

**Fort Hancock 21<sup>st</sup> Century Federal Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Summary #14**  
**Sandy Hook Chapel, Sandy Hook Unit, Gateway NRA**  
**December 12, 2014**

**Requests for Proposal (RFPs) released**

Jennifer T. Nersesian, Superintendent of Gateway National Recreation Area and Designated Federal Officer for the Committee, announced that the park had issued three Requests for Proposal (RFPs) today for a total of six buildings.

John Reynolds, Committee co-chair, reminded members how they all were there two years ago, touring these buildings. He congratulates the Superintendent, Chief of Business Services Pam McLay and the park for releasing the pilot RFPs to the public, saying "This is a great accomplishment." He compared this milestone and the Committee's progress to the minutes from March 2013, where the Committee did not have clear direction. "We did not know what we would do with buildings, what costs were involved, how to address insurance. Today, we have the RFPs and we are going to talk about the progress we've made. We are also going to talk about what about the rest of the buildings."

Gerard Glaser, Committee co-chair, noted that this was Reynolds' last meeting. Earlier he had emailed members to let them know he was resigning effective at the end of 2014. "We will not let him leave without remembering his role in this."

**Summary from previous meeting**

John Warren reminded attendees that the last meeting was held at Brookdale Community College on September 12 because the Sandy Hook Chapel was in use for a wedding. A lot of the discussion concerned the RFPs, which we will talk about today in their completed forms. The Committee discussed enlarging its membership so that more voices from the community could be heard. The committee favored the change, but concern was voiced that a larger committee might be unmanageable, or that new membership could reverse progress made to date. There was also quite a bit of discussion about RFPs in development with a focus on criteria for RFP. Afterwards, the Committee discussed getting the word out about the RFPs and will do so again in this meeting. Meeting minutes were approved by Committee by email and are posted on the website.

There were five speakers at last meeting's public comment. Today's public comment begins at 1 pm. The public is invited to speak though is not required to do so, though NPS encourages the public to do so. The members need to think about the best dates for meetings in 2015. One that is already certain is the next meeting on Friday, Feb 20. Tentative dates for other meetings are Thursday, May 7; Thursday June 25; Wednesday, September 9 and Thursday, October 22. (None are yet published in the Federal Register.) All 2015 meetings will take place at this Chapel.

## **Park announcements**

Nersesian updated the Committee on relevant park business. Regarding nominations to the FACA Committee, we are working with the Office of the Secretary and will keep the Committee posted on any proposed/new appointments. We will also talk about transitioning and bringing the newly appointed committee members up to speed.

A public meeting will take place Monday, January 5 here in the Chapel from 6-8 pm to discuss a proposed parking fee increase from \$15 to \$20 and raising the cost of season passes from \$75 to \$100, as well as raising camping fees from \$20 to \$30 daily. Fees go directly back to the park to support several projects, mainly in capital improvements.

A separate public meeting will take place on Thursday, January 15 from 6-8 pm to talk about Maintenance facilities. (NOTE: This date was later moved to February.) North Maintenance and South Maintenance facilities sustained a lot of damage from Sandy. There is no way to make North Maintenance facilities sustainable and we are looking for alternatives for both. We cannot combine them into one facility and there has been some comment from the public about the location of Maintenance facilities. We are looking for more creative solution that minimize impacts to resources and accomplish our preservation goals at the same time. We would like to facilitate adaptive reuse of some of our facilities in connection with a need for Maintenance facilities.

Building 23, the barracks adjacent to NJ Sea Grant, is in very bad structural shape. A recent evaluation speculated that the building may not survive the upcoming winter. Basic costs are expected to cost baseline \$1million for stabilization alone.

The National Park Service (NPS) has mentioned at previous Committee meetings that it is interested earlier in rehabilitating Building 7 as a model for the rest of Officers Row. However, the only way to put funding into Building 23 is to take funding away from 7. We are communicating with park partners to see if there is any interest out there to help save Building 23.

Nersesian called Building 23 an “emergency situation.” If there is anyone who is ready to come in and save the day on Building 23,” she said, “we are ready to negotiate directly with them. Knowing where we are now and what the situation is,” she made a plea for thoughts or feedback on what we are facing in terms of this challenge.

Linda Cohen asks about the condition of Building 23 vs 7. Nersesian replied that Building 7 needs work but it is not nearly in as bad shape as Building 23. The porch on 7 was just rehabilitated but Building 23 is far larger than 7. (NOTE: It was determined later that Building 23 would not see significant investment this season, thus diverting funds back to Building 7 after all.)

Cohen also asked whether parking fees collected at Sandy Hook support only SAHO. Nersesian replied that there is an 80/20 split of that revenue: 80% to the whole park and 20% to the Federal government. Gateway also collects fees at other park sites.

Guy Hembling stated that the park could do more to Building 7 with \$1 million than we could with those funds to stabilize Building 23. If we apply the money to Building 23, we won't have anything to show except for stabilization scaffolding. Maybe we should just let it go and let the public see what will happen if we don't do anything to buildings. Maybe it will motivate the government to come up with money for it. Or in the alternative, maybe someone will invest in Building 23 if they see it stabilized.

Michael Holenstein remarked that if the building fell down, it makes a statement. Maybe if you put the information out there, someone will come along and fix it or—not a popular thought—it will give you a lot of spare parts for the other four buildings of the same style/build. He recommended that the park “stay the course” with Building 7, but see if someone else will rehabilitate Building 23.

Nersesian expressed concern that a collapsed Building 23 may dampen enthusiasm of potential investors. The building itself is a cultural resource we would hate to lose, and it will certainly leave a hole in the cultural landscape as it is one of four buildings with the same footprint.

Shawn Welch stated that if the park lost that building, it was “a heck of message.” Larger buildings such as 23 offer bigger opportunities for use by groups. Since the interior of the building is damaged, there may be more opportunity to modify what is done with the interior. The Landmark status of the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark begins to lose its integrity when you lose elements of the historic landmark. Look at the Presidio as an example for how to trigger funding into preservation of national historic district without use of park dollars.

Nersesian replied that we are not going to be able to get political reach to use funds to do so. Partners are important for the preservation of this building.

Reynolds observed that his comment was not specifically geared to Building 23. These buildings are in really bad shape. It is wonderful that we have RFPs out but, in his opinion, there is no relaxation for getting RFPs out for the rest of the buildings. The sooner the NPS acts to get the rest of the buildings under contract, the better.

Glaser said that Building 23 is not part of the RFP (actually it is—this was corrected by Nersesian), but urged the park to find any creative way it can to cut a great deal with an organization/individual willing to take the risk and investment to play a role in the park to let us move forward with the process.

Lynda Rose asked what Glaser means when he says the park should “make a good deal.” Is he saying to relax some of the criteria? Glaser was not sure he can identify what those criteria are. The rent should be zero, shouldn't it? There are offsets that should be in place and there must be a way to make this a very attractive offer. Rose noted that in casual conversation, the historic requirements are a barrier and if possible, there could be a relaxation of those standards. Reynolds says that “relaxation of those standards” is manifested in the form of rehabilitation in lieu of rent, not in a softening of the Interior Secretary's Standards on Historic Rehabilitation.

Nersesian said that, in any case, with the RFPs we are looking to make the best deal possible to allow the lessee to make the repairs/improvements. The primary consideration is to save the buildings. The NPS is not looking to make a profit. Nonetheless, we have to operate within the framework of the law

and meet the Secretary's Standards applicable to rehabilitation of historic structures. That said, many of these buildings are not safe to access. Restoration is up for negotiation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and is part of the discussion required with our cultural resources folks.

Dan Saunders, who works at SHPO, said that it is wrong to be building-focused. We are trying to create spaces that give Fort Hancock its historic character. We must fix buildings one by one, but we must also step back and see how the buildings work as a whole and work with each other to make this a historic district. If a building is lost the message is, at least as it appears to the public, that NPS does not care. He would love to see 7 up and running and thinks the opportunities presented for future opportunity look good but if we lose Building 23, we lose a part of the landscape and a part of the history that is really important. There is more flexibility though with respect to the interior rehabilitation of Building 23. If it fell, there would be no obligation to rebuild it.

Holenstein cautioned that we all be careful about this message. There is a difference between relaxing standards and the obligation to comply with SHPO. Anyone who wants to participate should think about rehabilitating structures first, and if they are not interested in preservation, they should not be in the game. NPS should stay the course on what it has as a solid plan, i.e. Building 7. You can't spread limited resources and expect to accomplish any goals.

Glaser said that this was the first public announcement addressing the condition of Building 23. What we do is especially visible in light of the fact that building is in imminent danger of collapse. He agreed with Holenstein.

Nersesian replied that the park has already opened conversations with non-profits and educational groups who exhibited interest in the RFEI. Time is of the essence. Perhaps our marketing and outreach committee can help spread the word.

Timothy Hill asked, what does "time is of the essence" mean? What is the realistic goal of getting anything done with winter upon us and the RFP? Nersesian replied that, honestly, it is a roll of the dice. Building 23 cannot take snow load or moisture. The floors are about to go and if they fail, they will pull the walls in with it. There must be reduction of the load on the interior and a new roof structure. (a tarp won't do). Realistically, contracting will take some time and all of this is a roll of the dice.

John Ekdahl asked how much money is available from Building 7 to help alleviate concerns related to Building 23. Nersesian replied: Not enough.

Guy Hembling asked, what is a realistic time frame for this? The federal government doesn't do anything quickly. Nersesian replied that this is a gamble.

Margot Walsh noted that sometimes a crisis acts as a catalyst. Maybe a building collapse will create a greater sense of urgency for what needs to happen at Fort Hancock.

Mary Eileen Fouratt realizes that the pot of money available for any work on Building 23 is not enough to save Building 23. If it collapses, could someone build something in that style on that spot? Nersesian replied: Reconstruction at the spot of Building 23 that honors the fort architecture is a possibility.

Ehkdal said the worst case scenario was to put money towards Building 23 and see it collapse anyway. Nersesian assured the group NPS would not take the Building 7 funds and apply them to Building 23 unless we could get all the funds we need to stabilize it properly.

Welsh advised that if the park had funds identified for maintenance and repair, it should use them. Do not deviate from Building 7. It deviates from the cycle of approved funding for maintenance and repair. Restoration is not a function of maintenance and repair. It removes focus and funds from viable projects. Also, Welsh noted that Fort Hancock was beginning desegregation *before* the rest of the Army was desegregated by President Truman.

Nersesian thanked members for “a valuable discussion.” There are buildings that are not far behind Building 23 in terms of instability. We will need to decide whether we will patch and hold buildings such as 23 at the expense of rehabilitating buildings such as 7.

---

### **Request for Proposals and how they work**

Chief of Business Services McLay announced that three RFPs (each covering two buildings) are now live. She thanked the Committee for their help to arrive at this point. McLay showed the room where to find the RFP information, both on the park website (see <http://www.nps.gov/gate/parkmgmt/fort-rfp-2015.htm>) and on FEDBIZOPS. All three RFPs are listed separately, with all the attachments available on the website. The three RFPs are:

- For bed-and-breakfasts (B&Bs) in Buildings 6 and 27;
- Residences in Buildings 8-17, with offices allowed in Buildings 15-17, and;
- Non-profit organizations in the commercial/education area, which includes Building 23.

Many of these buildings can be seen inside and out on the Committee’s Flickr account (see <https://www.flickr.com/photos/128398185@N08/sets/>).

All the RFPs are substantially the same but each differs in terms of building information and some criteria. The RFPs address the competitive elements. If we had printed them, the RFP books would have been much longer. We talked about this at our last meeting and based the weighting criteria on that discussion. Criteria for selecting a successful proposal are: Use, Financial Feasibility, Fair Market Value Rent Consideration, Experience, Sustainability, Preservation.

McLay used the B&B RFP as an example. The park wants a “vibrant community” to take root and to complement the Chapel; wedding venue components are already in play. Financial capability is the second component (funds and credit-worthiness). Our primary objective is not to bring revenue to the park in the form of rent but to save historic buildings, so the proposed rent is one side of the equation. If the Lessee proposes something, we hope that we can convince upper management that it is a good offer (though we will have to back these up with appraisal). The NPS seeks leaseholders with the experience necessary to make the necessary rehabilitation and to have a successful business. The NPS also wants sustainability – good environmental practices, green restaurants. Applicants should also demonstrate that they have worked on projects in the past that preserve historic structures.

For the B&B RFP alone, the park has included additional land area with the hopes that the B&B could sponsor outdoor social activities, poetry readings, movies, music. Land assignment is included in the proposed leased premises.

Holenstein asked if the Lessee will have control of the land as designated in the RFP. The answer is yes. In many of the RFPs, the structure itself is the leased premises but, for the B&B leases only, the corresponding land assignment is meant to facilitate use of the land area to foster the vibrant community and use.

McLay noted that residential/office use is different, but the other criteria are largely similar. Again, the park's primary motive is to preserve historic structures. We acknowledge that the first six buildings to be leased are pioneers who must accept an element of risk. We will allow the applicants to tell us what they think the investment and the rent are worth. The park especially seeks applicants with experience handling historic tax credits and the ongoing preservation and maintenance obligations of a historic structure. We are looking for people who themselves have qualifications or who can assemble a team of professionals capable of dealing with the needs of historic structures.

Holenstein: If a person is investing a significant amount of money, can they expect the investment will offset the rent but the cam must be paid? Yes, answers McLay. Holenstein said the park must be clear that when one invests in the structure, the amount of investment will offset corresponding rent so that rate of return to investor is viable.

McLay continued with non-profit/education leases. We are looking to foster a community and build on this environment. Again, financial capability and credit worthiness are a component, as is experience, for the operator and the ability to run the program and account for the needs of a historic structure and rehabilitation. Also, an organization that can appreciate the efforts required for sustainable management of the facility with good consultants who can understand the historic components is required.

Response to all six criteria is required. NPS is looking for concise responses to RFP with comprehensive financial forms demonstrating capability.

Given the condition of most of the properties, we will not have an open house. We will have site specific tours by appointment only. All buildings will require hard hats. We will not allow access to Building 23. We want to make sure applicants are serious and have the capability to address the serious nature of this undertaking.

Monday, April 17 is the due date for proposals. The public has until March 16, 2015 to submit questions. We will respond to the questions in writing and post them publicly. The park anticipates review and evaluation of the proposals will take six or so weeks. Thereafter selections will be made by a committee which does NOT include any employees of this park. Finally, lease negotiations will commence.

Committee members can help get the word out in several ways. RFP booklets are out and can be distributed to interested parties. The Fort Hancock 21<sup>st</sup> Century Committee website is active. FEDBIZOPS will be utilized. The park will also do some advertising. Today we will contact all those who

contacted the park during last year's Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI). Committee members will do open houses and we are looking to do some outreach with municipalities.

*WE DID IT. Phase 1 is out!*

The Committee applauded, with thanks from Glaser and Committee members. After a short break, the Outreach Committee asked members what they were going to do to spread the word. Cohen has enlisted McLay to speak at the Hartshorne Woods community in order to enlist a great deal of cooperation from the community. Walsh is putting it out on the Jersey Shore Partnership Facebook page. Dr. Howard Parish is involved with Hudson County organizations with large corporate membership and will circulate with contacts in Monmouth County who have expressed an interest. Welch will send out the message on his lists of volunteers with interests in military sites and history.

Glaser mentioned how Warren walked into local businesses in uniform and spread the word by distributing tear sheets. All members could do this and Glaser will be happy to do so himself.

Reynolds will reach out to Board Members of Presidio Trusts to see what type of nationwide contacts they have.

The Two Rivers Conference of Mayors includes 12 nearby towns. Ekdahl will schedule someone from FACA to make a presentation at January meeting of the Council of Mayors.

Holenstein will stand on a tall hill and yell loud.

Hill will reach out to the recreation community, including key positions covering all counties. The organization includes about 400 people and reaches a bit into Pennsylvania. Hill will also reach out to local Chambers of Commerce.

Saunders will reach out to his contacts in SHPO. There are a fair number of contractors who do this work in the area and he will let them know these opportunities are available.

Warren mentioned that members can attend town council meetings. Rose replied that local towns are not interested unless the bottom line serves that town. Hill disagreed and says the impacts to Sandy Hook have an impact for the entire bay shore. Also, sometimes when you go to town meetings, they have resources you may not have considered.

Nersesian said that, aside from town council meetings, if you think there are other opportunities for NPS to get out there, let us know and we will get out there with you.

Ekdahl points out that municipal councils like to be on the inside on these matters and they bring it out to the public. We should enlist that engine.

Group points out that Lillian Burry (unusually absent for the meeting) has been working with the county Tourism Board.

Also, there are tons of tear sheets up at Twin Lights and there are more tear sheets available to be left elsewhere. Finally, there are posters in development.

NPS has issued press releases and we will be doing some advertising as indicated in McLay's PowerPoint. The park can put up posters and tear sheets at the Lighthouse Keepers Quarters and the Visitors Center. Holenstein suggested leaving tear sheets near the park entrance. The group made comments on the posters and made suggestions, including the adding of QR codes. Is it possible to use all posters in rotation? Yes. Group wants to know what we are doing to direct people further once they see them. Warren reminded the group that when we first developed the posters, we wanted them to be available for multiple uses. Holenstein says we can make them a bit different as needed.

Rose asked if NPS consulted with marketing people about the designs. NPS staff said no; they are design driven. Rose says she will put NPS in touch with marketing people so they can give us some feedback.

Welch wanted to lift some of the cantonment area language into the posters. Landmark info needs to go out to educate people that all of Sandy Hook is within the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark.

Rose is acquainted with the editor of Two River Times; she will ask her to do a story.

Holenstein asked where is the FAQ for Committee members to have as a source of info. McLay pointed out that the tear sheet has all the needed information except the date the RFP was due. Also, each Committee member received a new flash drive this morning with all the RFPs and attachments loaded.

Glaser asked McLay to talk more about FAQs and conveying info. McLay explained that questions from the public should be emailed to the Business Management Division (address in RFPs and other materials), which will craft responses for the public.

Reynolds asked where all this information gets posted. The Committee website is one place where leaseholders can find the information, as is the park website. FAQs can be sent to our Fort Hancock email list and updated when new questions are added.

Reynolds wanted to frame his previous comments about economics. About thirty years ago, there was a UN report called our common future, which defined in global terms, the modern definition of Sustainability, which includes a) environmental, 2) economic, 3) social components - all three of which must work together for sustainability to really work. The NPS really focused on environmental. Over the last three years, there has been renewed focus on moving the NPS toward considering economic sustainability. The tie to environmental sustainability is critically tied to economic and sociopolitical relationships. All three are critical and depend upon each other for long term sustainability to work. This is what he thinks about when he thinks about this project.

Holenstein noted how reuse of existing structures makes sense financially and ecologically. It might be worthwhile to get a committee together to state what this committee is designed to accomplish from the sustainability standpoint. We do not have such a statement and we probably should. Welch provided the article that got him thinking about financial wins of using existing structures. Members need to support what is going on here from both an architectural and an economic standpoint. Architects designed these buildings to withstand prevailing winds and they have. Use of that information is a good way to further the course of preservation.



Hill said we should keep it to one page. Holenstein asked who is responsible for overseeing this and making sure it is appropriately done? Should we create a committee? Glaser mentioned he has begun talking to the park to produce an interim report of three pages or so. This is a good time to reflect on that. Use for a document like that outside of GATE is good to show what we want, which is a model for how the park will do this. Glaser wanted to assemble a small group to help write the interim report. Group agreed. The document will be useful internally and for the media, whether it is looking at history of the Committee and where this process has come from and is going to, whether the asset is sustainable when looking at the structures, and having this process as a model for posterity. Holenstein advised that the document summarize this model of rehabilitation with the parks actions and the experience of the folks involved. The revenue generating stream that sustains all of this is a benefit to the public at large, and the development presents an economic impact to all of that.

Glaser and Holenstein volunteered to work on the interim report. Economic Impact and Environmental Sustainability comments will be sought from committee and Glaser will compile.

Nersesian noted that the park recently hired a climate change intern who will focus on the fort and work with historic preservation. This is related to the October workshop at Sandy Hook on climate change.

Walsh asked, what happens if there are no responses to RFP? Holenstein replied that we will address that as it comes up, if it is an issue. Not to diminish the question, if there are no responses, that will take us back to square one in a very sobering way. Walsh remarket that she hopes we don't end up there.

Break for lunch at about 12 noon. The meeting resumed at 1 pm with a public comment period.

### **Public comment**

#### **Only one member of the public, Rory Stout, offered comment.**

From Acrymax Technologies/Alastomeric Roofing and Coating Roofing Mfg., located outside of Philadelphia; subdivision is Preservation Products and they do a lot of preservation work. Stout is from Red Bank but lives in Philly and has been tracking what is going on at the Hook. For anyone interested in buildings at the Hook, he is familiar with retrofitting and renovating historic property. They've worked at Fort Sumter, Lee's Mansion, and Valley Forge. Their coatings are used for metal roofs and they do a lot of historic gutter renovation work. They do a lot of box cutters that historic buildings have. A lot of the historic porch roofs can be preserved with their products which are all liquid applied and user friendly and their company is validated for use on historic buildings through the national historic register. He has brochures, cards and samples. They are a family owned, three generations, they don't go through distribution, were founded in 1951. They do projects all over the country and internationally. They would love to have the opportunity to preserve right in their backyard.

Reynolds asked Stout to clarify what "national register certified" meant. He replied that there is an affiliation but is not clear about what that affiliation is. Reynolds asked if they have status as a non-compete for contracting purposes. It seems the answer is no. Welsh asked, are they on GSA General Schedule for Services for products or services? Answer: Fort Monroe Authority contacted him directly and they are working with Fort Monroe maintenance folks.

Welch advises Stout to find out if the company is on the GSA General Schedule and to let us know if they are. If not, please get on the Schedule if you want business with the Federal Government.

Stout said that the company has worked with NPS on many historic projects. Cohen asks him if he has seen Building 23 – that roof could use a lot of TLC. Stout said a lot of the roofs are asphalt shingle and there are certain substrates they can go over. Asphalt shingle has always been a little suspect; it has membranes/reinforced systems, but asphalt shingles are typically not within their area. Metal roofs though, such as the ones on the porch, are well within their expertise. They do a lot of prep work to get the metal roof ready for the “system” they paint over to preserve and protect.

Holenstein asked: When you look at a project from the perspective of a company that does historic preservation work, can you address what someone looking at roofs here, whether asphalt shingle or metal at the fort, can you speak to cost effectiveness? Do you have information that could benefit the public at large? Are your products more expensive?

Taking off an existing building substrate such as a wall or roof – coatings are sometimes an option when similar materials cannot be found or are more expensive. In regular construction projects, coating are used all the time when considering cost analysis. In the historic realms, his experience is that agencies are willing to do more to preserve and keep historic components. The coatings avoid having to construct new components or to leave new components exposed to the elements until completion of the project or the phase of the project.

Holenstein then summarized what he heard: under certain circumstances you can preserve the historic components with the coatings and it may be cheaper.

**Public Comment Period closed after Stout spoke. No one else present wished to speak.**

Holenstein asked if the Committee can move the Public Comment Period up to 11:30 am, before we break for lunch, so that we can hear comments while people are all here. (Many attendees were present only in the morning.) Group agrees by consensus. Warren explained that we can change public comment for the next batch of Federal Register Notice dates, but the February meeting is already in the queue to being announced in the Federal Register; therefore, the public comment time for that meeting must remain at 1 pm. It would be permissible to add times for public comment earlier in the day—say, at 11 am as well as 1 pm because once the RFPs come out there will be more parties wishing to comment.

Lynda Rose asks if there is a page on the website where public comments can be posted. Yes, written comments may be posted and are sent to all members.

The group agrees that 11:30 am will be first and 1 pm will be next if there are still people wishing to comment.

**Reflections on 2014, choices for 2015**

Holenstein: Is it time to rethink our mission? He wanted to hear from Nersesian on this topic. We should restructure and plan for a change in our mission. If we cannot talk about it today, we should make it an agenda item for next meeting.

Nersesian replied that, looking at the year ahead, today is a huge milestone. The focus for the coming year will be different. For the next few months it will be about engaging the community and working to get the right solicitations to get things going down here. Two other concerns: Once we have selected Lessees, it will take a while to negotiate the leases, and after that it will take a long process to set this up from construction and the multiple policing parties and the involvement of SHPO, the state, and local governments, and how we are setting up services for the Lessees. It will be a big operation to start up at once, even if it is “only” six buildings. We will need to know what other resources we will need. Additionally, we don’t have any time to lose in identifying what complementary uses could work here and what lessons we are learning from the Pilot Phase to make this work further down the road.

But all the participation from the FACA Committee has made a tremendous difference. Members experience and contribution is tremendous and must be underscored. Any success is directly related to this committee.

Rose asked if anyone else was interested in serving on the Committee. Nersesian answered yes. There was a tremendous response and there is a lot of talent that is beyond what we can accommodate for the committee. We should engage that level of talent and engage that enthusiasm as we continue to move on.

Walsh commented that the Committee’s mission has not changed, but its tasks have changed as they move along the path. The Committee is just following the process.

Holenstein asked, when will the new members be on board? Nersesian replied that she hoped but could not guarantee they can be announced for the next meeting.

Holenstein asked how to provide for the absence of one of the two co-chairs. Should we add a new co-chair? It may be worthwhile to wait until new committee members join and seeing how relationships are forged. Holenstein said we need to agree on agenda items. Let’s plan to deal with this issue.

Nersesian: Something else we need to think about is mentoring new members. We should have materials ready for their review. Perhaps we could match up a standing committee member with an incoming member.

Reynolds reminds us we approved by consensus two co-chairs. IF we do not have two co-chairs, we need to rewrite our charter.

Holenstein: He thought Glaser ought to stay a co-chair, but maybe Glaser felt differently. Should the new co-chair be a new committee member?

Reynolds: Looking at Jan, Feb, and March of 2015 – that is time during which the Committee and NPS could begin to address what the next offering could be as opposed to waiting until everything else is done. After the end of April, the BMD will be involved in evaluating and selecting responses to the RFP. Once those are done, negotiations are required. So it won’t really be until the summer that there will be breathing room for thinking about other buildings. Committee should use time in Jan-March to think about the next round/steps about Fort Hancock’s phased development.

Reynolds wanted the Committee to figure out how aggressive they need to be with getting to the next step. Nersesian expressed concerns about this. We don't know what the RFPs might generate. McLay: At this point, we don't know what we don't know. We cannot adjust our RFPs to make the next round better until we learn how it worked with this round.

Committee can appreciate that there are a lot of unknowns that will make themselves known within the next three months. But we can anticipate and put into motion what we can.

Welch said that, if we wait until April for selection and subsequent negotiation with selected Lessees, we are missing out a good portion of the construction season. That is another good reason not to wait.

Holenstein suggested that the Committee revisit the bylaws and clean up any issues that are outstanding. He would like to see the February agenda address by-laws and committee reorganization as it pertains to new members.

Walsh would like to ask for a reassessment of the properties once the RFPs come in so that we can apply it to buildings we want to consider for the next go round. Welch asked: as you work through the process of evaluating the buildings at Fort Hancock, is there any chance that information it will be ready for a report out? Nersesian asked Bill Bickerstaff (maintenance, Sandy Hook Unit) to let us know about status/condition assessment of the 35 buildings by the Feb 20 meeting. Welch asked for FCI evaluation and explanation of what conditions are causing them to drop but with the understanding there won't be enough time to get that kind of information by 2/20. He stated that condition assessments need to be "granular." Overview is fine. We want to avoid any Building 23-like surprises.

Glaser observed that it looked like the Committee has a pretty full agenda and it is pretty clear what our goals for the next year will be. Glaser agrees that anything we can do to be prepared to move ahead with a larger number of buildings very quickly is really necessary. He understands the administrative burden is great.

### **Wrap up and bon voyage to co-chair Reynolds**

Committee members state that it has been an honor and a privilege to work with Reynolds since the Committee first convened in January 2013, considering the progress in two short years. Reynolds was presented with a shirt that has RFP pics and GATE logos on it and a railroad conductor hat.

Reynolds thanked the members and park staff. He reflected that Gateway is really on the move. The park has been so troubled for so long; it never seemed to have gotten off the ground. We all knew the previous superintendent, Linda Canzanelli, who was focused and was the right person for her time here. As a result the park has a new GMP that the current superintendent was able to complete and get signed, and this committee was created. After Linda left and Nersesian came along, it was a perfect follow up. What has happened at Gateway over the last two years, and particularly what has happened here, is that the park has accomplished so much and reached this grand point of three RFPs, which was not easy. Reynolds said he was honored to be a part of this and is so excited for both Gateway and Sandy Hook. The opportunity for the future is way beyond what anyone would have dreamed of a few years ago.

Glaser: More than one of you has asked for the opportunity to express thoughts about Reynolds. What you have not seen are the interactions that take place weekly, and more often than you know. I have been the beneficiary of Reynolds' wisdom and experience and have learned more about the NPS than I ever thought I could and will be forever grateful. You all should know that he has impacts you cannot possibly understand.

Walsh: Reynolds is thoughtful and respectful of everyone on the committee. He has brought us a long way.

Parish: We could not have done this without Reynolds' expertise.

Saunders: The proof is in the pudding and the RFPs are the pudding. This would not have happened without you.

Holenstein: Good leaders train people well. That is a good legacy. Personal thanks.

Welsh: Thanks Reynolds for his insight, instruction, phone calls. Welsh called Reynolds a wise counselor who has helped him bridge gaps. He hopes Reynolds is available for counsel in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 pm.

**Appendix A: Attendance**

Meeting Summary approved by Committee Co-Chair

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX A: ATTENDEES**

**Fort Hancock 21<sup>st</sup> Century Federal Advisory Committee  
Meeting Summary #14  
December 12, 2014**

**Committee members:** John Reynolds and Gerard Glaser (co-chairs), Linda Cohen, John Ekdahl, Mary Eileen Fouratt, Guy Hembling, Timothy Hill, Michael Holenstein, Dr. Howard Parish, Lynda Rose, Dan Saunders, Margot Walsh, Shawn Welsh

**NPS employees:** Jennifer T. Nersesian (designated federal officer), Karen Edelman, Pete McCarthy, Pam McLay, John Warren.

**Public attendees:** Betsy Barrett, Vernon Chevalier, Roy Grammer, Richard C. King, Kelly Ryan, Gerry Scharfenberger, Raymond Smith, Oliver Spellman (NCPA), Rory Stout, George "Chris" Valone, Kevin Walsh, Michael Walsh