing. We've looked at identifying the critical systems necessary to achieve this. We started with the roofs, we've identified the masonry as the next most critical aspect, we've got fenestrations (arrangement of doors and windows on a building) still hanging out there - windows and doors to help seal up those buildings. The porches we're working on with the masonry, and those are our basic stabilization features. There are also critical systems which we haven't discussed taking that next step yet. Our focus is stabilization so that we can continue these conversations about longer term plans

DOROTHY GUZZO The historic trust money, if you were thinking about that, they are most interested in the exteriors of the buildings so ultimately the interiors will have private uses. So the exterior can be looked at as museums so keep that in mind as you are looking for projects to do. If you really were planning to use some of these other funds to get factored in, they are more likely to be used for the exterior.

JEN NERSESIAN: Maybe off-line we will pick your brain more about that, but strategically how we can best stabilize the buildings but still be considering how to maintain some financial incentives for other investors.

TONY MERCANTANTE: Great. I guess my thought is maybe there is a way to plan, navigate, maybe taking on 21 buildings is a lot. Would Stillman be interested in picking out say, 4 or 5 of maybe the most rehabilitate-able buildings, and they go to the EDA in January for a pre-application meeting. Okay, Stillman has a plan we are going to do these four buildings here is what we are going to do start working through the numbers because the key question is going to be, "Will the prevailing wage requirement knock out the financial incentive." I don't think it will, it doesn't help, but I don't think it will. In the long run we have done a lot of projects that have the prevailing wage requirement, and we've always found a way to make it work. I don't think it's a big problem. It's a hiccup but I don't think it is something we can't overcome. For a modest size project (4 or 5 buildings) Stillman wouldn't have to spend as much money in preparation for those, so easier amounts to bite off, or the state obviously wants to help Fort Hancock achieve the work, so let's take them up on that. And maybe the financial subcommittee members could be involved in that pre-application with the EDA. So we get started in the early part of 2025, with the pre-application process, but if they like what they see, the numbers work, you're going to get it approved. It is competitive. There is sort of an attraction to what this means, it's bigger than just another project. We have a really good chance of success. We have to start with a manageable size of the contract. Someone needs to crunch the numbers about the difference with the prevailing wage rate and the impact that would have on the costs and play out a scenario of a manageable size.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, do you have any other thoughts how Tony's thought might live within the other Stillman conversations?

JEN NERSESIAN: I think I would be interested in that kind of number crunching, assuming the prevailing wage works. I think it is more manageable and I think that's the right scale to put in for this kind of grant opportunity.

TONY MERCANTANTE: The other reason to do it that way is to have less cost to start with. If those projects get going and they get occupied, now there is income coming in, which makes the plans for the rest a little bit better because then you have revenue coming in.

JEN NERSESIAN: Yes, that's a really good point.

GERRY GLASER: You think that's a workable strategy

TONY MERCANTANTE: When you get into this scenario, then other funding opportunities will surface. It has to be real - I think together funding opportunities exist.

BENNETT BROOKS: Other thoughts from other members on how to move forward?

SHAWN WELCH: When you talk about stabilization efforts on the masonry which is important - we have wide open windows. Is that an in-house thing you are going to take on or a contract? Is the contract in planning yet? The reason I say that is, tomorrow is November we are already in technically the rainy season --it doesn't look like it right now, but historically it rainy for the next four months - what are we doing about wide-open windows?

JEN NERSESIAN I can't answer that right now.

AMY SEBRING Okay. Two things I want to interject. One is the roof stabilization project that Jen mentioned was park funded and approved. That project also provided drainage. We did temporary drainage and more importantly and less obvious we secured all of the holes, foundations, etc. with temporary drains. It doesn't look beautiful but it's very important. We want to get water off and away from the buildings. We worked really hard they are all secured from wildlife infiltration and water infiltration. In terms of the fenestration, we can do it when we fix the brick. We can't put in fenestration if we don't have masonry. So, the masonry is first, then the porches and after that is secure, we are going ahead with the fenestration.

SHAWN WELCH: Are we going to temporarily close the windows?

AMY SEBRING: We did a survey when we were doing the roofs. Our maintenance guys did a pretty fantastic job - it was not beautiful, but it is secured. There is less than 10% that needs to be secured, and our maintenance group is going back. We feel in the park we stabilized it very well and that was the point of the project. So as we do more there'll be no more damage

SHAWN WELCH: The other thing they did (she didn't talk about) underneath they checked all of that stuff, joists and everything they were either replacing or reinforcing. They did a lot - I think we squeezed about 5 million dollars of work with 3 million dollars. You did awesome.

DOROTHY GUZZO: The first thing we need to do is the working group, put the matrix together with all of the buildings and funding who gets to do the funding, is it private, non-profit, or park service and when is money expected and what would happen. If we were to have a matrix we might actually go back to Stillman, if he were going to take advantage of any of these other things, particularly trust monies, maybe trying to list all of that stuff, lay it all out has potential, because once you see the overlapping parts of this, some of the deadlines are not going to be easy, and the historic trust process is more complicated than the other fund sources. . It's something to keep in mind.

JEN NERSESIAN: That's really helpful. Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Any other thoughts or concerns?

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: We know Stillman is still looking at this right now at these different programs.

JEN NERSESIAN: We only shared all of this with him in the past two weeks.

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I like Tony's suggestion.

JEN NERSESIAN: Yes. Absolutely. I think Tony's suggestion works in the Stillman scenario if we want to talk about applying for the grant program and I think it also works in the Plan B scenario where we maybe are going out again. But that plan B - that's more of a timing thing - we really need to focus back out on an RFP and get a new investor or interested party in a lease. We need better timing with that and capture some of these additional funding methods

BENNETT BROOKS: So, we move forward exploring both the piecemeal option and Stillman?

JEN NERSESIAN: Yes. We would, I would expect Stillman will come back and say this work or doesn't work and we can have that conversation about moving forward with smaller grouping of buildings, so we capture this opportunity. Either they are going to say okay we can do that or that doesn't work or we don't know if we can get this project done and if the latter is the answer, that's when I think we need to say we don't want to lose out on these opportunities - we don't have a pathway for the project - we need to move forward at least carving out a group from the rest of the Stillman buildings.

BENNETT BROOKS: and that's the question – when do you want to switch from one track and maybe what Tony said is

TONY MERCANTANTE: That funding would be the big difference.

JEN NERSESIAN: That got their attention too. It is weighing that against prevailing wage -- so everybody understands when in the federal government do construction projects, we also have use the prevailing wage -- when we lease out structures that does not apply to them. A private lessee using their own money with us does not have to use prevailing wages. Once the state money comes with some of these pots of money in it not only applies to whatever that state funding is covering but it applies to the entire project, so it is significant

SHAWN WELCH: The question would be, can they bifurcate their money and not pay prevailing wage or if they pick up state funding it requires prevailing wage across the board?

DOROTHY GUZZO: With the Historic Trust, if the money is going to a non-profit they do not need to pay the prevailing wage.

SHAWN WELCH: The nonprofit can get around that prevailing wage?

DOROTHY GUZZO: Going to a private nonprofit.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. If we have a public charity involved nonprofit is that considered the same? There are caveats to the IRS rules whether public charity or private foundation there are some caveats. We don't have any private foundation that I know of here at Fort Hancock.

DOROTHY GUZZO: In order to get trust money, you have to be a 501(c)3

SHAWN WELCH: We have the private foundation and the public charity - there are a couple of different components to that 501(c)3. You're a political if you're C4 but C3 you have private foundation and public charity. Sandy Hook Foundation and AGFA (Army Ground Forces Association) are both public charities – 501(c)3 classifications are good.

BENNETT BROOKS: Aidita I think you're still on the line, so if you want to weigh in on the prevailing wage question, please feel free.

AIDITA MILSTED: For us, all work has to be prevailing wage, no matter what. Throughout the course of the project all of the construction activities have to be prevailing wage. Theoretically there is like a two-year period but that falls usually into the construction activity; has to be prevailing wage. And then, we have the ten-year hook that is only for the building services.

DOROTHY GUZZO: If you're putting nonprofit money or trust money into it but you're also getting the EDA grant, you have to use prevailing wage

TONY MERCANTANTE: We try to do these equations- you're going to tie yourself in knots—you're going to have to use prevailing wages if you use state money.

SHAWN WELCH: It's clear in my mind. Thank you.

GERRY GLASER: I'm trying to link what Dorothy said - there must be some sense from the working group about the matrix. That might be what priorities we should focus on and that leads directly to what I was saying to Tony. It sounds like we are being handed an amazing situation. We don't have an unlimited amount of time to take them up on this offer, and I would hate to see it slip by. I'm super excited about the challenge Dorothy and Mary Eileen brought and how we can take advantage of this. As most of you know I've been in a grant-making organization for my whole career and when a grant-making organization says come by and talk with us – you should come by and talk with them.

JEN NERSESIAN: I want to emphasize the tightness of that timeline. The New Jersey historic application is due in April, we talked about a year for the EDA opportunity. A year sounds like a lot, but when you consider the fact that we need to be ready to move on construction with this funding, that is not a lot of time to have everything lined up. We need at least a year. We need to figure out pretty quickly what the best pathway forward is for the application and work toward that to make it happen within a year.

TONY MERCANTANTE: What I think you do is have Stillman work on the interior and apply for the Historic Trust for the exterior of the buildings. That does start to separate it out. And maybe the foundation takes the lead on the projects as a non-profit.

DOROTHY GUZZO: They need the ability to execute, they may need another agreement. I haven't seen it yet but they need to have their agreement with the Park service in order for the Historic Trust to take them as a real applicant as a C3 that has to have within their lease with the NPS the ability to execute the project. That doesn't mean the match can't come from the NPS but it means that's whoever the applicant is for the historic trust, they have to meet Secretary of Interior standards, they have to be able to implement

SHAWN WELCH: proper authorities required.

BENNETT BROOKS: I suspect --we will come back but I want to move forward with comments. What we do is ask each person would like to make comments to limit their comments to no more than two minutes. We will start with folks who signed up. We will start with Muriel, you're the only person who signed up. Then we will move to others. Online folks - any attendees would like to make a comment please raise your virtual hand you should find at the bottom of your screen. Just a couple of points to note these are to be comments or questions the way it is handled, the way the committee handles them if there are questions feel free to pose them and then Jen and her team we will get them out. Start with your name, affiliation and it would probably be helpful for folks online to stand up and get closer to get

better sound quality. I have at least one email that came in that I'll read later. Let's start with Muriel. And again, name and affiliation. You're probably close enough so that people can hear.

MURIEL SMITH: I'm Muriel Smith I'm just a local resident with a love of history and Fort Hancock. The idea from Mr. Mercantante. It's such a great idea. I'm in favor of funding from these nonprofit groups. It seems that we have been over-generous to Mr. Stillman. Four months ago, at your last meeting I heard you say you were debating whether you are going to take it away from Mr. Stillman and go some other way and you are still talking about the same thing. And the buildings are still debilitated. The Park Service is putting real money in and yet nothing is being done because Mr. Stillman has made his own investment for his own purposes. I want to point out there are four very successful businesses out there now. Four very successful folks who have done a lot of work and have done a great job and are successful. Why not break this into smaller groups? Why not ask those four people who have proven it can be done to do it again. I think they would be happy to do it. Why not get new investors, and Jen said there are people around that have shown interest. We can't just keep waiting until Mr. Stillman has everything right for him, until the Park service spends more money, and I applaud you for fixing the roofs and everything you're doing out there. That is all federal money being spent while we are waiting for this one single private investor to do exactly what he said was going to do. Last year, two years ago, I don't know the time, Mr. Mercantante, I love it now, this idea of using state funds and having 20% of any residential buildings low and moderate income. Think of that - low-income people having to use a gallon of gas to get a loaf of bread. I don't think it's the right place for low to moderate income people. I know MAST the Monmouth County tech school is under a separate lease, it's different. I talked to the administration of the Monmouth County tech school district yesterday they said they have no plans, there's nothing going on right now. I don't know what they plan on doing out there, I understand, the NJROTC program I think is an important program out there. 12% of the graduates of that school I know, in the last ten years have had scholarships and appointments to military academies strictly because of MAST and because of the NJROTC program out there. The fact that building has been limited, I want you to see that building the one ball still standing, and nothing else has been done with it and know it was supposed to be for NJROTC cadets to do their drills and things and now I'm learning more today about brick-but think about this there's no building and no marching grounds - there will be no NJROTC out there either and that's a painful thing to think about. And you as a federal government as a federal group protecting federal property ought to think about that too. sorry about that. I am hoping even though Jen isn't here, I know her heart is still going to be here like so many of us are, maybe because she's in Washington she will be closer to some of the other people we can talk to some time, and I wish her all the luck in the world. I don't think she'll ever forget Sandy Hook. I think she wants to come back and see Sandy Hook the way she sees it in her mind. Thank you very much.

BENNETT BROOKS: Let's see if there are any other commentators.

JACOB JAMAL: My name is Jacob Jamal with J and E Realty. I grew up here my whole life, only recently took interest in what has been going on here. It's very clear that somehow over the last however long has this project been going on - nine years, ten years. The government

is now working for one developer that got tied up in some agreement on, I implore everyone here to Google what \$100 million can do with a real estate project. There's no way that that is what this project costs. For one developer to go ahead and seek now \$50 million of government money to break even does that make sense to anyone in this room? Is it possible someone would invest 50 million dollars to break even? He's not in the business of public good, that's not what a developer does. A developer tries to make money. We have 21 buildings, waterfront, ten minutes to a ferry that takes you to New York city, there should be no problem making money, especially when you have no acquisition cost on the property. I think it is imperative the government does their job and reopens this pretty much right away to a new developer. I personally would put in for one building because it's an amazing opportunity and somehow everyone in this room has lost the optics on that. I don't know how you can tell any developer they would be able to take a building pretty much for free no acquisition cost, invest money that would go against their lease payments, they wouldn't take that offer. I could literally have 21 developers lined up to do that today. I'm prepared to do it if the government is going to try to round up \$50 million of taxpayer money to serve a developer. It stinks to high heaven, I don't think it's right and it needs to be reevaluated completely. That's all I have to say.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks very much. Anyone else in the room like to make a comment?

LAUREN COSGROVE: Thanks for having us here - I'm with the National Parks conservation Association. I have the pleasure in serving on one of the working groups of the nonprofits. I didn't formally prepare comments I just want to say it is really tremendous what Gateway and Jen has been able to do at Sandy Hook. You've invested 3 million. We are looking for more, but we've invested a ton of time and staff capacity in this work building out capacity of the business office including architects and project managers. It's clear the federal government has a big stake with this – and I really do believe this project will move forward. I am here on behalf of NPCA as advocates for the national parks. So I'll say some things that they can't really say, because we're not part of the federal government. We are advocating for more money to come down to not only individual park units like Gateway, but we are advocating for larger buckets of money like the Great American Outdoor Act that provided \$6.5 billion over five years for the National Parks to tackle backlog projects that are maintenance projects that have -- they don't have the budget to take them on. This is not just a problem with Gateway; it's a problem all across the system and all 400 plus National Parks. It is the federal government's job to pass budgets to make sure that national parks are not just stable but protected and thriving, open and accessible for all people. As an advocacy organization we continue to see another round of this. The Great American Outdoors Act lasts five years, next year it will expire, and we are pushing to have another five years so we see a big investment more than we will ever see in base budgets, and we can potentially use some of that as match or as piecemeal to close this gap. I applaud the unit and all the investments and passion you poured into this and I encourage and empower everyone in the room and on the phone to also be an advocate for this and to continue to work with Congress to pass these maintenance bills and cultural resource protection bills and others because I know you're doing the best that you can. Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you. Anyone else in the room want to make any comments? Anybody else online want to make any comments? If not, I will read the email that came in. Brian Samuelson, the lessee of Building 21 he asked this be shared with members:

Dear FACA Committee members:

> Looks like it's time for a few new ideas to facilitate the saving of Officer's Row and other buildings on Sandy Hook. Let's save the NPS and taxpayers a lot of money and save some great houses. \$25 million and over \$800,000 respectively!

> Developer Roy Stillman has held Officer's Row and a total of 21 buildings hostage for over four years. At the last meeting he was asking for \$50 million dollars from the NPS to complete it. Roy Stillman also wants to make them each have multiple apartments up to five (in some circumstances I believe). This is against the Secretary of Interior Standards, and hence illegal in our opinion. It's criminal that he doesn't even know this. As Mr Tony Mercantante pointed out, there is not enough parking out there for that kind of development. We can do the same project for less than half that \$50million. So this is my formal request to out bid Mr. Roy. Stillman and ask for \$25 million dollars to do the 21 buildings he has a free option on.

> I have also been in touch with a local Bank of America loan officer. Many people in this area qualified for the Maximum \$975,000 HELOC loan. If GATE would release buildings 2 through 5, 7, 12, and 17 to me, I can get them leased. I have been in touch with the Durst family, the owner of Seastreak, a movie producer, and about a dozen others that have interest in this project and the financial where with all. We just need flexible lease terms, and power of yes!

> GATE does not have any ADA accessible overnight accommodations. Since building #600 (aka the Sandlass house) is not on the national register, it is perfect to convert to an ADA accessible accommodation at virtually no cost to the NPS. Its location outside of the main entrance next to the Highlands bridge makes it more uniquely accessible to handicapped visitors. According to the recent unit coordinator Pete McCarthy, it would cost the NPS around \$800,000 just to tear it down. We can personally save that home that is rich in local history per the Seabright Mayor that also wants it saved. This would enable GATE to comply with ADA requirements at virtually no cost. We just need them to build a handicap ramp or supply a lift to their specs. Creative lease terms would help. This project could easily save the Park Service over \$2 million dollars once completed. Unfortunately, we were unable to attend today's meeting in person, as we never received notice of it from GATE. Thank you for your attention – Brian Samuelson

Are there any other public comments?

JACOB JAMAL: Who is his name and do you have his contact information?

BENNETT BROOKS: I cannot share contact information. Again, any other comments for folks online. If not, we have about 15 minutes or so we can come back and finish the conversation and Jen you can talk a bit more

MICHAEL WALSH: This sort of tracks to a number of comments but mostly about the timing. We earlier talked about whether it would be theoretically possible to enter into the [NJ EDA] program this year. Before they change the definition to allow for multiple buildings and given the time Karen has talked about you all know it takes to get approvals or non-objections or whatever it is called, I would think that anybody who starts today wouldn't have it in place to participate in that program. But we have somebody who is theoretically developing four buildings. I don't know what their financing structure is but they are doing it they are going to be spending lots of money and it sounds like they are very much at the cusp of getting the approvals they needed and their plans are farther along. Would it be useful for them to consider making an application to contribute to the restoration of those four buildings? It would serve a number of purposes. One, it adds to their financial capability to make sure those projects get done, it would also serve as a demonstration project to show it is possible to get into these programs to get some money from the program potentially as stackable program. We talk about Stillman and how we cover the gap with Stillman, I don't think that's the only thing we should be thinking about, and we have somebody who sounds like they are right at the doorway to do it and why not encourage them to apply to these programs and make their experience open to the committee and to the Park service. That's really my only comment on that.

JEN NERSESIAN: I think something like the Officers' Club would be a great flagship project. Karen, I'm looking at you, I think it would be a good follow-up for us to talk to Scott Hegney about.

MICHAEL WALSH: It could be one building and he's got four. It doesn't have to be all one project.

TONY MERCANTANTE: I know going through the EDA process is not simple. It takes people to go through rules and whoever is going to do that they need some attorney or an investor who's been through it to work with you, so there are attorneys who do a lot of EDA projects, which is kind of niche. I think they would probably want to get somebody who's been through it to help. December 5th isn't that far away now, it's a quick turnaround. I personally don't know people who have done it, but I know there are people who specialize in that stuff. To get somebody who has been directing would be really helpful for that applicant.

DOROTHY GUZZO: I only know one person who's been working with a non-profit; he seems to know the rules inside and out. That's the name I shared.

TONY MERCANTANTE: There are other people out there, and I can get some additional names.

BENNETT BROOKS: Anyone else?

LINDA COHEN: I will mention I was thinking considering plan B was our original Plan A. The way things are looking and the auxiliary budget.

DOROTHY GUZZO: I'm going to mention if we were going to with Plan B and changing all this then putting out the RFPs we'd need to build in time.

JEN NERSESIAN: I want to think about that and pick up on what Dorothy was saying about putting out an RFP and the timing to really underscore how tight a year is in that timing. We really need to sit down now and work out that schedule - what that looks like - to see if it is feasible. If we are able to move forward on a group of buildings with Stillman to capture some of this opportunity, or in the coming year that's great. If the answer is no that doesn't make sense, and we want to go another route, It means we need to develop the RFP. I'll have to say we have a lot pieces already out there but it has to be repackaged, put out on the street and there's going to be a minimum requirement of 30 days or however long it has to be out there. Then all of the respondents have to get validated, and we have to put together a panel outside the park and it is own prescribed process and then – once we have a selectee - we have to execute a letter of intent, we have to develop designs to go through compliance including some type of evaluation with the historic preservation office. We have to come to consensus on the designs, negotiate terms of the lease and be ready to sign a lease being able to execute on a project and I don't know what EDA would accept in terms of where we are in that process, if it looks like we are heading toward lease signing, can they be an applicant at that point in time or do they need to have a signed lease in hand to apply? Those are two scenarios we have to work out. Even if it is the scenario where we as we negotiate the final stages with all I have laid out it's a tight fit. So, all the more reason why we really need to get down to brass tacks and really start putting these time frames and funding sources on paper together to look at what is possible and what that means.

BENNETT BROOKS: A good reality check. All right. Are there any other thoughts anyone wants to share. Jacob I know you have questions, when we have a break you can ask- go ahead- this is still public comment.

JACOB JAMAL: a local developer. [Inaudible] for many years to make sense of this great project would offer a great group of buildings and you have a look at that and if you are going to reopen this and you should reopen this to the public and the public competition. You will find very quickly, in this economy, 50 million dollars of government money to get it done - people will be lining up to get it done with their own money because it's a great investment. I think we have lost sight of that. If you don't want to abuse the system that is the right way to go about it. I think a lot of people feel the same way.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Aidita, are you going to come on again?

AIDITA MILSTED: I did want to add two quick things with regards to what would be required to submit to us. It is complicated - that is true - that is why we encourage people to talk to us before. But with regard to a lease agreement, if there was like an LOI the lease would not have to be fully executed in time for submission. You just have to show there is a path to site control. The lease would have to be fully executed before an agreement is signed but for the purpose of an application you would just have to show some kind of communication in general agreement with the owner there is a lease in process, negotiation. There's an intent for that. The other thing is while we cannot answer specific project questions now, we have a general email account it is historictaxcredit@NJEDA.gov and you can ask project specific questions or any kind of questions you have for the current round and what we do is within a week of

receiving the question we post that question on line and send you a link and it basically is a list of all the questions asked on the program or current round with the answers.

BENNETT BROOKS: Super helpful.

AIDITA MILSTED: The website is historictaxcredit@NYEDA.gov I think you should have the contact information on the last page of the information I sent originally.

BENNETT BROOKS: I will note the PowerPoint shared today will be posted online. Thanks, everybody. Thanks for those public comments they are all very helpful we appreciate it. With that, Jen, I will throw it to you for park updates.

JEN NERSESIAN: There is a lot going on at Sandy Hook project wise. Lauren had mentioned before the Great American Outdoors Act. We have a number of major projects out at Sandy Hook. We have been very successful getting some capital investments to help our deferred maintenance at Sandy Hook and we also had other funding sources that have been combined with that at the same time to fund a lot of the work. Muriel had mentioned the parade ground is starting to get impacted, this is all going to be painful for a while. Things are starting to get torn up and are going to get more torn up over the next two or three years. And really start ramping up next summer. What you are seeing out there right now is our project to rehabilitate the water and wastewater system getting underway. They are starting work on the pipes. This is a \$14.2 million project. That is under way and anticipated to be completed by the end of the year. This will be going on a while but will allow us to continue to run the faucets and flush the toilets which is critical. We have been successful in Great American Outdoors Act and line-item construction funding for infrastructure funding, but not so much for buildings. Ultimately what we all like to see is additional funds for buildings. Right now we can't do anything with those buildings as we have equal or greater needs underground with the utility infrastructure. These are the things that nobody visiting the park sees or thinks about until stuff starts breaking. All of those systems are deteriorated, and some are over 100 years old. To be able to make these investments that will support our future rehabilitation work in the buildings is absolutely essential and very exciting. We've got that project under way for the water and wastewater. We have a pair of projects for Officers' Row seawall and the chapel seawall. It is a contiguous section of seawall on the Bay side of the northern end of the peninsula. The Officers Row seawall is a \$15.8 million project, and the chapel seawall is a \$20 million project. These are in the latter stages of design, and we anticipate construction getting underway next summer. These are chugging along. I want to clarify, so everyone's clear about these projects - it's not going to be a 20-foot wall at Officers' Row. It's rehabilitating the current system and taking into consideration sea level rise, planning for the future. It's about shoreline stabilization, not surge protection. We will address long-term considerations and how we invest in these buildings knowing that things down there may not last forever. But these buildings were built well, they fared well during Sandy, and we think about these as long-term facilities.

SHAWN WELCH: Are the seawall projects being doing with the US Army Corps?

JEN NERSESIAN: The seawall project we are doing through an interagency agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers. Construction is also underway rehabilitating our water well. Not

everyone realizes we at Sandy Hook we are the water provider. We have a sewer treatment plant; we are like a municipality almost. The water systems wells are being rehabilitated. That's a \$4.5 million construction project that is underway and almost done. It should be finished by the end of next month. Revegetation work is left for next spring. Another Great American Outdoors Act project that is in design is for the electrical lines out there, the ones you see when you drive around. That's an \$8.5 million project. For any of you spend time out there, you know how frequently we have power outages. This will not only modernize the system but make it more resilient when we have it underground. That should serve us well. Other work is happening on some critical systems work and envelope work on buildings 32, 34, 35, 51 and 108 including putting an underground propane tank in the chapel. That's a half a million-dollar project, at least right now. All and all, with all of this project work that is in design or in construction, it's about \$50 million worth of investment.

SHAWN WELCH: That's really big.

JEN NERSESIAN: It is big. And it's going to make a big difference. And it may not be yet the work the historic preservation that we all want to see, and we want our visitors to experience, but it is needed investment to enable that in the park. It is all part of a larger vision. A few other things. Parking, when we go down to the Mule Barn you'll see they are going gangbusters already stripping what we've envisioned for parking and as we bring more entities online at Sandy Hook and think of whether it's residential use or event space, or restaurants, we've talked about parking here and we have some different ways to create more opportunities for parking that we've been looking at. We need both those short-term solutions as well as a more formalized vision for parking. Our staff are getting underway to hold some preliminary internal charettes to come up with more formalized plans to share with all of you in terms of how we move forward with parking. That is under way. Also, I did want to touch on building 600. That came up in some of the comments. Since that has come up in these meetings before, it has often been brought up in public comments, and that is the building that's on the left right as you come into Sandy Hook. For years there have been folks advocating for the preservation of that building. It is not contributing to the national historic landmark and doesn't pertain to the history that we're there to protect. I have to hand it to the folks who are advocating for this, they approached it with such passion and pushing for it but also professional and respectful and really have gone to every great length to find every potential piece of information to get this designation. We try to be just as diligent, look into every piece of information brought to us. We did last year contract with an entity to do a formal determination of eligibility for inclusion as an historic property to see if it rose to that level. The outcome of that determination was that it was not eligible, it was not historic for a variety of reasons - due to lack of integrity, it's been moved, it's condition, it doesn't pertain to national historic landmark. A variety of factors. That was the determination that we had from the professional that we contracted with and then that goes through the evaluation process. With a level of interest and advocacy behind this it went all the way up for final decision - and this is an interesting title it's the keeper, the keeper of the secretary of interior of historic standards that is the ultimate decision-making authority, and also the associate director for cultural resources in the National Park Service. The final determination is Building 600 is not eligible for inclusion in the national register of national

historic landmarks. It's not historic so at the federal level it's not something we will invest in the preservation of or maintenance of. It is also, historic considerations aside or park operations, it's in a very vulnerable location right off the water and hard to get to where it's situated on the road (no safe access, a lot of challenges). And now that we have gone through that process, we'll move forward with demolition, and we do have funding for some demolition throughout the park. That will be included. That would still go through a formal consultation process as required for all demolition projects. I just want to have full transparency on that.

A few other notes on happenings in the park, not just infrastructure work that we are focused on, it's also the visitor experience. We are moving into our quieter time at Sandy Hook. The visitor center at Sandy Hook is moving into winter hours and will just be open Saturdays and Sundays. History House is open Saturday and Sunday through the winter as well. We've got some upcoming tours of the Nike Missile Radar Site if anybody is interested; the next couple are on Saturday November 2 and November 10. We always have lighthouse tours but we are adding sunset and sunrise climbs. This is the first time we've had sunrise climbs. You'll have fabulous views of Sandy Hook if you come out for those. The dates for these are on the website, I'm not going to read all the times and dates now, but if you can't find it on the website as us, we'll be happy to help. We are planning a full moon hike in the holly forest looking at the holidays for our annual program with AGFA at the History House. We've got some exciting programming with the Sandy Hook Foundation as well and gearing up with our seal education team in anticipation of the winter arrival of our favorite seals and the crowds they bring which is a great thing. I think that's it. Any other questions about happenings in the park or investments?

BILL KASTNING: Summer access to the park?

JEN NERSESSIAN: That's on our radar too. It's not something that we have the answer for right now, but what we are looking at. The next step there is two pieces: it's the entrance itself and whether that needs a redesign to get people more quickly through and thinking about that in conjunction with parking lots. There are a number of ideas that have been floated around, like should we get rid of the entrance booths and charge for parking at the lots and will that help speed up access, and eliminate some of the backups, but that may create problems of its own as lots fill up and people are trying to turn around and circle around to look for parking; it may create more problems than it solves. The answer to those kinds of questions - we need to do a formal traffic study and bring a traffic engineer out. And that is what we will be doing to really have some more professional assessment of what our options are. The challenging piece of that is also beyond the park - the fact that one lane comes over the bridge and one lane comes from Seabright, so on a busy summer day when everyone wants to come to Sandy Hook, even though we have got 5 or 6 lanes open at the entrance booths, the fact that we only have two lanes at some point that feed into there is a hard one to solve. But part of a long-term answer to that is that we need more alternative transportation to Sandy Hook. We need more water taxi service, more ferry service, more shuttles from parking outside of Sandy Hook so we are not just relying on cars coming in and parking in the parking lots. There is plenty of room for more people on the beach; there's just not room for more cars in the lots. And then hand-in hand with that we need a shuttle that is circulating in Sandy Hook so you don't need a car to

get around. Once you're in Sandy Hook you're here for the day and go up to the main post area to get dinner or to stay in a B and B or do all of the other fabulous activities that are going to be there. That's the long-term vision. The short term is a parking study, and that is something the park has its sights on.

BILL KASTNING: Thank you

TONY MERCANTANTE: You had to leave something for your successor, so you left the hardest thing.

BENNETT BROOKS: Right. Is that everything?

JEN NERSESIAN: Everything I have, unless there are any other questions.

BENNETT BROOKS: If not, let's move forward. I'd like to leave a little time for around table for thoughts, feedback, closing perspective that any committee members has.

GERRY GLASER: I want to add in following with what Jen said, about the activities, this isn't the only park she's in charge of. She does all of this with several other units. It's constant, and she always does it well. She's being taken away. She is going to get into one of the biggest jobs in the park service. And if we think there is construction issues here - Jen will someday tell us how to continue to fix the wall around the tidal basin in Washington, and hundreds of other things. I don't have a count, how many parks there are in the National Capital Region, but I will tell you this: If I ride my bike from my house from the northeast side of the city to downtown, I go through about six national parks - some are big and some are small. And that's just on this one little bike trail.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, how many parks?

JEN NERSESIAN: I think it's about a dozen, but a number of those parks have multiple parts. Like GW Memorial Parkway has many sites but counts as one park.

MICHAEL WALSH: Just add to that, it is amazing what you have done and what you will be doing and handling so many balls in the air. I think there was a comment I forget whether it was 600 buildings or structures or historic structures within just Gateway National Park, National Recreation Area and you handle them all and we of course are very focused on this but you have been focused on all of it and have done amazing job. Kudos to you and congratulations where you are going, We are lucky because we are concerned about a large area as much as we are focused on this and we know that our DC national parks are in good hands and I know you won't forget us.

JEN NERSESIAN: Can I respond? I want to remind everyone this work will continue. I appreciate the comments, I'm leaving this wishing it was further along, but knowing it can be done. And counting on all of you to get it done. I want to underscore we have a great team in the park that is going to keep persevering until we get there, I want to mention we have had support from the regional office who I have been talking to about this project and who also wants to help make sure it succeeds and is offering resources to the park during that transition to help make sure this project keeps on track and talking to folks in Washington who are as

equally invested in wanting to see this succeed. There is support from all levels. Use that, leverage that. And keep it going because this is doable, it's feasible. It's really hard work but it can be done, and it is worth it. And for myself, it's been 11 years now, that has flown by, but I've been at Gateway for 11 years. During that time not only have we gone through this with the committee but with Shawn and Gerry especially we don't see all the work that goes on behind the scenes and all the work the two of them put in. We have biweekly phone calls - once every two weeks for 11 years, I've spent months of my life with them. Continuing to keep our focus on moving this forward so there is momentum, there is expertise. A real desire on what we are doing here. I will also just say for myself if there is anything I can do to help and support, I mean someone else will move this forward and I know they will be great everyone will do their best to find a wonderful person, so we get a new fresh leader in here and you move forward. But I am always happy to help. A piece of trivia about me not everyone may know. I got married on the beach on the Jersey shore in a sweatshirt that said Jersey girl down at Cape May. There are pictures to prove this. My heart really is in seeing this succeed. I love Sandy Hook. Before I ever had any inkling that I'd be working for the National Park Service, I was hanging out at Sandy Hook, first as a beach goer and then as a birder and sneaking into Nine-gun battery. I can't wait to see this vision and my heart will always be here. I'm still around the park service. Look forward to seeing this.

BENNETT BROOKS: All right. Just before we finish, the power points get posted tomorrow. I think we will have the working group and start looking at these opportunities and trying to figure out how to move forward and the Stillman project, and figure out all of the pieces

MICHAEL WALSH: Just sort of an administrative thing because we talked about posting this - there are new people here, if somebody could just for the public say what the website is.

DAPHNE YUN: It is the park service website: www.nps.gov/gate. It's not the Fort Hancock website - that's no longer our website.

MICHAEL WALSH: I just got it.

DAPHNE YUN: NPS.gov, if you do it on the phone on the front is a section for Sandy Hook leasing. There's a link for all of the meeting information.

MICHAEL WALSH: I think it is especially important because it links to the historic preservation standards or something. Anybody interested in this work needs to know these buildings have to be done in accordance with those standards. Everybody that comes in I think for administrative purposes. It is important people are aware of the website and go to it and review the material.

SHAWN WELCH: If you got the press release the link is directly in there. It takes you to the leasing program and there are three different links inside that.

MICHAEL WALSH: If you just search 21st-century - that's the old website. It's easy to get to, but it's defunct

BENNETT BROOKS: Daphne - any logistics anything else we need to hear?

DAPHNE YUN: After lunch we are going to start a tour we're going to start at the History House, but we can talk about that at lunch

BENNETT BROOKS: That's open to the committee numbers and online anyone would like to join is welcome.

JEN NERSESIAN: Two things, the picture up on the screen and the holes in the roof, keep that picture in mind when you go out there this afternoon. That is progress. And the other thing before we adjourn, we didn't do any recommendations. And we may want to think about as the last step before we adjourn things like what we want the finance workgroup to do. I think it is helpful to have a formal record with these recommendations, it's helpful for the park. It helps to keep us accountable because we check back in on those between meetings to see if we are doing what we said we would do and what the committee was advising. The meeting notes go up to Washington and they look at them and when it comes time for charter renewal or appointing new members, they know what it is doing so it is good to have a record of the committee's role of what you are advising us to do. I think it would be helpful if there is some encapsulation of our conversation.

SHAWN WELCH: How about this? We continue to work with the finance committee to begin to shape structure of submission. That's got to happen with Karen's team and the members of that working group, but we need to move forward in that direction exploring how to pull that together.

BENNETT BROOKS: A couple of words to say to that if that helps - something along the lines of being the financial workgroup to develop a charter to focus on understanding and flushing out opportunities in conjunction with --

SHAWN WELCH: Business office.

BENNETT BROOKS: Does that work?

SHAWN WELCH: Yes.

GERRY GLASER Something that would get to the urgency of the discussion with Stillman.

BENNETT BROOKS: Is that the working group

GERRY GLASER: Perhaps it's a subgroup of the working group. . The other part of the recommendation is to have a conversation with Stillman. There needs to be a separation of the two things.

SHAWN WELCH: That would be a separate bullet.

DOROTHY GUZZO: I would say the finance committee should figure out and have pre-application meeting with the EDA.

SHAWN WELCH: That's a great turnaround right there.

GERRY GLASER: I think a pre application meeting and also a conversation with Stillman.

SHAWN WELCH: That would be done or lead by Karen's team

KAREN EDELMAN: We can't apply - it's got to be a nonprofit.

JEN NERSESIAN: We can help facilitate the connections.

SHAWN WELCH: We have to identify a non-profit.

JEN NERSESIAN: No, A nonprofit is with the New Jersey historic program; the developer would be the applicant for the EDA program.

SHAWN WELCH: That becomes the question of who is the applicant - this committee or working group - the applicant will be the foundation or some other non-profit.

JEN NERSESIAN: There are different applicants for different funding sources and that's part of the complexity of what we need

SHAWN WELCH: It can't be for profit entity.

DOROTHY GUZZO: That's why we need the matrix. For-profits can do EDA for the tax credits, but the NJ Historic Trust applicant needs to be a non profit.

SHAWN WELCH: We have two separate animals.

JEN NERSESIAN: Three separate animals actually. We didn't talk about the CAFE program, but that's another one.

SHAWN WELCH: There is probably a bullet in there flushing out how to approach each of these three and that can be the working group plus themselves working on that. The problem is we are not going to have another meeting until well into next year.

JEN NERSESIAN: But the working group can.

BENNETT BROOKS: How about 1. Convene the Financing Alternatives Working Group to develop a charter for its next phase of work, with a focus on understanding and fleshing out emerging funding opportunities to support the re-use of Fort Hancock historic properties. This work, to be conducted in close coordination with the Gateway Business Management Services, includes:

- a. Developing a matrix that lays out the opportunities, eligibility, specific requirements and limitations, deadlines associated with different financing programs, etc.
- b. Including a focus on setting up a pre-application meeting with the New Jersey Economic Development Authority (NJEDA) to understand the application requirements associated with the Historic Property Reinvestment Program.

TONY MERCANTANTE: This should include an effort pre-application meeting and then some bullet. We have to work on the nonprofit.

DOROTHY GUZZO: That needs to be another bullet. So begin to identify the nonprofits.

>>With NPS.

BENNETT BROOKS: Are we good with that? Thank you for that. Okay, 12:33 I want to say thank you Tony for making this available.

TONY MERCANTANTE: You're welcome – and this is available if you need it.

JEN NERSESIAN: We are looking at the next couple of years of construction

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Charlotte and Daphne, for making the hybrid work. Thank you for making that happen. And thank you for being here.

JEN NERSESIAN: Thank you and thank all of you for all of your efforts. This is my job, and I am very happy to do it. I have the privilege to have the job, but you all are volunteering your expertise your passion, energy and commitment to help with this forward. We recognize this and appreciate it and the public will profit. Thank all of you for all you have done.

END OF TRANSCRIPT