

Fort Hancock Advisory Committee Meeting 43: Closed Captions

BIS-DOI-NPS-6854832
Fort Hancock 21st Century Federal Advisory Committee Public
May 20, 2024
9:00 AM - 2:00 PM (ET)
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.

8:49 AM (ET)

Captions were chair certified for accuracy on September 10, 2024

CAPTIONER: Standing by.

BENNETT BROOKS: Welcome, everybody. It is good to see you all. I will come back in a few minutes and give a more proper sort of welcome to our call for our meeting. But at the moment I will hand it over to Jen to give a welcome on behalf of Gateway, and her team and then to Shawn as well. So, Jen, over to you.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thank you. And welcome, everybody. And thanks for your patience. Usually, we start right on time, but we were trying to pull in our last couple of people here.

But we are looking forward to diving in with you once again for the next steps forward in our historic program at Fort Hancock. You know we are not dealing with small challenges here.

But we are making incremental progress and that is the only way we will get through this long journey to the successful in them.

So we appreciate your time today, your thoughts, your energy, and helping to continue to propel this forward. I'm going to ask that we pull the slide up, and we will kick this off with our Pledge of Allegiance.

Who is presenting? Does somebody have the flag?

BENNETT BROOKS: Karen is presenting.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Karen?

KAREN EDELMAN: Do you see my screen?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: We can see your screen, but we do not see it in slide presentation.

KAREN EDELMAN: How about now?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Perfect.

BENNETT BROOKS: If you can advance one slide.

SHAWN WELCH: There you go.

KAREN EDELMAN: All right. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for, which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you, everybody.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Shawn, on behalf of the co-chairs and the Committee, would you like to welcome everyone also?

SHAWN WELCH: Yes. Welcome! This is an exciting period. Jen has an awful lot of news for us and happenings that are occurring out at Fort Hancock in the Peninsula.

But we need to have our thinking caps on. So, as we are going through what she and the rest of the Park Service team have to tell us because we have to make a few recommendations today, and we have to spend time deliberating on this. So other than that, it is wonderful to see everybody's faces. And Jen, let's roll!

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: —

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, you are on mute.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thanks. And I was just going to say, Bennett, back to you.

BENNETT BROOKS: That is what I had a feeling you were going to say. All right good morning, everyone. It is good to see you all. I think it was back in November when we were last together. So, it is good to be as a group again and good to see everyone and sort of put our heads together as Jen and Shawn just alluded to, to take stock of a what is happened over the last five months or so and see what it tells us about what we want to do going forward. Let's just do a quick around the table just so folks can briefly introduce themselves, names, or affiliations. So for the Advisory Committee members, let's start, I am just going to take it in the order that I see you. Bill? Bill Kastning? You are on mute. Member to take yourself off of mute.

BILL KASTNING: Bill Kastning, Monmouth Conservation Foundation.

BENNETT BROOKS: Patrick?

PATRICK COLLUM: I represent the education community.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes. Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: I represent the business community, 40 years in business services,

BENNETT BROOKS: Jim?

JIM KRAUSS: Jim Krauss, chair of the Atlantic Islands environmental commission for 11 years, also obviously, resident of the Atlantic Islands.

BENNETT BROOKS: Dorothy Guzzo? Good morning. Dorothy?

DOROTHY GUZZO: I am Dorothy Guzzo, the former Executive Director of the historic trust.

BENNETT BROOKS: Mary Eileen?

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I'm recently retired from the New Jersey State Council for the arts and will be retiring to the Committee.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Tony?

TONY MERCANTANTE: Tony Mercantante, Middletown resident.

BENNETT BROOKS: Linda?

LINDA COHEN: Linda Cohen, I'm currently working for New Jersey Sea Grant, and I have been working out there for almost 30 years. So, I represent the educational communities as well.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. And then I know there is members of the Park Service team here. So, Angela?

ANGELA CAMPBELL: I'm Angela Campbell, acting Sandy Hook unit coordinator.

LINDA COHEN: Oh, hi! Hello.

BENNETT BROOKS: Karen?

KAREN EDELMAN: Hi. Karen Edelman, I represent of the business and education unit for the Gateway area, National recreation area.

BENNETT BROOKS: Daphne?

DAPHNE YUN: Daphne Yun, Gateway National Recreation Area.

BENNETT BROOKS: Nitsan, do you want to introduce yourself?

NITSAN MACHLIN: Nitsan Machlin, internist. NCBI.

BENNETT BROOKS: And Mike Holenstein, I see you are on the attendee list. We sent you a couple of messages. I see you. Once you get in, take yourself off mute and turn on your camera, and you can introduce yourself as well. And while you are doing that, I will note that we have about seven people or so who are members of the public who are

in the audience, and Patty Rafferty with Gateway is there as well and Pete Izzo from Sandy Hook Foundation we will hear as well and a half a dozen other folks.

And Harold is a member of our leasing working group as well. Thank you all for making the time to be here. We appreciate it. Mike, do you want to come off of mute and introduce yourself?

Okay, we might come back to Mike when he gets himself off of mute. And I will note also we have a couple of journalists on the call as well, which is great. It is really good to have members of the press here because what this Committee talks about is obviously of importance throughout the region. So, thank you all for making the time to be here. So just pushing on we are looking forward to a really rich discussion today.

We have a lot to discuss. We will start by taking a quick look at last meeting's notes and seeing if there are any questions on that. We will touch a little bit on a future meeting schedule so we can have a sense of what the next 6-12 months is looking like and then we will have some general leasing updates from Karen.

After that, we will really take a deep dive into the heart of what we are here to talk about, which is the leasing program, and finding ways to hold onto the historic buildings in a way that are useful and meaningful and effective and financially doable and all of that.

And we have got sort of three different ways to talk about that because all of these things have to pull together.

We've got about one hour carved out to talk about updates from the Stillman project and there has been some developments and progress since we last talked, and it is important for the Committee to be caught up on that. We have a good chunk of time set aside to hear from the Sandy Hook group, and I mentioned Pete Izzo and to get an update on the leasing and activities at Fort Hancock and then we established financial alternatives working group at the last meeting and that group has met, and we want to catch everyone up on with the Committee talked about and with the working group talked about.

And broadly to think about how these, all different efforts, support each other, connect, where is the synergy, that is kind of I think on the high-level our task today is to understand how all these things are moving forward and how do they work together.

Finally, before wrapping up for the day we will get a couple of quick general Park updates from Jen. We will do an around-the-table comments and that is something that the Advisory Committee has asked for, which is a way at the end for the community members to weigh in and take your comments based on the conversations.

We will close by reviewing any key takeaways, recommendations, next steps, and as Shawn has already noted, we really look to the Committee to, as appropriate, develop

recommendations for Jen, and her team, and we will look for opportunities for the Committee to weigh in with any direction that is helpful and useful.

A couple of other quick notes. We will have a break at 10:30 so please take advantage of that if you have phone calls or emails, that is a right time to do that so we can have your full focus when we are meeting. Public comment is from 11:30 to 12:00, and we will absolutely break any conversation we have at 11:30 to respect that time. We don't have anyone signed up in advance, but we always want to make space for folks to comment on anything they have heard. We will's name to adjourn by 1:15.

Just a couple of ground rules before we jump into the conversations for the Committee members. As always we ask for you to contribute so we can hear from you and know what is on your mind. Jen and the team benefit from your thinking. That said, share time, there's a lot of you and we want to be able to hear from everybody so please be as focused in your comments as possible.

Integrate, ask questions of each other, integrate perspectives particularly as we are thinking about recommendations. Think hard about what kind of recommendations might get their arms around the different perspectives we have here at the table. And then logistics, Committee members, you are able to use the chat. You can chat to all of the panelists or just to an individual one. In general, I really recommend you take care and using the chat mostly because I think it is distracting if we are busy chatting in the chat. And also the public doesn't get in on that.

So I recommend we mostly keep our conversation to comments. When you want to get into the mix, raise your virtual hand at the bottom of your screen. You can raise an actual hand, but I may or may not see you as the numbers get too big. And you can keep your cameras on, and we appreciate it. It makes I think a better, richer conversation if we can see each other

Two notes for panel members and Advisory Committee members and for the public. We are recording the meeting so please be aware of that, and we also have live captioning available. So if that is helpful, please avail yourself of that, which is again available at the bottom of your screen. You should either see live captioning and if you don't see that, you can click the "more" the three buttons and that should bring it up.

For members of the public, thank you for making the time to be here. I appreciate it and the conversation is very much around the table for most of the meeting, but we very much also want to hear your thoughts, and we have public comment at 11:30, and we also have the Q&A available to you. In general, again same thing. We ask you do use that sparingly. If there is a factual question and someone mentions in acronym, and you don't know what it is, feel free to throw a Q&A in there to the extent that Daphne or Karen or Jen or somebody can answer it in real-time, we will or we will answer it afterwards.

NITSAN MACHLIN: I will add that the link for the closed captioning is in the webinar chat.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you so much. Let's see. I think that is all I want to say other than if anyone has a technical issue, probably the Q&A is the quickest way to alert us to that. If you do not hear us or certainly if something doesn't seem to be working right, do that.

As well you should always feel free to send an email to Daphne if there are comments that you have, and you don't want to use a public comment period etc., the Park Service is always interested in hearing whatever is on peoples' mind.

With that let me pause and see if there are any questions or if anything Park Service folks want to add in on, and I will note Daphne put her email in the chat. Thank you.

And Mike Holenstein, can you come off mute? I want to make sure we got you.

BENNETT BROOKS: All right. Mike, if you are trying to talk and not getting off of mute, maybe you can shoot an email to Daphne or throw something in the chat, and we will try to get that fixed. I'm not sure what is happening here. But you should have the ability to unmute.

Okay, we will work on that on the side. At the meantime I think I want to hand it over to you, Daphne to see if there is any feedback on the minister questions and talk about the schedule.

DAPHNE YUN: Apologies. I just realized that I had not sent out the minutes. I just sent them out. We will probably not be able to approve them today. Apologies about that. But I do want to talk about September 10, hold the date. We do expect to have a hybrid meeting on that date, possibly hosted by Middletown thanks to Tony and then I'm going to come out with some more dates, possible dates probably November-December, and we will try to have four meetings this year. So, keep your eyes open for my emails and thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Perfect. Thanks. And Mike Holenstein, if you are on your phone, which it looks like you might be, to come off of mute, you hit star six. Let me see if that works. There you go. Mike? Now we got you. Since we have you, can you briefly introduce yourself, so folks know who you are?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: I'm Mike Holenstein. I'm delaying the meeting. Let's get on with it. Good morning.

BENNETT BROOKS: Good morning.

[Laughter]

BENNETT BROOKS: All right. So let's go over to Karen to give us a quick update on sort of general leasing activities, any issues you want to flag before we get into other business? Karen?

KAREN EDELMAN: Good morning, everybody. I would like to just remind everyone that we are recapping in terms of the progress we have made to date over this long period, and we have a number of buildings that are currently leased. Some of in use. The newest one is with the Mule Barn and Sandy Hook. It looks great. The menu is pretty good.

And we are still moving ahead with four buildings in Sandy Hook. We have a letter of intent holder that we are continuing to negotiate leases with, and for those of you who worry that the lease negotiation takes a long time I will remind everybody that the compliance, sorry, I don't want to stop the compliance, the review of the drawings for what is proposed for the Building has to be undertaken by the Park and those drawings have to be in pretty good shape for us to sign a lease. So we continue working with the lessee to finalize those things so we can move ahead once the lease is signed with the start of construction. And that is obviously an oversimplification.

There are four buildings that are subject to this letter of intent, and we are looking forward to being able to announce sometime in the summer or maybe fall that we have additional signed leases, but I am reserving any comment on that until we actually have something to announce.

Then as you know, we have 20 buildings that are subject to an agreement with Stillman development and Jen will talk about those later as we move on through the day. But I just wanted to put up a snapshot so everyone can see where we are.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Any questions for Karen on any of these? And again, if you raise a hand, that will be the best way for me to see you. Okay. I do not see any. Okay. Let's push on. As I said there's been a lot of activity since we last met.

And we really are setting aside a good chunk of time to kind of take stock of the recent developments, get a sense of the Committee's thinking about what it tells us around future directions, opportunities, recommendations, things that any of us around this big table should be doing and get a sense of any kind of recommendations that might make sense.

As I said we will take this in three chunks. We will talk about the Stillman project, the Sandy Hook Foundation work, and the leasing working group, but before I do that, I want to hand it off to Jen to provide us a big picture context on some sort of purposes and challenges and directions and all of that we will get into it. Jen, over to you.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thanks, Bennett, and I will give the big picture context, and then try to focus in to get us started on the portion of the conversation that will focus on the Stillman project. And as you saw from Karen's update, you know, we have got some completed projects. We have some successes to date. I hope you have all been out to the Mule Barn. We are all very proud of that most recent addition to the portfolio. And she noted, we are getting very close to lease signing on for the additional larger buildings.

But we still have many buildings in the lessee portfolio in need of rehabilitation.

And of course, we are continuing to fight the clock as they stand unused and unrehabilitated. At our last meeting we assessed where we were and grappled with needing to develop a different strategy for moving forward. And I will go back over some of that. We discussed the concept of a three-legged stool with the government, nonprofit, and private sectors coming together to each be a part of the solution.

We will take a look at each of those three today first with current status and thoughts on next steps with Stillman, then hearing from our partners at the Sandy Hook Foundation and their perspective, and then as Bennett mentioned, checking on the work of the financial alternative subcommittee that you all set up at the last meeting.

And I just want to remind everybody once again that as we go through these, it is very helpful to us to have the Committee generate formal recommendations based on your discussion and perspective. You know the discussion itself is very illuminating to us as well but having those formal recommendations as a part of the record to really coalesce the Committee's thinking into this is our advice, our recommendations for how we see you to move forward in a very formal way is important.

So I will start by recapping that juncture that we discussed at our last meeting. And just remind everybody of a little background on the Stillman project. Roy Stillman and his company responded to our request for proposal several years ago for 21 buildings, all of what at the time was the balance in the leasing program portfolio left for what we had proposed to undertake.

And we signed a general agreement with him.

And we do this for a few reasons. It is not our typical process. Usually, we sign a letter of intent, but we looked at this in doing it in a phased process, a first phase that would really look at feasibility, and then a second full implementation phase.

So we did this to know whether the proposal put forward was feasible from historic standpoint, whether it could meet the historic standards for preservation.

And we looked, we wanted to also test the feasibility of the business model to see if, to really run the numbers and do the calculations with the level of investment that is needed in these buildings and the potential revenue they can generate once you put the investment in. Does it all balance out as a business proposition?

And then you know as you all remember, there were issues and concerns that were raised by both Congressman Pallone and a number of our local and state environmental groups, which included concerns about residential use and impacts from having that many users or introducing that level and type of use at that end of Sandy Hook. So in the intervening time, we formed the working group, the Environmental Issues Working Group of the Advisory Committee and have worked with many of those groups to really understand their concerns and look at ways within our Park management and within the

leasing program that we could address those concerns and really up the management to make sure that we are taking all of that into account.

And we will touch base on just — we have looked at many of those issues. We have a few loose ends, and we will come back to that later in the meeting today. But coming back to Roy Stillman and his proposal, when we looked at the historic standards — so I first off I will say that in the phased process, to really test some of the things out, he did a really very thorough design on two of the buildings on Officer's Row and based on the architectural designs, we were very happy to see that they were able to do them in a way that was very historically sensitive and the proposed use of the buildings again was residential and putting several apartments I think in general, five apartments -ish was proposed, and they did that in a way that respected the historic character and was a very sensitive treatment. Part of our goal here is to get the buildings rehabilitated, do so in a way that makes it financially viable and makes it makes sense and doable with the work that needs to happen on these buildings while not losing what it is we are trying to see. We want to maintain that historic character because that is our mission and our primary goal in making sure these buildings are preserved and that every member of the public has the ability to walk around the northern part of Sandy Hook and experience the port and see the landscape in those rehabilitated buildings like they would have looked in the heyday of their military use.

So check on the historic standards question and that feasibility testing.

So the other part of the feasibility testing was looking at the business model and at the last meeting we shared that we had gotten to the point where Roy Stillman and company had completed their cost estimates and assessment of the business model and looking at how much it would cost to rehabilitate the buildings and how that level of investment compared to potential revenue projects.

As we shared then, the numbers were upside down. Initially the Stillman group came into this thinking that it might be around a \$30-million-dollar investment when they put in the proposal, that the breakeven point for not making any money on this, but covering all costs was about \$50 million. That is where the revenue would cover the investment right at the zero level that was being made. But when they looked at the designs, looked at the buildings, ran the numbers for rehabilitation and extrapolated that across the portfolio, that the actual project was probably going to cost at least \$100 million given the state of the buildings. That left us with a 50-million-dollar financing gap. And so it was at that last meeting that we discussed this new approach and new into different respects — one is that there would be a nonprofit partner role as well.

And then the other part of this new approach was thinking about maybe we need to process an incremental way instead of looking at the entire project is once? We don't have \$50 million right now to put into this, but if we were able to bring in funding over time in, we move forward incrementally to get the whole portfolio eventually done. We

also said we in the Park Service would take us back and go back to potential funding sources.

And we have conversations with our colleagues in Washington.

And I will say that not entirely surprisingly there is no major funding source out there that will cover this kind of gap from the Federal Government in, not that we have any other access to or control over in the Park Service doesn't typically get these large pots of money for that type of investment with the exception of the Great American Outdoors Act and that was legislation passed I believe it was an 2021 that brought five years of funding to the National Park Service for deferred maintenance and certainly, the buildings in question are a perfect example of what deferred maintenance it looks like.

But they are not currently on the Great American Outdoors Act program. I think they would be and, again, and talking with our Washington colleagues, you know everybody supports the idea of if there was a reauthorization of the Great American Outdoors Act, these buildings were a prime candidate for investment. Even with that, it would be very unlikely that it would fund a 50-million-dollar gap but could be funding that is more the scale we need even in an incremental approach and, but that does not currently exist in right now there is no Great American Outdoors Act beyond the coming year.

And we are keeping our antenna up to track what happens. There is discussion of a potential reauthorization, but until that actually does happen but there is no funding coming from that.

I will come back to the idea of how we can continue to make progress not at the 50-million-dollar level, not at the 10-million-dollar level, but perhaps at the 2–3-million-dollar level. But I want to take a minute to talk about where we come in the discussions with Roy Stillman and his proposal since the last meeting.

So you know in this thinking that we discussed moving forward on a more incremental basis, we have discussed this with Roy and his group, and they are very willing to take that kind of approach. Rather than doing the whole portfolio at once, to do a subset of buildings at a time. And at his vantage point, it is better to start with two, and he is very willing to move forward with those first and then as more financing is available, keep moving forward on groups of buildings on the increment basis.

But the big caveat is that he still needs the entire portfolio to make it work financially in terms of that is, is model. That doing two buildings, doing four buildings from his standpoint and his investment needs does not pencil out financially. So even to move forward on an incremental basis, we need a financial plan, and we need to know what financing would be available one.

So let's say if this is over a six-year period we need to know in year two that we expect X number of dollars and in year four, Y number of dollars so he could plan out his strategy and his incremental investments that mess with that. But they have a clear

pathway to the finish line at the outset so that he knows at the end his investment make sense.

And I think that would likely be the case for anybody making this level of investment. They need to know what they are working towards, and that there is some assurance that they will get there at the end. And right now, we don't know that. We may have one small investment that I will talk about in a minute, but we don't have anything on the scale of the tens of millions that are needed to move forward.

What we do have is at least a number of irons in the fire. We had the leads being generated by the finance Committee, the subcommittee. We have the Sandy Hook Foundation getting involved and, again, we will hear more about all of these things in a little bit. And you know we will continue to track on where Congress is heading with the Great American Outdoors Act or any other sources of Federal funding we can possibly tap into.

So again, if we can come up with a financing plan, Roy Stillman is still very much in this and willing to invest from his part. So, we still have a potential private sector partner in the tens of millions of dollars scale.

But we don't have that financing plan yet.

And we may wind up with the conclusion that there is not a viable pathway forward at the scale of investment that is needed to cover that financing gap. At that point, we need to move on from the Stillman agreement if it is really proven itself to be not feasible and pursue some other direction altogether.

Now I will say that from my perspective, we are not there yet. I don't see what light there is of the tunnel yet, but again we have got these irons in the fire and should see what the next few months bring with these other possibilities, between the finance subcommittee, the foundation, whether the Great American Outdoors Act seem to have legs or not. To me, that feels like the next few months will be very telling. But I would appreciate your input on this in terms of what kind of timing makes sense for what steps.

So before we stop to talk about all of that, I do just want to spend a minute also going back to that incremental strategy. That was the other thing that we had talked about at the last meeting. And whether — if we do take an incremental approach, whether it makes sense from our NPS side and the investments that we are able to make to try to take on a Building or two at a time or to invest in systems across the portfolio. And in the systems approach, what I'm referring to by that is similar to what we are in the process of completing now with the roofs on Officer's Row. If any of you have been out to Hancock lately and been out to the Post area and been to Officer's Row, you've seen that the roofs are looking good and looking a lot different than they were just a couple of years ago.

So this was an investment that we were able to make from the Park Service. It is well upwards of \$3 million. It is not 50, but it is still significant money that, honestly, went a lot further than even we were hoping it would, and we got a lot of really good work done.

So 15 roofs wound up being included in the project, which is more than we initially thought we were going to get and, especially because we had to go in and do some initial stabilization work just to be able to work on the roofs and be able to properly assess the roofs because of the deterioration was to such an extent that there were concerns about structural integrity and been able to do the roof work.

So we took care of that for those 15 buildings. We did new rafters, including rough sawn valley rafters that were replaced in kind, and sheathing was replaced in kind, copper flashing was replaced in kind, and we used new eco-star composite shingles that mimic the historic slate and have a 50-year life span and a better prospect or resiliency in the kinds of whether we get out there.

We have temporary gutters and downspouts in place. The intention is to replace them with in-kind materials in a later phase but in the meantime, they are still fully functional.

And we are not quite yet, but almost at substantial completion of this project.

So, I mean we took on roofs because without roofs, we lose the rest of the building. If they are not sealed up, that compromises everything else, and we saw this as the most critical priority to address if we were going to keep the buildings standing and buy ourselves time to get to Fuller rehabilitation. And so that is what I am talking about when I say looking at a systems wide investment. So, across a grouping of buildings, taking on all of the roofs.

And we have been looking at, for the same buildings, particularly the Officer's Row buildings, if our goal is to keep them standing, the goal is stabilization to buy ourselves time for more incremental investments, what would be the next priority? As we look at this over the past couple of months, masonry jumps out as number 2 with the bricks that are falling, and we need to rehabilitate and replace those in many cases, so the buildings are sealed up, and we are not having those brick blowouts, which are not only a structural issue but a safety issue as well. So, we are proposing from the Park Service end to move forward on doing masonry work on his many buildings in that same grouping as our funding will allow and pulling in another 2–3-million-dollar investment starting over the coming year to focus on masonry. After masonry, we think windows and porches would be the next priority. Again, focusing on sealing those buildings up, the building envelope to buy ourselves time to look at other kinds of investments. But with the money we think we can bring to the table now, which is good news in, and of itself we are looking at moving forward on a masonry project.

So it would be also my proposal that we continue to move forward on a systems basis with our smaller, and by smaller, these are still multimillion-dollar investments, Park

Service investments again with that goal of keeping the building stabilized as we look at bigger financing models.

So with all of that, and again, I welcome your input on that. I think the discussion is extremely helpful, and we want to tap into all of your thinking and expertise and experience, and formal recommendations would be welcome as well. And that helps, you know, us track this through the public record where the Committee is that, as well as I think helps coalesce the conversation into a very focused direction.

So, but with that, both with the update on Stillman and the thinking of the timing of looking at other big financing options without yet quite being at the point of looking at a different model and losing that 20-30, or however many tens of millions of dollars level of private investment, some discussion on the Committee on the timing and your thinking on that, and just touching base again too, based on the last discussion, the discussion of the last Committee meeting, that this is the direction we want to continue to go, as well as this incremental strategy that, you know, we are looking at focusing our Park Service investment rather than on a building at a time, trying to continue to invest in these portfolio-wide systems, looking at the success we were able to achieve from the roof project, trying to replicate that across other systems to achieve maximum stabilization and hopefully, avoid losing any buildings in the interim.

Bennett, I would throw it back to you.

BENNETT BROOKS: That is great Jen. In a nutshell stay the course for now, sequence, systemwide sort of investment.

We've got about 40 minutes to chat about this. I would love to see what questions folks have for Jen on anything she just presented. I think we can clearly hear from Jen the interest in getting recommendations back from you all.

SHAWN WELCH: Jen, we have like 25 open windows and about 12 open dormers. Is there a way to get those emergency seals before you go in and do serious window work, just to keep the water out? And that is a thought. Maybe that something the Committee should talk about. But as I drive down there and see the windows — but more importantly, I got asked about seven times yesterday about that. So food for thought.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes, that is absolutely+.-+965 something we can look at doing.

And we do not have a near term investment lined up for windows. So I want to be clear on that. With that is different than trying to just seal them up in the meantime as a very temporary measure. Sure.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Shawn. And again, Committee members what questions do you have? Patrick, and you need to come off of mute before you talk.

PATRICK COLLUM: There you go. I am having trouble following the logic on the Stillman project. Apparently, there is a 70-million-dollar hole in the boat and by tying up all of our assets and stringing this out, I don't know how that will help with this \$70 million hole in the boat. And I don't know if it is a wise business decision to tie up a large partial of assets to put out into the market for him to do a couple of buildings.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I will say that my thinking on that, and you are very welcome to poke holes in that. He is looking at the potential revenue generation of the building, which is going to be a, you know, probably a similar calculation to anybody coming into it plus the cost of the historic rehabilitation again, which is going to be similar to anybody coming into this.

And factoring in also, you know, some cost efficiencies with the doing multiple buildings at once, doing this at a bigger scale. And if the numbers are not working in that kind of analysis, I don't know that there is another private developer who is going to come in and have a completely different take or some way to make this so much more cost efficient or find some revenue-generating potential that is so great that it is going to pay for the needed \$50 million worth of investment.

I do want to clarify that the 50 break even point to the 100, nobody wants to do this at a breakeven point. Hopefully, our gap is not quite 70 million, but we are thinking in the 50 range, but these are all a little bit fuzzy numbers. It is a big gap.

But I don't know that pulling them out, putting these all back on the market is going to yield a different result. I mean it is going to cost this much for anybody to come in and rehab these buildings at this point. And so whoever the private investor is going to be, I think we are going to have to figure out other types of investment that can help move this project forward.

In the meantime, we do have a private investor who is still willing to invest tens of millions of dollars, and it took us years with these buildings out on an RFP to get anybody with that level of interest. I don't want to you know turn away from that prematurely. You know if we can figure out something that is workable, then that tens of millions of dollars of private investment is an important piece of the puzzle. It is one of those three legs to the stool. But also, fully appreciate that at some point, you know, we will have to face, if there is no other investments to bring into this, that that model isn't workable.

In that case I don't know that it is workable for any investor with the program as it is. But again, I welcome — poke holes in that if there is something I am missing or if there is another approach that makes sense. You know I am very willing to look at that.

BENNETT BROOKS: Pat, I want to come back to you if you have a follow-up thought or question to Jen based on that.

PATRICK COLLUM: I think the model we are looking at or Stillman is looking at is residential housing.

BENNETT BROOKS: Right.

PATRICK COLLUM: I don't know if, we don't know if there is anyone out there, but a different use may change the profitability of rehabbing those buildings.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: And I have had that discussion with Stillman as well, and they settled on residential use because it was the way to produce the highest return in their estimation and with less risk, financial risk than other potential uses. And I will say that over time too you know with this Committee, we have looked at other types of uses. We have looked at, you know, nonprofits, educational institutions. We have talked to colleges and universities. We have talked to short-term lodging entities, overnight lodging use, and we have been unsuccessful in actually finding anybody that would be willing to invest in those and mostly hearing back that the numbers don't work.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Dorothy, why don't you jump in, and Pat, if you want to come back and later, of course you are welcome.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Okay. I have a two-part question. Jen, have you discussed the incremental approach with Stillman, and if you were doing sort of like systems, and then he was back in doing development, does not work for him? And the second part of this, is there a point at which, I don't know about his timing or what his other commitments are in the world but is there a point at, which he says you know what, you cannot hang on anymore. I was curious to know if you had those kind of conversations.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes, in terms of the first question about incremental, moving forward incrementally, he is very open to that, willing to move forward in that fashion. At first, I was not sure if it would be the case, but it is. But it's only if we have a plan to know how we are going to get to the finish line. If it is incremental progress over a period of 10 years or — I am making that time frame up —, but you know he is looking for us to have lined out what investments would be happening when in the 10-year period, and he is willing to plan his investment incrementally along with ours. But we need to know about our investment before we move with it. Remind me of the second question?

DOROTHY GUZZO: You covered it. If there was a timing issue. Like if you said you know what, you cannot get your act together in five years, and then I'm out of here because I have too much time or money invested already., one you he has not said that.

JEN NERSESIAN: He still is hanging in there and still willing to participate in this again if we can line out the full investment plan, which at this moment we are unable to do. He has not said to me, you know, if you guys can't figure this out in a certain amount of time then you know we are going to walk away. I don't think he has much to lose at this point by hanging in there.

But we have had the frank conversation that from our vantage point you know we get to the point that this looks totally unworkable as a model then we need to dissolve the agreement and do something else entirely. And he understands that, and we are all very open about that as a possibility.

But he has already invested a lot of money into these initial designs on a couple buildings they did and the assessments that they have done in the cost estimates on the rest of the portfolio. And so you know he already is into this. And I would say from my outside perspective it would make sense for him to stay in until we can figure things out. But no, has not said that — you know put any kind of time limit on it from his standpoint.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Other Committee members? I would love to know what questions you have on your mind, the thoughts you have on your mind. Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: At the fear of stating the obvious, I am assuming in these discussions that you know sort of the exit, the early exit, you know it goes both ways. You know when we were originally doing a couple of buildings like there was a test case to see if they were capable of delivering what they said they were going to deliver, I know it is a longshot, but if the Park Service was able to deliver on their end financially. We certainly would want to make sure we had a clear exit if the Stillman group doesn't deliver on them too. But of course, we would love to have an option as long as possible you know if we can confirm that if they don't or if they are not able to step up and provide the financing to complete the project, of the Park Service is going to work their end of the bargain that we do a clear exit.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Absolutely.

MICHAEL WALSH: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, can you say a touch about what it looks like in terms of if the Park Service thoughts at any point over the next whatever, from one day to 10 years if this is not working. What does that look like given the general agreement on anything that might happen? It will be helpful for the Committee to understand.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes, we have those kind of safeguards built into all of our legal agreements. In this case, we have in several letters of intent a general agreement. And then once we get to the point of signing a lease, you know if a lessee is unable to hold up the terms of the lease and their responsibilities, then we have ways to dissolve that relationship. But I'm going to turn it over to Karen who I think can explain better the legal mechanisms that are built into the structures.

BENNETT BROOKS: Karen?

KAREN EDELMAN: Sure. We do have, as Jen said, the ability to terminate an agreement if we need to. And that goes both ways. Either party can terminate the general agreement with a certain amount of notice to the other end that is based on

reaching certain milestones in the process, which up until now have been the development of the prototypes and that was phase 1 of the project. And so now that we have identified all of the things that Jen has been talking about for the last 20 minutes or so, we understand that we are in the feasibility analysis period and so now that we have additional information, we can move through that feasibility analysis period with more thought, with your input of course. But going forward a little bit, assuming you get to the point where you are signing a lease, typically by the time we are ready to sign a lease, we have very developed drawings, you know, and SHPO, (State historic preservation office) approval is in place and that is a point, which you are ready to issue not only the lease for signature but shortly thereafter you're ready to issue the proceed with construction notice. We don't sign the lease until the lessee is able to show us that they have the financial capability to move ahead with the project.

Now this is something that we asked for from all of the applicants in the beginning of the process when they put in proposals to show us you are qualified to do this from a financial perspective and the applicants had to submit financial records to show that they had the financial wherewithal. And then again this gets shored up as we are going into lease signing because we ask the lessee again to show us where you are at because a lot of time elapses between the time we receive the applications to the RFP, and you know the time the drawings are developed in the time the lease is negotiated and the time we are ready to sign the lease. So we have a second check essentially, and we don't sign a lease unless the proposer is able to make and back up those representations.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Karen. Super helpful. Other questions or thoughts about this, sort of where we are at, and I think you heard from Jen a very clear ask for your thoughts and ideally in the form or perhaps a from the Advisory Committee on what she laid out as kind of a near term pathway. Patrick? Go ahead, Linda.

LINDA COHEN: Okay, good. First of all, in terms of the finances, I did not quite understand. The \$30 million was for how many buildings?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: The \$30 million that he initially came in thinking that the project would cost was for 21 buildings. Now that is where that breakeven point is at 50, but it looks like the project is going to cost more in the realm of 100 million. Now — that is for all 21 buildings.

LINDA COHEN: How much are the two buildings? The two prototypes?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: First of all, the caveat we purposely chose buildings that were in better condition to do the designs on because they were easier to get into and properly assess. But those buildings, which I think are building seven and 12 on be. We took two different building types from Officer's Row.

I want to say that his estimates put them at about \$6 to \$7 million each. I'm going to make maybe a recommendation also. One of the things that I had asked for input on

was the timing of do we wait a few months to see what some of these other things that you know we are looking at, like if we learn anything new or have any other potential leads on financing. But also realizing that we haven't yet even talked about any of this. We will hear from the Sandy Hook Foundation and talk about the work of the financing subcommittee. So maybe it makes sense before the Committee fully choose on that question to hear what else is going on in the interim.

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes.

LINDA COHEN: I want to say it one more thing if I can. I'm out there all the time because I am still working out there. I think the roofs look terrific and make a huge improvement. And although superficially this adds the most eye appeal and that is what people see right away. That is most important. If we are going to put our money someplace, that is a priority. And I also want to say that I believe in Roy Stillman, and I feel like I want to encourage him in any manner possible. Is the September 10 hybrid meeting going to be in-person?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes, for anyone who can make it in-person.

LINDA COHEN: Great. That is great. Thank you.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: And just to be clear it likely will not be at Sandy Hook because we don't have easy capability there to do it as a hybrid meeting, and we want to make sure people have the option to attend virtually as well.

Thank you to Tony for working with us to help make the facilities at Middletown available. We will probably do it in their new digs but also using that as an opportunity to somehow combine it, welcome, Committee members, and whoever wants to join us out to Sandy Hook as well to do a site visit.

LINDA COHEN: Great. Excuse me. One more thing. I'm sorry. But did you know that they did great technological improvements in building 22, which is New Jersey Sea Grant? They had an IT specialist do work for them and they had great success.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Good.

LINDA COHEN: Yes. So, it could be a prototype for us.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Terrific.

BENNETT BROOKS: I don't see another hand up right now. Maybe we should pivot a little bit and bring Pete Izzo in. And Nitsan, would you mind promoting Pete to the panelist and Jen, I will let you introduce Pete. And Karen, I invite you to take down the slides because there really is nothing to show, and it would be nice for all of us to see each other a little bit better, for anyone who is on a single screen.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: All right. I would like to introduce Pete Izzo, our Executive Chair for the Sandy Hook Foundation, still maybe relatively new-ish in the scale and history of the Foundation to that role. The Sandy Hook Foundation has long been our

friends group out at Sandy Hook for decades and has taken on some significant projects in the past like rehabilitating the lighthouse keeper's quarters, which we now use for our primary visitor center at Sandy Hook as well as done a lot of programming and other activities that are well beloved by much of the local public around Sandy Hook. And Pete, since Pete has come in, the Sandy Hook Foundation is really going through a transition to looking at a new kind of structure and role with the Park at Sandy Hook. And as part of that, we have been having discussions about you know what role the Foundation could play as we try to look at the future of the buildings in our leasing program.

With that, I want to heartily welcome our partner at Sandy Hook, Pete Izzo.

PETE IZZO: Good morning. Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you, everybody for your patience. Jen, thank you so much for the introduction. Hello to everybody. I am very happy to be here. And on behalf of the Sandy Hook Foundation, I would just like to take a couple of minutes and introduce the Foundation, sort of the role that we play with the Park and then some thoughts that we have on how we might be helpful. So as Jen said, the Sandy Hook Foundation has been around for a while. Established in 1989, the Foundation funds cultural, educational, environmental, conservation programs. Yes, we help to restore the Sandy Hook lighthouse and other structures within Hancock and Sandy Hook. And in addition to that, we partner with the Park to help not only was sort of physical projects, but collaborate on a wide variety of Park initiatives, anything from programming and events, enhancing the visitor experience and of course this topic, which is working on preserving these important historic structures.

And of course my seven-year-old came in right as we start.

BENNETT BROOKS: Of course.

PETE IZZO: Okay, sweetie. That's okay. The timing could not have been better on that one. I am so sorry.

BENNETT BROOKS: No worries at all.

PETE IZZO: So I did want to just take one minute and just point out that the relationship between the National Park Service the Park units, which is kind of the term for the Gateway National Recreation Area and others is both very common and also well-defined. So just a bit of background, there are over 420 National Park Service Park units in the country. Gateway National Recreation Area, which Sandy Hook is a part of is one of those. So you have Yellowstone, Yosemite, Great Smoky Mountains, and all of those names we have heard of course and then he has smaller Parks like Ford's theater, Abraham Lincoln's birthplace. It is large and small. And if you are asking where is Gateway National Recreation Area and where does it fall within the hierarchy of the Parks, I thought you would never ask.

Gateway is actually in terms of visitation anyway; it is the fourth most visited part in the country. It's a pretty big view. We are a real significant part within the National Park

Service and 8 million visitors visit Gateway National Recreation Area every year and Sandy Hook has 2 million visitors alone.

The point is almost everyone of these Parks large and small have their own nonprofit partner, their own Sandy Hook Foundation who partners with them to provide sort of whatever resources they might need, importantly with the National Park Service Park units undertake an effort to preserve historic buildings and structures and of course this group knows is often the adopted reuse of the assets, it is definitely common and expected for the Park's nonprofit partner to play an important role in the process.

And that can take a wide variety of forms, planning, strategy, fundraising, building important relationships and more that can all assist the Park and, in this case, assist the Park and of course the Federal Advisory Committee as they work to find the best solutions for stork buildings like those at Fort Hancock. And so it might be helpful to think of us as sort of a third leg of the stool in some sense along with the National Park Service leadership. And again Jen, and her team and along with you the Advisory Committee as a way of sort of partnering to try to find solutions.

With that said, we talked a lot about this idea of a phased approach toward stabilizing these buildings first, how do we stabilize them, and Jen, I think she laid out really quite well this idea that it is going to take some time and come in phases or whatever time period it might take.

The way we think we can be most helpful as an organization is to try to bring together folks who might have an interest in helping us with that. And so the Sandy Hook Foundation is proposing on creating what we are calling the Fort Hancock symposium. It is essentially a daylong event that would bring together all parties who might have an interest in developing solutions for Fort Hancock. That is a lot of folks that we are thinking about. — I love you — sit over there please — I'm sorry.

Who the folks we are thinking of including in this? That would include of course our leadership at the National Park Service and the Federal advisory Committee members are of course invited to participate. We are thinking that this would include Federal legislators, state legislators, county and local legislators and public officials. It would also include organizations like the National Park foundation, and the National Park foundation is the national kind of nonprofit partner to the National Park Service. We would include folks like interested local charities and nonprofit organizations and an importantly we would like to include professional consultants who specialize in this kind of work and also who specialize very specifically in projects like this at National Park units around the country and to have a great amount, a great deal of expertise in the field. Historic preservation organizations, grantmaking organizations, other professionals, engineers, architects, etc. and more, and that is not an exhaustive list. It is really trying to communicate that we really want to get everybody in the room together to be able to have a discussion. Now what with the discussion be? At a very high and simple level we are envisioning a daylong approach that would spend some time talking

about first, where have we been? What is a history of Fort Hancock and the efforts to create the solution for the adaptive reuse of these buildings?

Where are we now? Because a lot of the folks that have joined don't have the benefit of the deep knowledge that certainly this group has. And then where do we go from here? Let's bring everybody together and say what could the possible solutions be and get some smart people in the room to come up with some things that might be helpful to move our goal forward.

We think precisely this is the role that the Sandy Hook Foundation, has a nonprofit partner to the Park, should be playing. We think it is an important step in the process to bring together leaders from a variety of organizations to discuss the important questions about how we stabilize these things so we can preserve them for the enjoyment of visitors for generations to come.

Please don't hold me to this, but I'm sure the question will be asked.

But we are targeting sort of in August /September time frame right now. We have to work on scheduling with a few key participants, but that is the goal and the hope, and we think it will, hopefully, be a helpful step in the process to continuing to move forward with the good work here. I will stop there.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Pete very much. And I want to open it up for questions. I'm sure folks have some questions. Let's take a couple of questions and then we will go to break. And if there are a few more, we will pick up a few more after break as well. Shawn?

SHAWN WELCH: Maybe I missed this, but what timeframe are you looking to do this in, Pete?

PETE IZZO: The timeframe to host the event? I think we are going to try to — we are looking at the August /September timeframe, and we have to coordinate with some folks who are, I think, really critical to have join us at this event. But that is what we are looking at.

SHAWN WELCH: Thank you.

PETE IZZO: We are envisioning a full day event. What we would probably do is for folks who are traveling, coming in the day before, we probably would offer some sort of a tour of Sandy Hook and maybe dinner at the Mule Barn. And the next day would be a full day of discussion and talking about the past, current, and then really where do we go from here.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Other questions for Pete? Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: Pete, first of all, thank you for doing everything. I think coming up with the idea of the symposium is really good and I think bringing all the people who might be interested in this together is a great idea. I guess the question in this is

probably for Jen and everybody else. Do you think it is going to be hosted at Sandy Hook? I know we had problems with large meetings down there. And I guess tied into that is are you thinking also about including people from the educational world? People from Monmouth College and Brookdale and maybe some of the technical schools who might have an interest in the area, sorry, in the Fort Hancock area?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: In terms of where to do it, we are certainly open to look at options at Sandy Hook. I don't know, but it certainly would incorporate an opportunity to get out there and do a field trip and look at the buildings at the very least. In terms of educational institutions from my perspective, the more the merrier, but Pete, I will let you answer that.

PETE IZZO: Thank you. And the answer is wholeheartedly yes. We think it is important to try to bring to bear all of the resources that our area of the world offers. That includes I think Monmouth would be a great part of this discussion.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. We are just coming up at 10:30, which is our break. I propose we take a break. Pete, we will keep you as a panelist. I imagine there might be a few more questions. I'm sure people have a really good feel for sort of what the Foundation is doing, with the symposium is, so we can get their thoughts about where is the energy and the partnering. If you can stay right there, that is great. And invite your daughter.

PETE IZZO: Right. Grayson, and I will be right here.

BENNETT BROOKS: Perfect. All right we will be back in 10 minutes. My recommendation is to just turn off your camera. Go to mute. But keep everything else on so you don't have to log back in. See you in 10 minutes. Thanks.

(Break)

10:30 AM (ET)

BENNETT BROOKS: No worries. Okay, let's jump back in. Pete, you are with us. Okay, good. Other questions? Thoughts on Sandy Hook Foundation, partnering, three-legged stool, we have a great ambition and significant challenges, and we have sort of a team here that is assembling. We welcome any questions; thoughts people have for Pete to enter or react to or get into conversation. Patrick? You may be on mute, Patrick. In fact, you definitely are on mute. There you go.

PATRICK COLLUM: , I have to remember to take my hand down when I am finished too. Just a suggestion to Pete. I know it is obvious, and it jumps right out here too and when we think of colleges, we think of Brookdale, and we think of Monmouth University. I think we should go further out of the County and at least look at some state institutions, and maybe at some institutions in Manhattan. I think there could be opportunities for research here and I know there is a foothold at the end of the hook. And, I think, reach out a little further if we could, just a suggestion.

PETE IZZO: And a very good one. I wholeheartedly agree. I will tell you and I am sure many of us on this call have had a similar experience. When you begin to have a conversation about Fort Hancock and your involvement, however that might be with someone who has an interest in National Parks or historic preservation or anything along those lines, people universally are very interested and have a lot of questions and are very interested in participating.

As an example, I know that a friend who I was introduced to who is a retired Superintendent of the National Park Service Park is so interested in participating in this. And I only say that because people I think really are embracing this idea of coming together for an open-ended discussion and sharing of ideas. I have written down your suggestion to go further than just Monmouth and Brookdale. I totally agree and would say to everybody on this call the part of the process is going to be getting the right people in the room. If you think there are individuals, organizations, institutions, entities, anybody, or any entity that you think would have an interest in participating, by all means, please let me know. This is meant to be wholly inclusive of anybody who has an interest of helping us with our mission, with our collective mission of folks on this call.

BENNETT BROOKS: Pete, this brings up a very good question. Then I will go to you. Is it invitation-only?

PETE IZZO: It is open to the public.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you. Linda, please. You are on mute again, Linda.

LINDA COHEN: How is that?

BENNETT BROOKS: Better.

LINDA COHEN: Good. Jen said you know the inception of the Fort Hancock Advisory Committee I've been very involved and interested in getting some kind of educational opportunity at Fort Hancock. And Pete, I have met with you too about this. I think, and in my looking at contacts, Tammy (Murphy) is a very good player. I was wondering if you had thought of including her.

PETE IZZO: Absolutely. I think it is an outstanding idea. I would welcome her of course, Tammy, to come, and welcome an update on that connection if you or anybody else is offering. That will be very helpful. I think in general that we know a very important component of what we, the Sandy Hook Foundation, hope to accomplish is to engage government leaders at all levels. We think it is really important that this is going to end up being a partnership that includes Federal Government, state government, county, and local governments as well.

And we want to make sure that everybody is in the room and having conversation together. So yes, I would love to. Linda, if you want to talk off-line about the best way to approach that, I would love to do that.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Pete. Thanks, Linda. Other Committee members? Again questions, reactions, suggestions, any thoughts around this leg of that three-legged stool? Bill?

BILL KASTNING: Question for Pete. I assume you have a current mission statement which we can all look up for the Foundation. Will this symposium potentially change that mission? And would you therefore have a strategic planning exercise to understand how you're going to go forward?

PETE IZZO: Thank you, Bill. We do. You can, anybody can just go to Sandy Hook — I have a little feedback —

BENNETT BROOKS: Hang on a second. We are getting feedback. Let me see if I can hunt to see where it is. Let me turn of mine.

NITSAN MACHLIN: Unmuted Bill. I think it was Bill.

PETE IZZO: Okay, you can just Google Sandy Hook Foundation. And you can go to the Sandy Hook website and see the mission statement. And this fits within our mission statement. This is exactly what a nonprofit partner to Gateway is in this case and any National Park Service Park unit. This is what it is supposed to do. This is how we can be helpful to the Park. And we are trying to fulfill our role for the best of our ability. No change to our mission. We are just trying to do what we can to help the Park.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. And if somebody would mind, throw that URL into the Q&A so folks have a chance to see it there. That would be great. Any other questions for Pete? At this point? Okay. I do not see any, Pete. For now, thank you. It is great to hear about this. Obviously, I suspect we will hear a lot more and talk with you a lot more. Were you able to hang around for a bit?

PETE IZZO: Absolutely. I will be here for the duration of the call.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay, great. We will put you back as an attendee. Please stay close to the conversation. We will bring you back in, and I expect you to be an active part of this conversation.

PETE IZZO: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thank you so much. All right. Jen, Shawn, I think I have a question for you. Do you want to open the conversation wider, about recommendations or discussion, should we shift to the Working Group?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I would vote for the latter. Talk about the finance subcommittee, and then go to the larger conversation.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Perfect. Shawn, I think I want to hand it off to you to kick that off and then give a quick overview of that groups number station. I think it was now maybe six or eight weeks ago. There are a number of you on the call who were and are

part of that community, and I certainly invite you to weigh in after Shawn. Shawn? You are on mute, sir. I hope to say that to everybody at least once.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. You were just seeing me with moving lips. People probably like that. We met on March 15, who met? Jen, Karen, Daphne, Bennett, Gerry, Mary Eileen, Dorothy, Mike Holenstein, Pete Izzo, he gave a presentation. Nora Kerr McCurry from Brookdale and a member. Tony, Mike Walsh, and we chatted for about an hour and a half, almost two hours. A quick one down, will be covered here. Pete proposed the same discussion we had today except to expand a little bit more today, looking at the financial mechanisms, interested parties, interested folks, permit. Dorothy recommended we take a look at various grant vehicles that would bring in small grants, and she can elaborate on this.

But we are talking about grants in the range of 750K to 1.5 million. It doesn't sound like a lot of money, but when you keep adding it up it is a lot of money. It is one option. Nora talked about Brookdale's ability to assist with grant writing. Okay. That is one way to secure money is to be able to write the grants.

Mary Eileen recommended options under the American Rescue Plan because there is money on the table for New Jersey. And they are giving it out to work on things similar to what we are doing here. She can elaborate on some of her thoughts. Mike was interested in more pursuit of portable housing potential. Will that work, and he may have some thoughts to add to that.

Tony gave examples of success in Monmouth County. We had a follow-up meeting to chat about that, looking at the affordable housing tax credit programs, support housing, looking at groups like the New Jersey blind man Association. And Tony can elaborate on that as well during this discussion.

That is kind of where we are at. Some of the discussions that we had, nothing is breaking the big funding barrier, but we did talk about the Great American Outdoors Act and the fact that the authorization is the fiscal year '25 program, which is in our face essentially and starts October 1. And after that, there is no go. The Park is not certain where they can get the really large blocks of money, and they don't normally get them. We had that discussion as well. Dorothy, Mary Eileen, Mike, Tony, one of you want to jump in with some of your perspectives?

BENNETT BROOKS: Can you just throw a hand up and then take you one by one? Don't all rush to put your hands up, but I would love to see a hand or two just to fold in a bit more... Michael?

MICHAEL WALSH: I agree with everything that Shawn talked about. I'm afraid that I mostly raised questions when — not contributing anything of real value. But as Shawn pointed out, asking questions, like is there a source of funding, like support in some way with respect to affordable housing and talking about you know it is not what we talk about affordable housing, you know there is a lot of people in Montgomery County who

would qualify, you know if people think of this as just for poor people, it is not the case. It is difficult to make housing in Monmouth County particularly housing close to the shore affordable. There is lots of people, lots of people who work for the towns, the Park Service, who work in our school systems, young people, older people who would qualify for affordable housing. It is really just questions of is there anything available? And like for example, would it be useful to towns and Sandy Hook is in Middletown and would it help Middletown reach their targets for providing affordable housing if there was affordable housing at Sandy Hook? And so anyway I wish I could say I added true value but mostly I just raised questions for the Committee.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Michael. Mary Eileen?

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I think I did the same thing, Michael. But I thought it was worth exploring to see if there was still the American Rescue Plan money left at this stage, and I am not sure who would have the context to find out where that is going. But recently there was a huge amount of money that is being used for the boardwalks in various beach towns, and I know like that's very Park got 20 million and other towns got significant amounts of money, and it is from the American Rescue Plan fund, and I think it is worth... And it might have to be something that would run through a nonprofit like from Sandy Hook Foundation rather than Federal money going to the state from a Federal entity. But worth exploring, I think.

BENNETT BROOKS: And Mary Eileen, you said you don't have a clear sense of what...

MARY EILEEN FOURATT: I don't know if it is the economic authority or community affairs. I feel like, Dorothy, did you have a contact you had mentioned before?

DOROTHY GUZZO: It is actually being administered by the Department of Community Affairs. There's a whole group on the sixth floor that is doing nothing, but in ministering Federal funds there. Not that they are the be-all and end-all end all in the stop board. It is just a process. But it is in the BCA.

BENNETT BROOKS: Are there folks on the call who feel they have a sense of how to pursue that path?

DOROTHY GUZZO: I think the fastest way is to call the local legislator and just find out. They can get an answer quicker.

TONY MERCANTANTE: I don't have a raise hand function. Can I add something?

BENNETT BROOKS: I was about to go to you anyway, Tony.

TONY MERCANTANTE: A couple of things. One, I think affordable housing is being a component of this overall project is a good thing. It is not going to drive the bus though. It is not going to make the difference in terms of the gap in financing. I think it is for a lot of reasons a good thing to have as a potential component but not the main focus of the project. It doesn't make any financial sense for that to be the case.

In terms of getting access to funds, one of the things, I think, we ought to think about is getting a lobbyist. You know there are people out there who are really good at making the connections with elected officials, particularly the state and Federal level. And they can help make your case to the people who have access to money.

Now I think obviously, it would be a little bit awkward for the National Park Service. They could not really be in a position to do that. But I think Stillman would be in a position to do something like that. I think it would make some sense. For example, for this event in August or September, if you invited Cory Booker's office and you know people who have the direct ability to have some serious money set aside for a project, I think that is a good thing. I think probably it is a good thing to reach out to his office sooner than later actually and meet with him long before the event that we are going to have to get him excited about the project. I think you need to do things like that.

But the sort of financial gap isn't going to go away by magic. And I think it is correct, Stillman is correct. Nothing is going to generate revenue comparable to residential use in this part of the state. If they see a huge gap, what they are proposing to do, which is to make each essentially single-family housing into five units, that is going to be a tough one to solve. But I think if you can get some sort of like public support on this project plus get somebody who has access to getting to elected officials who have their hands on the purse strings, that is just what has to be done or will somebody else is doing that, and they are getting the money. That is just the reality of the way things are done these days. You just have to have somebody kind of on the inside fighting for you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Tony. All good thoughts. I am hearing so far across several of these different comments and going back to Pete's presentation as well as education, there is a number of ideas circling there, a lot of interest, American Rescue Plan funds is definitely something to pursue. Housing again it has to role, as you said, Tony, but it isn't going to drive the bus.

But it is a piece of the puzzle and the other pieces, and to get any of these, there's a level of networking and reaching out to influencers, people who do control the purse strings, people who can make a difference, anything (as has been said) from getting the lobbyist to reaching out to somebody like a Cory Booker, Tammy Murphy, etc. I think there is a number of ideas kicking around here and a suggestion that the symposium can be a place or some of these ideas come together for that sort of brainstorming to see what happens. Other folks' thoughts?

This isn't going to be like a problem solved with the perfect answer but a collection of a few really good answers in a couple of really good folks coming together. Other thoughts that you have on avenues to pursue or questions for one another or out to some of the folks who have been doing some of the thinking here? If not, I want to give that a little bit more time and then start thinking about what kind of recommendations you want to give Jen and her team as they go forward from today because they are the

ones who are at this sort of day-in and day-out and I think Jen has asked very clearly for a little bit of guidance from the Committee.

Any thoughts from folks? Any initial questions or initial thoughts on what might be — what makes sense to you as a recommendation? I like the way Jen said it. She cannot see the light at the end of the tunnel, but I think she wants to look a little bit longer for that light and see how these pieces come together. Can they come together? How does Stillman fit into that or not? And not feeling like she is right at that fork in the road yet, but I think some clarity from you all on what you are thinking would be welcome and needed. And again, this idea of sequencing, sort of going after systems.

I want to invite the Committee. This is where your voice is super important.

BILL KASTNING: I think it is not too early to have a plan B. I don't think we have one.

BENNETT BROOKS: And Bill, when you say that, do you have any idea of what that is? What does that look like as a recommendation to Jen and Karen?

BILL KASTNING: Either we walk or Stillman walks. What is the plan going forward? And perhaps one might be to do this incrementally by involving interested parties to bid on one or more of the buildings as opposed to all of them.

BENNETT BROOKS: And Bill, let me ask you one more question. Is your suggestion that you want the Committee to think about that as something to do now? Or something in a few months from now? Or just help me get that a little bit more shape.

BILL KASTNING: I think it is something we should think about because it might be an eventuality sooner rather than later.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Michael?

MICHAEL WALSH: What I was going to say is sort of following up on what Bill was saying. I do think because what I have been hearing it is unlikely that Washington is going to have a lot of funding in the near term. I think we still may have it for some period of time, but it sounds very unlikely that the Park Service is going to be able to come up with funding that we are looking for to close the gap. So as Bill put it, what is Plan B? If Plan B is to get it back on track in terms of opening for others to bid on, on the whole group of buildings or the individual buildings, we need to be able to press the button or the Park Service need to be able to press the button and put that up right away. I think anybody who looks at that right now would say there are new buildings available to be bid on, and they are all tied up on the general agreement or they are contracts. It may be true or not, but I think, I don't think it will help anybody if we can't immediately get these back in front of the public, looking for other potential lessees. So we need to be able to push the button very quickly. It doesn't sound like we are going to be able to get the funding that would match what Stillman needs. And so I think we need to be able to go to —, if not a plan B, at least go back to what the plan was earlier,

which is get all the buildings out in front of the public and seek individuals or parties to come in.

SHAWN WELCH: Can I paraphrase what I think I just heard you say?

A) Stick with Stillman. At the same time

B) The Park needs to be prepared to relaunch this whole request for proposals, let's say, by the next meeting that we have if we don't see anything coming in the future. Is that what I just heard you say,

MICHAEL WALSH: That is as good of a summary as we can put on the table.

SHAWN WELCH: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Mike Holenstein, why don't you come in? Mike, you are on mute. Again star six. There you go. Okay, still not hearing you. Did you star six?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: What about now?

BENNETT BROOKS: Sometimes it is that double secret mute. Go ahead.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Double secret mute. Okay. A couple of things. The first observation about this morning's discussion is that it is nice to have people that are cycling through this. Because many of the suggestions are similar to suggestions that have been made throughout the history of it and the point, I go to with that is that a lot of the questions that have been asked and answered in the past they are another look. Because if you get the answer that doesn't work for you, you have to ask again and maybe in 10 or 12 years we can do this, and we have different people to ask. So I think that the idea that we have done things in the past and it hasn't been completely successful doesn't mean that it can't be done now. What I do think about the ask is that there has been a lot of ideas, and what is necessary more than ideas is connections to make something happen. The idea of going out to Cory Booker or something like that or local politicians for various forms of financing, those are all great ideas. But coming back to the Committee with oh, I met somebody, and this is a real possibility.

We have to get beyond the idea to the connections. And the ideas come, but we need the connections.

So that is observation number 1.

Number 2 with respect to the current Stillman project and the projects that have been in front of the Fort Hancock Committee and prior to that, I'm always struck by the idea that we are provided with certain costs and estimated costs and stuff like that.

And we have come to the conclusion, and we have been presented the conclusion again and, again, that the project isn't financially feasible and there is no financing available. And yet it is a recurring theme like many other themes from this process. I make the observation that if you have a 100-million-dollar project and your overhead

and profit is 30%, you are looking at \$33 million in overhead and profit. And if you have a 30-million-dollar project, your overhead and profit is \$10 million. There is an awful lot of money that he is involved the process that is separate and apart from the money that is in bricks and mortar. And one of the big problems we have at the very beginning when we are looking more at private contractors and private individuals was not that they weren't willing to get in there and roll up their sleeves, but that they were frustrated by the process of getting approval and there being approvals for things like paint colors and window types and roof coverings and things like that. That defeated a lot of the early entrepreneurial type folks. And so here we find ourselves back now for more than a short period of time with sort of a big development that is going to come in and take this over, which makes us feel better, but by the same token lo and behold we are back to the same place. It is going to cost too much, and we can't get financing. So I think it would be worthwhile for the financing Committee of ours to actually sit down and look at some pro forma information from the project itself so we can understand what it is about the project that doesn't work for this developer and maybe then we would have a better idea of how to advise the National Park Service. But I don't think that we can just take a round number like 100 million or 30 million or something like that, try to translate it into a cost per square-foot and really understand where that money is going and where it comes from. That is all I have. Thanks.

BENNETT BROOKS: That is super helpful. And Jen, I was going to call you and if you had not raised your hand. Go ahead.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thanks. I have a few thoughts. I will try to work backwards. First starting with the cost estimate. I think we are very much on the same page that we need to ground that and not talk in a big generality of we have got maybe a 50-million-dollar gap, and maybe this project will cost 100 million. But really understand what is driving this cost. So back at the last meeting we had these initial big bucket numbers from Stillman.

But we had not seen his actual cost estimate and how they were derived. He did recently share those with us. And these are based on the two buildings that he had designs for. We are still going through those. You know they are very long and detailed to see what our folks make of them and what we see as the drivers, and what this means for you know extrapolating the costs of the other building. That is a work in progress. But again, the same page. We need better numbers and to understand what relate this project is going to look like. As we have more information on that, we will share it.

In terms of a Plan B and, you know, looking at the model where we open it back up and have individuals or people bidding on individual buildings, I hate to characterize it as, you know, we had some individuals with great entrepreneurial spirit at the outset which we did have but were defeated by the requirements of the historic standards. I am not sure that that is entirely what happened. I certainly do appreciate the people who stepped up initially. You know many of them were not able to see it through to the end

apartment part of it was, I think, — I think everyone came into this — at least in part — as a labor of love, seeing these beautiful buildings and wanting to be a part of their long-term preservation and be able to be in them and enjoy them. I think some folks really underestimated how much it would actually cost, the level of deterioration on the buildings, you know a lot of folks thought they were going to come in and be able to put in a lot of sweat equity and do it for a couple of hundred thousand dollars. That is not the case with these buildings and the historic standards. I think there is a lot of give-and-take with the standards as we discussed in the past. It is not that you have to do everything to the nth degree. There are certain key things we have to preserve and give and take on others. But to understand those I think it is really important that you have a professional historic architect as a part of your team.

And initially folks were not coming in with that. We require that now. And I think it takes a certain level of experience for somebody to come in with that and thinking about a project like that. I think we found those one-offs challenging on a number of fronts. I'm sure it was challenging for the people who put in the buildings, and it was challenging for our staff too in terms of trained to work with and make a project work with an entity who may not be fully equipped to take on a project like that. And it also takes a lot from our staff managing each building and individual project, which you know if somebody is doing five buildings versus one building in terms of the time and management on our end it is not that much different. And looking at managing 21 different projects versus one, you know, is just another consideration in how we move forward. And so I mean, it may wind up being the only solution. You know we put these back out, and we see, and we take individual offers or smaller groupings of buildings. But I just want our eyes wide open to some of the challenges we found in the past and taking them on like that. It is not to say we wouldn't do it again rather than losing the buildings.

But we want to think through how to structure an opportunity in a way that minimizes the challenges and maximizes our opportunities for success.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, to the comment of your interest in going down two paths at the same time, on your last point - thinking about the challenges and minimizing the challenges - is there something you can imagine doing to sort of, now, to at least be thinking about what that might look like or a conversation to be had in the near future or better to acknowledge there is a Plan B, \?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I'm happy to go down two paths at once and be ready if we have to go to Plan B. But I'm not sure exactly what the next steps are off the top of my head right now. One thing I will say though is that you know there is a couple of dynamics at play that could change a Plan B as more time passes. If we are not making any investments in the buildings, the deterioration will continue to grow and the cost of the project as a result or projects will continue to grow. And that changes the viability of anybody putting in for them. At the same time, as time goes by, if we are able to continue making incremental investments and for example, I think, the roofs project has helped a lot. We are able to move forward next with the masonry project.

But also changes the finances of anybody taking these buildings on, that it may take a little less money and the less in upfront investment it takes on the part of a potential lessee, the more it is also opening up our flexibility in the kinds of uses we can look at and who we are bringing in. Right now, because of the high level of investment that is needed it has to be whatever is going to bring the greatest return on investment. Because otherwise nobody with the money needed to take this on will come to the table. But as we are able to put money into the buildings, it may start to change that equation a little bit.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Mike Holenstein, did you want to come back in? And then to Michael Walsh. Go ahead, Michael.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Can you hear me?

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes, we can.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: I have two follow-up questions. It is interesting to hear that you have some numbers on these two Officer's Row houses. And I would like to suggest that while it is very interesting for those to be reviewed and it is part business to do those reviews that you should perhaps get some private eyes on those as well from the standpoint of the private sector thoughts and reviews rather than simply looking at them from a Federal Government standpoint, and what makes sense in that context. I make that as a suggestion. And number 2 kind of going back again in time and this is just sort of an example of things that help move the process along. I would say at this point with Covid and everything else we're talking probably about five, six, seven years ago. We talked about putting together some kind of a product list for items that have been vetted and approved for use on these buildings and stuff like that to sort of help the process along. And I am wondering if that ever received any traction in such a document or collage that is available these days. Thank you.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: We don't have that per se. We didn't develop — and I will use the windows as an example. Because that has always been a tough one for folks, doing windows in a way that both meets energy efficiency, goals, or anybody who's going to have to pay for heating in the buildings as well as meets the historic standards. It can be done. We don't have a product sheet per se we do have more and more examples now at Sandy Hook where it was done successfully that we can point to and have pointed to on subsequent projects and have said to lessees you may want to look at how is so-and-so and how they just did this down a few doors down from you.

So that has worked to a certain extent. And you know in more recent times with the rest of the buildings all being under one agreement, beyond those that were already under letters of intent for other people who are still working on this, it is easier in that case to develop a consent for treatment that just gets applied to all of the buildings. So it hasn't been as much of an issue. But if we go back to putting these out under a different model, it may be something that we want to take a fresh look at.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks. Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: I just wanted to say something as a follow-up to what Jen said. Jen, if I or anybody else has left the impression that we are not supportive of the Park Service investing money into these buildings if they can get money in the way, you suggested the roofs have been done, working on the masonry next, maybe windows next which I am 100% supportive that work, based on what you just said it made me feel like you didn't feel like you had the support. And as far as support for me, I think that is exactly what should be done. I appreciate the Park Service pursuing that.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Michael. I think I am sort of hearing three, perhaps, recommendations from this conversation, but I put it back to you all to tell me if I am near the mark or missing the mark. One is a recommendation that the Committee continue to explore potential avenues to close the funding gap. They are still going to keep looking for the light at the end of the tunnel and there are opportunities we are hearing that the Park should continue to look at that. Second is as you just said, Michael, the Committee says yes, continue to stabilize buildings and look at the systems improvement and continue thinking about ways to sequence those so we are keeping this valuable resource. The third is to sort of take a look, take a closer look at the project pro formas, so we really understand what is driving the cost and what is happening here and get a sharper look at that. Lastly, the Park should probably think about plan B I think that is sort of the four things I am hearing. I don't know how that is landing for folks, if it is making sense or not. Jen, your hand is up.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Really quickly. That is you know and think about plan B and going out with individual buildings, the thing that I would want us to strategize about as well is if we open up all the individual buildings, the first ones to go are of course going to be the ones that are in the best shape. And the ones that we need to help on the most are going to be the last that people will pick as one of buildings. I would just want to think through with the Committee strategically how we could — you know I don't know if we put out small groups of buildings that have some loss leader does that help get some of the buildings and worst shape invested in as well.

But I want to think things through from that perspective, too, rather than the five best buildings get snatched up and then we include the rest.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: That is one of the advantages of having someone who takes all of the buildings. The good and the bad, and it all gets done. I would like to think of a way not to entirely lose that advantage if we have to break up the portfolio.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. I see Linda's hand, and I see Shawn's hand. And I also need to get us to public comment. If I can put a pin in both of your comments and come back after public comment, With that I would love to go to public comment. And let me just note as I do that I will call in, in the chat, in the Q&A, there was a little back-and-forth there around the value of bringing in military representation, the August-September event, Coast Guard, Navy, Army, potential rehab, at least if you houses, 1940s era

style, bass, kitchens, educational basis and educational and historic experience, that was from galaxy A10E. I don't have her name but somebody else could remind me and Pete had a great idea, and we plan on engaging the Coast Guard including all branches of the military as a great idea. Thank you for that exchange.

I believe we have at least one person who wants to come in to make a public comment. Muriel Smith. In a minute we will open up your line. But just to remind folks for public comment, I want to thank you again for being here and being willing to share your thoughts. For anyone talking, ask you to keep your comments to a minute or two per person. And if you want to get in the queue, raise your hand, and we will call you in the order that I see them.

These comments are intended to be comments intended for the Committee to hear your thoughts. It is not really intended as a back-and-forth dialogue. So please know that.

But we are very keen to hear your thoughts. And when I open up your line, if you would please start with your name and affiliation so we know who is in the mix would be great.

Muriel, if you are there, we are opening up your line. It is open. Again, if you can just start with name, affiliation, and then a minute or two of what is on your mind.

Muriel Smith: Thank you very kindly. My name is Muriel Smith, and I live in Atlantic Highlands. I am a journalist. I have a blog that is covered a lot of things out at Sandy Hook, and I write for several of the newspapers permit first of all, I am full of praise for all of you. You work so very hard. You are doing so much. You gave me a lot more good feelings today. Jen, to me, tireless, always work so hard. I don't know how she does it at all, everything that she does. But thank you very much for that.

I would hope — it seems to me like Jen is promoting some kind of recommendation for continuing with Mr. Stillman. I would hope you do. Everybody that is ever looked at any of the buildings out there, I certainly think he has the best plans in mind, the best possibilities in mind, and I hope it would give him any support he needs in order to continue with this. I think that is the best thing for the Park Service. Thank you, Jen, and everybody else who was involved with the roofs. You are right. They look magnificent. And it is helping to save the building, so I'm delighted to see all of that.

My one fear that I would like to mention at the beginning of the meeting you said that both sides in an agreement can terminate an agreement. You know for just reason and all of that. Given building 23, which is the one that Monmouth County school boards wants for continuation of the MAST programs of the kids are not working outside all the time, is there a plan B if the County pulls out, if they decide to terminate their agreement would be my question. I know they have had bids come in and the bids have been much higher than they anticipated. I don't know if they are seeking bids right now.

To me, it sounds like the first step that there may be not interested in finishing the building or doing it the way they want and in the building is in bad shape since they have taken it over. I'm wondering if there is a plan B. I don't of the purpose of that

crane that has been sitting next to the building, but I just learned this morning that I understand that will be taken away this week. I think the Osprey has found their nesting places by this time.

But thank you very much. I appreciate all of your hard work. I see Shawn's work out there all the time. We never get to talk about everything he is doing out there, which is also spectacular. But I want to thank him as well. I think he does a terrific job. I'm so happy that Tony Mercantante is available because this is Middletown, and it is great to have Middletown so involved as Tony Mercantante is doing. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you so much real. I don't know if maybe someone can give you a quick answer to your question in the chat.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Can I maybe say something first? Thank you for your kind words and support, Muriel. We always participate in appreciate your participation and your years of following what is going on at Sandy Hook and sharing the news with others. In regards to MAST and building 23, that is a different kind of agreement. That is not a general agreement like what we signed with Stillman. The general agreement and Stillman's piece is more akin to a letter of intent that leads up to a lease signing. The agreement we had with MAST is more akin to a lease itself. It is a different kind of agreement form because it is the result of special legislation that gives us this type of authority with the County. You know no agreement whether it is a lease or general agreement, or any other kind of agreement is ironclad and can make somebody have the money to do something if they don't have it or choose to invest in it. But if we were to come to that impasse with the County where they have signed on to do work and aren't doing it, then we have to explore what the legal options are at that point.

I hope that is not what it comes to. They have been a good partner, and we hope to see them complete the project that they signed on to do.

But we are also concerned about what we see as they go out to bid and what the next steps will be in this process.

Karen, is there anything you can add to the nature of the agreement with MAST?

KAREN EDELMAN: I don't have anything new to add. But like you said, it is by special authority that we have this agreement with them. And again, reiterating what you said, none of the agreements are ironclad. I don't have anything to add.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thank you. Thanks, Muriel.

MURIEL SMITH: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay, Brian, I saw in the chat you wanted to come in and make a comment. Let's bring you off of mute.

BRIAN SAMUELSON: Hi. I am Brian Samuelson, Pioneer Lessee, first one to save the building with the help of the Superintendent. Thank you to the Superintendent because you are managing three Parks and doing it in your spare time is never ending ample. And you do everything in your spare time. Listen, everybody I listen to your comments. Thank you. What I see, my big concern is we need, in reference to Bill Kastning and Michael Walsh, we need a Plan B. I've been trying to do this over 20 years. Initially we had the Sandy Hook partners out there. And that developer failed. Mr. Stillman, I don't see him ever executing this. It has been four years. It was a million dollars, and that it was \$3 million and now it is 6 million to \$7 million. But what he wants to do is a light building 12. I've been in it and put in a proposal to prepare that building in 2000, 2014, the leasing program started December 2013, but I'm humbly proposing to be the ambassador of the leasing program. Raymond Wong, he is a US Military Academy graduate and Captain Wong wants to save building 80 next to the Mule Barn. His proposal was kicked to the curb in favor of Stillman taking that building. One of the pioneers want to save the gas station, building 60. I would like access to one of the buildings. I have expertise and experience and insurance. I hope I can be trusted. If not, take my building from me. I like to get a building at least so give me one of the neighboring buildings, give me a renovated porch, and I have a list of people that would potentially do this, but certainly have the capability. The winning formula is the people that are out there that have leased the buildings. They are local. They are enthusiastic. I call it 10% crazy, and they have access to not a lot of money. If you own a house in Montgomery County, you can't get credit.

And then the Park Service, be an ambassador, give me access to one of the buildings and let's lease them one of the times. And like the other members, if Mr. Stillman fails to execute like he has been, like the partners did, like all developers have been, the winning formula is local people and any one in construction can do this. There are so many enthusiastic people. Let's do one at a time. Give me one, and I will find a Lessee. Thank you for the time. Sorry to take it up. You guys have been great. Anyone please reach out to me. I would love to show you the building. If you haven't been to the building, please come. The last plug, I would like to have the packets. There is things much more effective than Sandy Hook. If we cannot get into the chapel, do like the leasing pioneers and Mule Barn tavern. He said we could have the second one up there. That is 60 people. I think we can see more and do more when we meet in-person. But anyway, thank you so much. That is good news for me. I will sign off.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you very much. I know we had a question in the chat around basic infrastructure conditions. I see Jen is typing her answer in right now. So stand by for an answer to that question. And I am just looking at the participant's attendee list to see if there is anyone else who wants to make a comment. And Pete, as a heads up, I want to open up your line and see if you have any thoughts or reflections from the conversation since you have been in the mix, just any thoughts or reactions that you think would be helpful for the Committee to hear based on the

conversation? Shawn, should I bring you in? I want to make sure we have public comment.

SHAWN WELCH: We can hold on.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thanks. All right. I am not seeing any other public comment. Pete, I have opened your line in case you would like to share some thoughts here. You are coming in now. Perfect.

PETE IZZO: Okay, great. Thank you everybody for your comments. I think the only initial reaction I would have would be to say as far as plan B, maybe you know I think I might, from my comments, I might recharacterize that as just thinking about all options. And in that sense that is precisely what the purpose is of the symposium that we are proposing. It gives a number of folks the opportunity to come together and think about all the barriers, the options, and alternatives that we can approach this. Jen, and her team along with the Advisory Committee have to you know sort of drive the plan. I have no comment on that. But I will say that is kind of the reason for the forum, the symposium, to be able to talk about lots of ideas, germinate the ideas, see if it is helpful to move forward. That would be kind of my reaction to sort of say of what I've heard over the last hour and a half.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you so much, Pete. Thank you for that. Taking one last sweep of the public. I do not see any other hands up. I think I will bring it back to the Committee.

And we have got you know under the 45 minutes or so if useful to just sort of continue thinking about what are the recommendations that you all would like to make to the Park Service. Let's go to Shawn and over to Mike Holenstein.

SHAWN WELCH: A couple of quick things here on this comment about bringing in the military and have military have discussions with us. Beginning in 2004, all of the military departments begin moving toward centralized installation management. Real property transactions occur at the department level. In other words, very little, if any, discretion is left to a garrison commander. In the case of Earl, goes to the Naval Installation Command (NIC) and similar to what the Army does with Installation Management Command (MCOM). Very little capacity for individual installations to do much of anything other than report up the chain. The military construction gestation time period is 10 years right now. As you are looking at inviting the military to have this discussion understand:

A) I would be surprised if they show up

B) I would be surprised if they say anything because you would be inviting them at the installation level, and they have no authority.

It is worth having that in the back of your mind that it is limited to what the USCG and Navy will be able to do at the meeting.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Shawn. Helpful. Mike Holenstein, come back into the conversation.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Am I on?

BENNETT BROOKS: You are.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Okay. I would like to say to Brian Samuelson that, I think, if you want to know what it is all about, you can talk to somebody like Brian to get a sense of what it is like in the trenches and having been successful. And I think that is important. You know any comments about the period of time that we have been involved in this in 2012 we started, Linda Canzenelli was short in her term, but she commented that we needed to do this with private money that was moving away from the idea that it was under the partners that it would be limited to commercial development and two more other types of development.

The reason didn't work out was the same issues with the Sandhill partners, same issues we hear about now. And I don't have anything against a developer taking and doing their own project. I have nothing to say but positive support for the activities that Jen has been able to undertake in her tenure.

But in the 12 years that there has been, there has been money provided and put to good use. And in 12 years, that is all the money made available, and I really don't think, as Shawn kind of commented, that we are going to find the sources of money that are going to come from outside. And I do think that more of the grassroots approach and allowing some of these individuals to come in them to the building, I don't think there is a negative criterion to say fixing up the better buildings. I think that over the course of the 12-year period, we talked about the fact that the buildings were in lesser condition and there would be more options, which was a way of saying that you've got perhaps different options for redeveloping those buildings that the ones that were in better condition. I think we need to remember that. And I think we should avail ourselves of every opportunity that comes along, which means that if we can preserve this group or this bulk deal with Mr. Stillman and his group that is fine. But I think there ought to be at the very least a parallel, a parallel movement to allow some of these other people to get back in front of the board and for some discussion. And it may be that some of this financing — I mentioned earlier about the difference between a hard cost, soft costs, entrepreneurial part of the process. You might find that there are sources willing to finance bricks and mortar that are not willing to finance overhead and profit. So again, if you have a third of your cost in overhead and profit and that is 10-\$30 million based on estimates, maybe there is another way to look at overhead and profit and get more focus on bricks and mortar. Because I think there are individuals who are coming into the process of looking at bricks and mortar cost. And they are not necessarily looking at overhead and profit the same way. That is it. Thanks.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks very much. Other Committee members? It would be great to hear from others who might have some thoughts on this. I still feel like we are

circling around four broad recommendation: one, continue to explore the funding shortfall; two, not yet time to say sort of Stillman is not working - we want to explore that further; three, at the same time, start developing and think about plan B and hearing from some folks. And yes, that is okay if it includes folks that are interested in grabbing a building or two buildings. We should be thinking about that. And fourth, yes, continue to stabilize buildings within the leasing portfolio and four, take a look at project pro formas better and better understand what is driving project cost permit folks we haven't heard from? Anybody want to weigh in? And do those recommendations make sense to folks? Are those things you want to pass on as recommendations? Linda, I see your hand. You are however on mute. Still on mute. I know you did it before. I know you can do it again.

And again, if you look to the bottom of your screen, you can also maybe —

LINDA COHEN: Got it. Thank you. My original comment was going to be or rather altered since I've heard Brian Samuelson, I have to thank you and say that I think his recommendations are excellent. Who could benefit more than the people who are already building and had the experience of being there? I think it is all for being a liaison for us. It is a wonderful one. I also keep thinking since I have been on the Committee since the beginning, as have several of us, I keep thinking this plan B is really our original plan A when we had request for proposals, and we got some wonderful individual proposals.

But we weren't able to meet the people's needs, and we lost everybody. We had some very good ideas. That being said, are we interested in showing off any other buildings for lease? For example, the Sandy Hook Foundation was presented with some artists who apparently have a foundation, and they want this building, which is not in the list. It is to the east side of the Mule Barn. And I have gone out there with them. And we've gone out with Lori Bertone who is a wonderful Sandy Hook Foundation person. But there seemed like there was no way of asking anyone if the building would be available. So I am just wondering if there are other buildings, is my point.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen? Please.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: We refer to those — well, we refer to them inside the Park as our North maintenance complex because the buildings are where our maintenance facility used to be before Hurricane Sandy. And they were really heavily impacted by the hurricane. It is one of the lowest points in all of Sandy Hook. And so, it is an extremely vulnerable location. When we rebuilt from Sandy Hook — not Sandy Hook — Hurricane Sandy, the National Park Service said we would not invest in those buildings because of their vulnerable location.

Now whether or not that means we could let somebody else invest in them and use them is kind of a grey area. They could be that potential. We all have also had long talked internally about — let me just say that everybody loves these buildings. Lots of our staff love them. Lots of members of the Park love them. They are really beautiful

structures, and they also harken back to the proving ground era of Sandy Hook, like back in the late 1800s. And you know really historically significant in addition to being really beautiful. So we talked about the Park Service was doing something that we don't want to lose them entirely. Maybe there is some approach, or you know we can keep some parts of the structures and use them for it like a picnic pavilion or something of that nature that does not require a high level of maintenance, but you know still retains some sense of what was there to the public.

But regardless of what we contemplated or what may be possible, what we have committed to is we have an agreement with the Advisory Council for historic preservation. This came out of the process when we demolished the two white barracks buildings that were historic as well and that we are also really heavily impacted by the hurricane.

And we didn't have the funding or better solution that could address or maintain any sense of historic integrity and address their sorry state post hurricane and level of vulnerability. Again, they were also in a pretty vulnerable location. So we demolished them. And in the process, we made an agreement with the Advisory Council and historic preservation, which is a national level governmental body that is over, I'm going to say this wrong, I'm not the expert on the hierarchy of how these mechanisms work. But like if you go to the SHPO, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and things are resolved there, it goes to the next level, which is the Advisory Council. And they are the umbrella level over the standards and how they are applied in this undertaking. And in any case, we agreed with them that as we demolished those two barracks, the white barracks building, before doing anything with North maintenance we would undertake a planning process to really weigh in our alternatives there. We have not done that yet. But that is still something we need to do before we decide on any one specific use or outcome or project there.

I will say that in addition to the group that you are referencing, we have had interest from others as well in those buildings. We've had people who have indicated perhaps a casual, but a definite interest in leasing those a number of times. But not only do we have that planning process out there that we need to undertake before moving forward and the restriction that NPS is not going to invest in this building and given those things in our finite capacity in the Park, we really focused our staff time and resources on trying to move forward the leasing program on buildings that are the highest priority and that we are in danger of losing.

We are trying to keep focus on getting back over the hump with many of these yellow buildings for lack of a better way to characterize them and then maybe we can look at some of the others.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thank you, Jen. Any other thoughts from Committee members, Shawn, anything from you as chair, and you are on mute.

SHAWN WELCH: sWe have got a lot to think about here. And I think we need to kind of massage some recommendations. I have got a Word document that I can share the screen on. We can start chopping away at this and put some recommendations together. Just a passing thought on my end. I get out here about once a week, once every other week. I've been doing this for quite a number of years. It is not just because what I'm doing with the Army Ground Forces Association, I usually see most of the leaseholders and what they are doing and how they are doing it. And they all approached this differently. And they all are successful using their own methodologies.

I like the idea of private investment. I think that is the way to go. The question is what kind of private vehicle? It is good to see large organizations that Stillman that can bring some kind of muscle to the table. I'm very sensitive to the Park's capacity. Much of this sensitivity is based on work that we have been doing on the coastal defense fortifications by the Army Ground Forces Association and what it takes to do the work requires a lot of administrative compliance. Army Ground Forces Association recently moved into the mortar battery, and we have quite a number of tasks to secure the structure so we can start broader work. There is a lot of administrative compliance effort to do that work. There's a great group of people in the Park Service, especially within the cultural resources and natural resources offices. The issue is capacity, and what they can handle. When Jen says she is concerned about the velocity of work that hits her staff, pay attention. That is an important point. They are really great. But they can only do so much and overwhelming them with work that could be more concisely packaged could shut down the entire project. Now having said that, is this the time to massage recommendations or do we need to do other things, Jen?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I think from my part we just had the Park updates list. Is that right, Bennett?

BENNETT BROOKS: That is right. Once this conversation finishes up, we are probably just 15-30 minutes away from closing. I think Shawn, it seems like a good time to shift if you want to put something on the table for folks to think about. And he said he read a document he should be able to share your screen.

And you are on mute again, Shawn.

SHAWN WELCH: All right. I had to figure that one out. That was a little bit different. Okay. We have different sets of recommendations. We have this focused on the Foundation. It has three parts to it. And I think everybody can read. Anybody need me to read this to you?

BENNETT BROOKS: You may have people on the phones in the audience. --

[Overlapping speakers]

SHAWN WELCH: The Foundation one reads: The Advisory Committee welcomes the foundations plan to support the Park's historic structure leasing program. The

Committee further acknowledge the potential value of the Foundation participation and recommends the following.

A) That the Park formally ask the Foundation to advise the Committee on what the Foundation assesses and recommends. What do they see? What do they recommend?

B) That the Park engage with the Foundation in efforts that would facilitate such work and support of the residential use model recommended by the Committee and adopted by the Park. That is our current model that we currently say we want to do. Number 3,

C) As the Park's independent nonprofit philanthropic partner, the Foundation may have access to the community and governmental resources not available to either the Committee or the Park proper. The Committee acknowledges that the special access and recommendation of the Foundation pursue those avenues in consultation with the Committee and Park leadership. What do you all think?

BENNETT BROOKS: Comments? I see a thumbs up and a head nodding. More thumbs up. Anyone have any questions or concerns? I see a number of thumbs coming up. And one hand going at the camera. Sorry, Jim, that was your hand. Okay. I think I see not anymore hands coming up. It sounds like that is making sense to the Committee. I will pause for another second. Okay. I think you can push on, Shawn.

SHAWN WELCH: All right. We are all in agreement of those recommendations related to the Foundation. Let's take a vote on that. Let's get consensus here. Give us the thumbs up.

BENNETT BROOKS: I am just seeing — keep your thumbs up — who do not see — Linda, Michael Walsh, you are good, and Linda is good. Okay. Patrick, did I see your thumb go up? Sorry.

PATRICK COLLUM: I cannot see a button for thumbs up, but I agree.

BENNETT BROOKS: Voice works too. Okay, yes. Everyone has weighed in.

SHAWN WELCH: So related to the Stillman situation right now, the Committee recommends the Park continue to explore potential avenue to close the funding shortfalls such as reauthorization to GAOA, financial opportunities from the symposium, opportunities for the financial Working Group and any other opportunities we have that make themselves apparent between now the next Committee meeting, which is September before revisiting the Committee's recommendation to the Park regarding this agreement was Stillman International and his proposal for 21 buildings within the Fort Hancock historic post. Any comments?

BENNETT BROOKS: Shawn, a quick question. Is that the only recommendation that you have related to Stillman? Are there others?

SHAWN WELCH: That is the main one on Stillman.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Mike?

SHAWN WELCH: I see Mike with his hand up.

BENNETT BROOKS: Mike Holenstein?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: To Shawn's recommendation, I think it is fine to suggest to the Park that they follow the course of action. But I think it is more important to try to put into their hands the tools to accomplish those actions. So, what is helpful is not to tell them they need to do it, but to show them how, to get them there. I don't know quite how to do that. That is not my area of expertise. But I think it is not enough to give the Park a list of suggestions without giving them the tools to follow through.

SHAWN WELCH: What does that look like, Mike. Give me an example.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Okay. You want them to explore funding shortfalls such as reauthorization of GAOA. Okay, you know what that means. Maybe Jen, and her associates know what that means. But right now is four words on a piece of paper, and I am guessing there is quite a bit to that.

SHAWN WELCH: There is.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: How does it get done?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: And I will just say in the case of that that it really isn't exploring. It is just waiting to see if something happens. So, the GAOA is Great American Outdoors Act. And you know we are waiting to see if Congress might take that up or not. If it does, we would seek to have these buildings included in some kind of funding opportunity. It is not a guarantee, but we've been told they would be a lot of support for including them as a project. But it all depends on if this whole Act is congressionally reauthorized. There isn't much we are doing in the meantime except for just waiting and seeing.

BENNETT BROOKS: It is like tracking and assessing.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes.

BENNETT BROOKS: And Jen, I guess to Mike's comment, are there tools?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes. There are certainly —

BENNETT BROOKS: Is there something this Committee could see?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Absolutely. For example, some of the recommendations that are rising out of the financials, I think it is the subcommittee that we have been referring to it as. But some of the recommendations about you know reaching out to state legislatures, to find out about our ARPA funding, about the American Rescue Plan act, the Covid money funding or others, other state level funding opportunities, like if we were to engage the Brookdale offer of having students work on grant writing, you know thinking about what are we having them apply for. There are lots of things that we don't

have the knowledge of or connections for or expertise on that either its people on the Committee have those things or to have the connections to have those things, that would be helpful for the Committee. Or if we are just starting from scratch, if there are Committee members who want to help us try to chase those things down, that is helpful as well. We are kind of you know starting from scratch with some of those things. Were maybe some of the community members are not.

BENNETT BROOKS: If I hear that right, I hear that less as a recommendation from the Committee to the Park Service and more of the next step, which is Committee members through the financial Working Group or something else will start looking at this stuff. Is that right as opposed to sort of a recommendation from the Committee to the Park Service?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I think it is all of it.

BENNETT BROOKS: All of it? Okay.

SHAWN WELCH: Part of it as I watched it over time with these recommendations, they do two things. They put courses of action on the table, but they also give the Park the ability to say to senior leadership these are things that our Committee believes we need to do. We need to pursue, we need to research, whatever. And jump on me if I'm wrong on this, Jen, but I see these as empowering and encouragement things as the Park itself engages is leadership. Does that make sense, Jen?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes. And I think some of it is that it is helpful in that vein and good to have down as a formal recommendation for that purpose. It just helps keep what we are doing transparent, and you know visible to those — you know whose eyes we want on it. But at the same time, you know we want to use it to be guiding our actions and you know to continue to move forward on this with the Committee.

I do very much appreciate Mike's comments about rather than just saying Park Service go do this, and it is not necessarily clear in all cases how to do something, helping us with the "how." Is very much appreciated. And also, I will note that with the recommendation, I'm looking at the part this is like financial opportunities arising from the symposium. And I'm trying to think through in my head the timing of our next meeting.

And we had proposed a September 10th meeting date and doing a hybrid meeting. Part of that is built around Bennett's schedule because he will be in the United States, and we would love to get him here in-person to do a meeting for us. But I also want to think about it in regard to what Pete Izzo was saying about targeting and August /September time frame for the symposium.

I'm kind of feeling like from this point if we are looking to see what comes out of that, that will give a lot of meat for the Committee to chew on in our next meeting. It may be better to think about the timing of these things so that our next Advisory Committee meeting is after rather than before that symposium.

So there might be a little more finessing schedule there.

BENNETT BROOKS: For the recommendation purpose strike the timing and just say the next Committee meeting?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I would not strike the timing. But I would flag that for our consideration. We put out that September 10th date and Pete said August /September. Just so the Committee members are aware, if folks are in agreement that we should have that. And maybe if anyone thinks differently, maybe that is worth surfacing now too so we can plan this out whether the symposium should be before the next Advisory Committee meeting.

I will also note that you know we have this recommendation. And I don't know, Shawn, if you have stuff further down and scrolling. But I heard a lot of discussion about starting to work on a plan B as well and that may be something you want to include.

SHAWN WELCH: Yes, I think that gets into revisiting the Committee's recommendation. That is your plan B. We will revisit that. In fact, we could add it in there that the Committee's recommendation to the Park regarding its agreement and potential —

BENNETT BROOKS: I jotted down some language that is helpful.

SHAWN WELCH: If you can email it to me, I will stick it up.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. I can throw in the chat.

SHAWN WELCH: No, I cannot put it in the document. Well, let's try it. I will see if I can paste it from the chat.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. I think it was helpful. It was kind of the notes I was taking here.

SHAWN WELCH: All right.

BENNETT BROOKS: I just posted it.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay, let me see if one will post to the other.

BENNETT BROOKS: In general, if you copy within a chat, just don't copy the whole thing, but sort of grab the letters.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. Good to go. Okay, I know what I'm doing. Okay, it is in there.

Should develop alternatives, complete, good job, alternatives, plan B —

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: And I don't want to craft the recommendations. I mean this is a recommendation for the Park Service. But I will note that the partnership still is not viable, what I was hearing in the conversation was in case, like we should be doing this even while we are still continuing —

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes. That is the intent. At the same time. Right. Start looking down that path now. Right. Degree. Let's not wait until that moment becomes significant.

SHAWN WELCH: All right. In case the partnership with Stillman — the Park —

BENNETT BROOKS: Can you strike after the word "post" and strike at the end. I would keep it at the same time. It is the point. This is intended to be in parallel. I think that is what I heard strongly from a number of folks.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. In case the partnership with Stillman proves not viable, the Park Service should develop alternatives as a plan B. There you go. And it can include interest in a proposal for individual buildings.

As I'm looking at this, I'm thinking about something else. We learned something today that the Park has received details from Stillman on what they did with building seven and 12. And some are in here. The Park's assessment of that will inform this. I'm just wondering if we put something in the recommendation that would address that. Mike Holenstein, help me out. What do you think?

BENNETT BROOKS: I don't know. But Dorothy has her hand up.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. Go ahead, Dorothy.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Okay. Go ahead, Mike.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you for saying that, and my recommendation was that the Park consider availing itself of some of his private expertise to help with the review of cost so that the costs are not reviewed with them and strictly from the Federal perspective, that there be some third-party private interest to provide some guidance there.

So I was going to pipe up anyway and say that the idea that the Stillman proposal proves not viable would not be unilateral decision made by — it doesn't say by even who — made that decision, but that the decision should be more positively stated as, you know, there be some timeframe, or something associated, not even that we are going to wait until September to bring this up again.

But that there ought to be, we ought to be able to take a look and make some decisions whether it is of the Park level or the finance Committee level or however you want to do it. These things are done on a routine basis, and they are done in meetings like in a day, so they don't have to be thought about for months or six months or whatever. I think we can get it done. Let's do it so the Park to make a decision.

BENNETT BROOKS: I put together some language based on your earlier comments, Mike, I just put that in the chat if it is helpful. I wrote the Committee recommends the Park bring in private third-party expert to take a closer look at project to better understand what is driving the project cost. I don't know if that hits the mark or not,

Mike, but that is how I captured your earlier comment. Shawn, you are on mute if you are talking.

SHAWN WELCH: All right. Thank you. I can grab this and stick it in there, and we can start massaging it.

This almost looks like how we are doing recommendations. Like the first one had three components in this is starting to look like it has a couple of components as well. The Committee recommends the Park with the private third-party experts take closer look at the project pro formas presented by Stillman to better understand what is driving project cost. Do you see what have done there?

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes. Dorothy, please, you've been waiting..

DOROTHY GUZZO: I think my comment relates when you just scrolled up to your general in blue. I think that is where I was commenting. That I wanted to see we were simultaneously also trying to stabilize some of the buildings. But yes, I think this is where you were going. Yes.

SHAWN WELCH: This one. Continue to do what they are doing. You know that kind of stuff.

DOROTHY GUZZO: You know it could be more extensive. And again, I don't know. Jen was talking about similarly to how they were doing the roofs. If you did decide to chip away at it, the buildings would suddenly become more attractive. If either of those recommendations in terms of looking for plan B or whatever happen, get more work done on the buildings. Also, with smaller projects I think it is easier to find outside funding.

SHAWN WELCH: I want to finish this one.

DOROTHY GUZZO: Okay. I could not see that.

SHAWN WELCH: Jim Krauss has his hand up. He had it up several times and took it down.

BENNETT BROOKS: Well, let's —

SHAWN WELCH: With the guide to —

BENNETT BROOKS: What I like to do is stay with the recommendation

SHAWN WELCH: I want to see if Jim wants to talk about that. And now Mike has his hand up.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jim, Michael Walsh, anybody want to talk about that, the recommendation?

JIM KRAUSS: I guess it is related to the recommendation. I want to answer Jen's question that I think it would do better to have the symposium prior to the September

FACA meeting. What I would like to look into the Stillman recommendation, and if the Park has not done so already to have a candid discussion with Stillman and find out what their level of patients is to wait around to see if the funding gap can be resolved. Because that is going to drive the urgency as to how quickly the Park goes to plan B.

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

NPS no.

BENNETT BROOKS: Fair enough. Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: I'm not sure where the language is going. But I wanted to make sure we are in agreement. We talked about having third parties assess the viability of Stillman's proposal or contribute to the decision as to whether or not to continue with it. It is within the Park Service's job to make that decision. We are here as an Advisory Committee. And I think we would bring in independent parties as great. I think the Park Service is different. It is not a viable proposition any longer. But I want to make it clear they have the ability, and they should take that ability to cancel the project if that is what they determine. We don't have to wait to the next meeting. They don't have to wait for us — were not making a decision for them anyway. I think we are all concerned about it, drifting along too long, but Jen, and her team, if they determined that it is not really viable, they can pull the plug with our full blessing. At least with my full blessing.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Mike. Mike Holenstein?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Okay, I would like to pile on with Michael Walsh. I think that we have been waiting 12 years for these problems to be solved by an avalanche of funding that is going to come from either institution or governmental sources. And I think it would be wise at this point for us to consider the possibility of funding coming from these sources, Federal or institutional or other as a surprise, a welcome surprise rather than banking on it as a solution to a problem that we know has existed since the beginning. I think that it is not the best use of our time to wait for the funding sources to develop. We have been aware of them, and we have been observing them since the beginning of this, and it was well before the beginning of the SACA that the same thoughts and issues were being looked at and approached from umpteen different angles by private and public people. So let the availability of funding be at the effort of someone who is able to handle it and let it come as a surprise, a welcome surprise then rather it be the crutch this holding this thing up and let's move on.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Mike. And again, I think that is the concept of putting plan B, to, let's say, let's make sure that we are not just looking down one pathway. I just want to make sure; we have two bullets in front of us. At the same time in case the partnership with Stillman proves not viable, the Park Service should develop alternatives (A "plan B"). This can include looking anew at interest in and proposals for individual buildings. The Committee recommends the Park with visits is a private third-

party expert, takes a closer look at project pro formas presented by Stillman are national to better understand what is driving project because.

Is that, those two sentences, is that what we want?

It sounds like that is a yes.

I heard another piece here just recently. I'm trying to figure out where it goes. I'm not sure I can see the whole document. But maybe it is right here when you talk about Stillman, but there is a request to understand the timing. What are their timing considerations? I don't have the perfect language for that, but I think it was in ask at the Park Service in his future conversation would still understand their time horizon maybe for exploring project feasibility.

SHAWN WELCH: I can stick that into that first bullet at the same time in case the partnership does not prove viable. I think it can be something like the Park should use the best judgment in determining viability and when to move forward.

BENNETT BROOKS: Sounds good.

SHAWN WELCH: All right what do you think?

BENNETT BROOKS: How does that work, everybody? I see some thumbs going up. Okay. I see more thumbs going up. Okay. It looks like you got it there, Shawn.

SHAWN WELCH: All right. This one related to Stillman with his two subcomponents.

BENNETT BROOKS: It seems like the next one is as well.

SHAWN WELCH: The next one: The Committee recommends the Park continue to stabilize the buildings within the leasing portfolio such as work already underway like the roofing project on Officer's Row, masonry, stabilization, and emergency window closures.

BENNETT BROOKS: Dorothy, how does that land for you?

SHAWN WELCH: Emergency or temporary?

DOROTHY GUZZO: I would not say emergency. Just to the windows. I think somebody wanted to build — bid on the buildings will be thrilled. --

[Overlapping speakers]

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I think there are two different things we are talking about. I think Shawn is saying windows physically open. Like some windows, we put in things like plywood and stuff to keep them sealed shut. It is not rehabilitation, but a temporary measure. I think that is what he is talking about. I don't think we can afford to do masonry and the full windows project, that one.

SHAWN WELCH: Either/or. The issue with the windows, Dorothy, for some clarification or context, there's over 20 windows that are open. There're at least two sets of dormers that are open. And I'm talking about wide open. When it rains, the water flows right in, and it sits on those floors. And is right next to the wall and the joists are going into the wall. Once they rot, floors draw. That is the area where the need to close.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Probably our staff and not a contractor that goes in and takes care of it in all likelihood.

BENNETT BROOKS: Does this work as-is for folks?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I would note that you know at the last meeting we were talking about you know this incremental approach and that this could take two different forms. One, moving in increments going building by building and doing full buildings at a time or looking at the systems wide approach. So, in weighing those things and looking at the roof project and think about how to get buildings stabilized, now we are thinking in the Park Service that the systems approach probably makes more sense at this point. But I think it would be helpful to know if that is an approach to know if the Committee agrees. You know before then saying you know we support masonry, just the whole approach.

BENNETT BROOKS: Michael Walsh?

DOROTHY GUZZO: Jen, if I could — the other thing is I heard you mention some of the buildings are in bad shape. And one thing is we didn't do this holistic approach to 21 buildings and how the buildings get done. And I am wondering, and I'm throwing this out there. Does it make sense for you to put any money that becomes available into the worst buildings and take care of them because the other ones then become more attractive? I am just throwing it out there. That is a decision you have to make. But you know I think those options are out there.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Michael Walsh?

MICHAEL WALSH: Jen, what I understand when you say systems approach, the same approach you did with the roofing, whatever money you had you spent on roofs. And you put the roofs on his many buildings. And the next step would be masonry and whatever money you get you put as much money as you get into his many buildings as you can to correct the masonry. The question is do we support that approach? You certainly have my vote for that approach rather than pouring all the money in one building.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thanks.

BENNETT BROOKS: Mike Holenstein?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: If there is a show of hands or some other means of votes being taken, I think that the row can be interpreted by many means including having two or three buildings that are fully rehabilitated and the other ones would just be spare parts. I know that is not a welcome thought. But I would strongly suggest that you, rather than trying to move the mountain, that you try to get buildings up and running. Because the building that is up and running produces a revenue, potentially a revenue source, which aids in the process. My thought is that yes getting the roofs all done was a critical element because it helps to preserve them all in a major way as does closing up the windows, so the rain is not going in. But beyond that, I think, that the triage, fixing up your best items and getting them back online is a better use of funds if that is a practical need. So I will go that way on it. Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks, Mike. And if I hear you right it sounds like what Shawn has up there like going was something like masonry stabilization. I guess what I hear you say is a systems wide approach for certain things make sense. And I wonder if the masonry, etc. and dealing with the emergency window closures do though still fit that system wide approach?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Those are the systems wide approach. But what I hear Mike saying is advocating for the opposite approach where we take on whole buildings, get them activated, and they maybe generating revenue that we can roll into other buildings. But understanding with that approach we may lose some buildings in the process.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Fix your roof, fix the windows, close them, do a systems wide approach.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Got you.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Then focus on the building.

BENNETT BROOKS: Stabilize, invest —

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I understand that. Thank you for the clarification.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thanks.

SHAWN WELCH: We have been chattering. The Committee recommends the Park continue to stabilize the buildings within the leasing portfolio such as work already underway, such as the roofing project on Officer's Row and

A) Future projects such as masonry stabilization

B) Emergency window closures to keep the elements out

C) Mitigate the vegetation growing inside the walls and up to the roofs. That all of a sudden has exploded on about six buildings and that these two address. We have chattered on, and on about that for years, but I would put that underneath that. Two people made comments on that yesterday, which is a bit of a surprise. Why is the

vegetation growing outside of the building? I have no answer for you. But that is something that should be looked at. I think that bounce us in the bigger projects like the roofing project, internal stuff that could be done now or close the windows to deal with the destructive vegetation. The vegetation is not helping matters any.

BENNETT BROOKS: And I think what I heard Mike suggesting is it would be after that sort of language adding something, and I don't know how everybody feels about this, but something like once the buildings have been stabilized, the Park should consider the merits of improving individual buildings one by one to get them online sooner and generating revenue. Does that sound, right? Jen, I see you nod. Is that what you are hearing too?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: That is what I was hearing. Again, I am not advocating for a specific recommendation. Recommendations are to us.

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes. I want to make sure I hear it right.

SHAWN WELCH: The reason for the last line I typed there —

BENNETT BROOKS: The Park should consider the merits of focusing on improving individual buildings one by one to get them online sooner and generating revenue.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. I will retype. The Park, you know what, I had that thing in the chat. And then you can copy/paste it.

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes. In the meantime, let's bring in Patrick.

PATRICK COLLUM: On the second bullet what makes sense for clarification, emergency windows and doors, emergency window and doors, roofs, yes. Because we have about seven doors.

PATRICK COLLUM: We have to have common sense put in there.

BENNETT BROOKS: How do folks feel about that last bullet?

SHAWN WELCH: That also would be an alteration to our previous position, which is we want to see it done more as a group than individual. But I like the idea. It gives more flexibility to the Park.

BENNETT BROOKS: I see some flying thumbs.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Can I clarify that the recommendation, is it specific to the Park, the Park Service investments? Or is that, like if we are still working with the lessees, like let's say we are doing the incremental approach with Stillman. You know we are not saying move ahead one by one instead of doing the portfolio. This is really specific to the government investments we are making.

BENNETT BROOKS: That was my understanding. Mike Holenstein, is that correct? That was my understanding. Is that your intention?

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: That is my intention.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: But it doesn't say that in the language. That is what I'm trying to point out. We might want to clarify that in the actual recommendation.

BENNETT BROOKS: The Park should consider the merits of focusing government investment for individual buildings?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes. Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: We have about 10 minutes to work on the recommendations and then we should be pushing on.

MIKE HOLENSTEIN: Jen, Mike Holenstein. To your question regarding an approach or Mr. Stillman's approach, whether he is hitting them all at the same time or going at it incrementally, I think the answer there is that the funding issue drives any approach whether it is four of them or 21 of them. And the answer is the same. I don't think you need to break out the approach for him. I think it is more of all or nothing.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. If there is nothing else to add I think I would feel a lot better if folks got another chance to review this before we reconfirmed. There are a lot of moving parts here.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay, review what? The general recommendation?

BENNETT BROOKS: Let's just —

SHAWN WELCH: Start at the top?

BENNETT BROOKS: Yes.

SHAWN WELCH: There it is.

BENNETT BROOKS: If you can make it smaller so people can see the recommendation in its entirety. There you go. Okay, just take a minute or two and confirm. I think we gave this a pretty good go around. I want to make sure folks are on board with that.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I am a little confused. Did the Park formally as the Foundation to advise the Committee?

SHAWN WELCH: I think it is more of the Park's role to bring them in, not our role. I don't think the Committee should be saying hey, foundation, give us your advice. I mean if you want us to.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I think the Foundation has stepped up in its offering to be a partner in this and share new perspectives with what they can find. I don't know that there needs to be, or if it is the role of the Park to ask them to advise the Committee.

BENNETT BROOKS: Jen, are you suggesting it doesn't need to be there at all or the Committee welcomes —

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I think it is probably more of the latter flavor.

BENNETT BROOKS: The Committee welcomes those students--

SHAWN WELCH: Read what was there. You are dealing with two different entities. The structure is different. There are different authorities and different responsibilities. One of the structures specifically to advise the Park and the other is the philanthropic partner. A completely different animal. The Park has designated several officials. They are seeking advice from the Committee. The Committee could ask the same foundation to advise us. But being your philanthropic partner, you need to, at some level request that linkage or create that linkage.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I don't think so. I mean I do not. They are a philanthropic partner. But I don't control who they talk to. And I don't have any problem with them talking to the Committee. I think by the same token, if it is just like this weird bureaucratic hamster wheel that got on here, I feel like it gets a little awkward. The Committee is there to advise the Park Service. And if the Park Service request, has a formal request that the Foundation or partner advise the Committee to advise the Park Service —

BENNETT BROOKS: Can I jump in with maybe an easy one, and the first sentence, Shawn, right below related, like the Advisory Committee greatly welcomes the Sandy Hook Foundation's plans to support the Parks and historic structure leasing programs. The Committee further acknowledges the potential value of the Sandy Hook Foundation — its assessments — yes. Okay, so folks, are we good with this?

BILL KASTNING: On the first bullet, take "with" out.

BENNETT BROOKS: That the Park engage the Foundation, yes.

SHAWN WELCH: Good.

BENNETT BROOKS: Are we good to move on from this one?

SHAWN WELCH: There was a thumbs up.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Let's go to the next one. If we can shrink it, we can go to the screen. There we go.

BILL KASTNING: You need a double parenthesis after the GAOA.

BENNETT BROOKS: I don't think so. I think it ends after ," etc."

BILL KASTNING: Got it. Sorry.

BILL KASTNING: Just a general comment. The Park should be capitalized throughout. It is not in the above section.

BENNETT BROOKS: That can be cleaned up after I think if that is okay. Thumbs up. Do I see anybody else? Thumbs up?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Do you want to put in National Park Service wherever it says Park Service? In the first bullet?

BENNETT BROOKS: Recommends the National Park Service?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: In the bullet.

BENNETT BROOKS: In the bullet? Okay, National Park Service.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Thanks.

SHAWN WELCH: There we go.

BENNETT BROOKS: Are we good? I see thumbs. If anyone is not okay, please come off of mute and say something. Okay. Then we have the last general recommendation. Okay, you are good. Okay, yes. This is the one we were just looking at. This one is getting bigger and bigger.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: First bullet "such as" you need the word "as."

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Right after the word "such."

SHAWN WELCH: Thank you. Let me simplify this.

BENNETT BROOKS: I will make the case that the last bullet should not be a bullet, but it is on the sentence at the same level. There you go. Is everyone good?

BILL KASTNING: I have a comment.

BENNETT BROOKS: Please Bill.

BILL KASTNING: Linda mentioned it earlier. For PR purposes, the thing that is remaining, are the porches very important —

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Or folks good with that?

SHAWN WELCH: It is a good point. I hear periodically, and I heard this weekend, somebody commented positively on the porches be repaired. And then asked, what about the others?

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. I am looking at my clock, and I see time racing by. This is good. Anything else we need to look up and talk about here? Are we good with the recommendations? Great. Okay, thanks, everybody. Thank you, Shawn for the good work here.

SHAWN WELCH: Okay. I will email this.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you. We will get it around to everyone. If anyone has any last thoughts on this, please, I want to make a space. Jen, I want to go for some quick

Park updates. But any Committee members? Any last comments on the recommendations? Jen, over to you.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Okay. Let me find my updates. All right. I will talk about projects first. We have talked a lot about the roofs already. We should have those completed this summer. We are down to the final outstanding items. That was about a \$3.3 million project. We are also in the latter stages of rehabilitating our water well at Sandy Hook. We are the water purveyors out there. We run our own four treatment plants. We manage a lot of the utility infrastructure that is out at Sandy Hook. The water well project should also be done this summer. That was almost \$4.3 million project. And those are from — well, those are not Great American Outdoor Act projects. We do have a couple of GAOA projects also moving forward. We are rehabilitating the water and wastewater systems at Sandy Hook. Estimate that it will be done around the end of calendar year 2025. That project has been moving through the design. And that is a 14.2-million-dollar project.

And we are also rebuilding or rehabilitating two of the seawall systems at Sandy Hook, the seawall in front of the chapel and in front of Officer's Row. Construction will be starting on these later this summer. And together that is about \$836 million investment. We also have the electrical lines being rehabilitated, the electrical system. And a lot of the remaining above ground lines you see in Sandy Hook will be put underground, which not only is aesthetically pleasing but also more resilient as we move into the future. That is about an 8.6-million-dollar Great American Outdoors Act project. For any of you who spent a lot of time out at Sandy Hook or operate out in Sandy Hook you know how we deal with very frequent power outages. Hopefully, this will help solve a lot of that. So, as you can see there is a lot of major utility and infrastructure work. Not the building historic preservation work, but the kind of work investment that is happening that will help support anybody investing in historic preservation at Sandy Hook. I want to thank the Army Ground Forces Association for taking on some work at the mortar battery and helping us to secure that space so that we can thwart any would be folks doing vandalism there that are getting in there for the wrong purposes and keep it as intact as it is a right now so we can move forward together and take on more reservation work. Thank you, Shawn, and crew. We have some programs that are coming up at Sandy Hook. We have had clean ocean action out there just this past week ringing hundreds of folks, particularly young people out for volunteer work and student Summit. We have ocean fun day coming up. That is always a big event for us and a lot of our partners out at Sandy Hook — ocean fun they just happen to.

Do have coming up the Sandy Hook Foundation summer soirée on May 31. Anybody who is interested in that, I will send you Pete Izzo's way or you can check their website.

We have the Jersey Shore partnership foundation summer celebration in June. And the MAST celebration for us is a big one. And the partners at Sandy Hook have their members they are coming up later in June. And I just briefly want to give you a sense of the programming that is ramping back up in June, what that is going to look like. So

the visitor center will be back open Friday through Monday from 10:00 to 4:00 every week. In the lighthouse Tours will resume Friday to Monday from 1:00 to 3:30. It is a first come, first serve basis sign up at 12:30.

History House will be doing tours from Monday through Friday 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. And the Nike Missile Radar Site is our great partner, volunteer partners there have events going on Saturday June 8 and Sunday June 23rd. We have got yoga on the beach. Birding on the observation deck. We have the museum at Fort Hancock is opening back up. We have a lighthouse night climb on Tuesday June 4th. We have lots of Junior Ranger angular program schedules, bird walks, programs for younger kids, campfire on the beach, butterfly bio blitz. Around the bases at Fort Hancock, looking at more interpretation of well, in this case, it is baseball in the 1940s and the peak time of the Fort during World War II. Lots of great events coming up. We are looking forward to our unofficial start of summer. I guess summer starts officially, I forget the date, sometime June 21st-22nd. But for us it starts a Memorial Day. So as of Saturday, the fee collection booths will be open and we won't have all beaches open for swimming right on Memorial Day weekend, similar to what we did the past two years, we will have some beaches open. As we get more lifeguards on, we will be opening up more beaches for swimming. It remains a big challenge in the Park hiring seasonal lifeguards. This is not out of sync with what is happening nationwide in the lifeguard positions and not just National Parks, but all kinds of lifeguard operations.

But we are thankful to the Foundation efforts in helping us to get the word out about these positions and helping us to recruit. Please ask everybody. If you know some folks who are interested in summer employment, if you want to sit out on the beach at Sandy Hook, please send them our way. We have a rolling enrollment process.

A few other things I did want to update the group on. We are bringing on some staff. This is through the Inflation Reduction Act. It brought funding to the Park Service for positions, not project funding, but staff funding. And it is not for operation. We cannot use it to fund positions we would normally have in the Park. It is for special time-limited transformational projects. One of these is a team that we will have focusing on some revitalization efforts throughout the Park. And it will include things like project manager, a planner, business specialist, and a compliance person, a team.

And one other thing they will be focusing on at Sandy Hook is this northern post area section of the hook as this comes to life with more activity and more people looking at issues like parking, circulation access, lighting to make sure that those are managed in a thought out and thoughtful way and in a way that is protective of the resources and creates the best visitor experience out there.

So that is something that we are in the hiring process now and hope to over the coming months to have those people on board. And yes, that is how the hiring process works in the Federal Government. It takes a while. And another key position that we are bringing on through that, the climate change adaptation planner who will help us take,

who will work in various sites in the Park, looking at a few site-specific sites to work with, but one of them is Sandy Hook, taking some of the climate vulnerability assessment data that we have recently collected. And this is data on a facility by facility bases at Sandy Hook to look at climate change vulnerability and look at the Peninsula in terms of changes that we can reasonably predict. They will take this and help us to coalesce that into a larger strategy on our investments, on our operations given those changes that we anticipate.

Now I had said earlier in the meeting when I referenced the Environmental Working Group that we had assembled or the Working Group environmental entities and historic preservation entities and Committee members to look at some of the issues that is surfaced with the environmental group that we have tackled a lot. And we've gone over a lot of that at the meetings, but we still have a few loose ends that we set as we are able to move forward on these things, we can bring the group back in for the discussions. And one of those is that climate change planning. So I want you to know we haven't lost sight of that, but that is our plan right now for how we move forward in that arena.

And of course, in the interim, whatever we do, for doing a project, or making an investment, we are always looking at climate change data and trying to make the smartest investments we can, given what we can reasonably predict. But having some more holistic form of planning can only help. I do also want to mention the social equity Working Group since Gerry is not on.

And we have not pulled those panelists and those group members back together as we have focused on really how do we make any investment work right now and figure out our next steps with the buildings in the leasing program permit, but I want to say that is something we have not lost sight on. But as we are able to figure out the trajectory of this project, we really look forward to activating and moving forward hand in hand with them as well.

So I think that is all my Park updates unless anyone has any questions or wants to call it something I was missing.

BENNETT BROOKS: That was a stack of Park updates. Thank you. Bill, let me bring you in. And if there are questions or if there are not any questions, we could move to close. Bill?

BILL KASTNING: The speed of Park access is compromised during those peak hours. Are there any plans to improve that?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: Yes. And that is something we have been talking about with the Foundation as well. That they are interested in helping to support any efforts there. What we need to do, our next step, whether it is through the Park Service, through the Foundation, getting an informal traffic engineering study for the entrance booth at Sandy Hook, you know we've had various proposals floated, suggested, like to collect fees at

the parking lots are at the entrance. You know some of these may actually cause more backups than they alleviate.

But we fully recognize that this is something we want to continue to work on and improve and resolve, if possible, if there is a reconfiguration that can help that process. You know part of the challenge is there is a definite pinch point. We have, I forget how many links at the booths. but there is essentially two lanes, the one from Atlantic Highlands and the one from Sea Grant. , but we have ones that we try to figure out how to manage.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you, Jen. We are set to close today at, 1:15p, which means I don't think we have time for the roundtable comments. I know we've already lost Tony. I feel like we should probably close it out. But if anyone has any burning last-minute comments they want to say, I would invite that before I sort of hit a couple of next steps.

BILL KASTNING: Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you all. I think it was wise of us to use that time to get those recommendations together. We needed the time. I think it was well used. A couple of quick next steps that I have. One, as Daphne said at the outset, the minutes from the last meeting were just sent out. Please take a look at them. If there are any questions you have, or anything please give her a shout. I will note that Pete has posted in the Q&A the link to the benefit. Take a look at that.

At the moment, the hybrid meeting is set for September 10th. I think as well talked about the Sandy Hook Foundation symposium is set for that meeting. Keep an eye on that. And Pete will obviously stay in close touch with you with all about. Thank you. I think that is all I have. I think there are a couple of pieces from the recommendations but mostly I think it really boils down to Jen and team pushing the Stillman stuff and some of the recommendations there as well as think about plan B. I think about the financial alternatives Committee. There were some pieces there to pick up again looking at the opportunities and digging deeper into the opportunities whether they are local or regional or state. I think there are several things that Working Group should be picking up and thinking about. I don't know. Shawn, Jen, anyone else have any specific next steps that I did not capture just then?

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: No thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Okay. Shawn, Jen, I will invite either/or both of you to make any final comments.

JENNIFER NERSESIAN: I will say for my part we got through a lot today. Thank you for the robust recommendations. You know I appreciate you pushing or thinking in different directions and exploit all the options here. We still have a lot of work to do. But I appreciate the fact of having so many people committed to rolling up their sleeves and helping to get these done as we push through this. Thank you all for your

continued participation. We can't do this without you. So I am looking forward to keeping this going over the summer and seeing where we are at in September when we are all back together.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Shawn? Any word from you? You are on mute.

SHAWN WELCH: Again, more moving lips. Inking back on Jen, I appreciate everybody jumping in on the recommendation. This is the most comprehensive group of recommendations we have put forward that was long needed and thank you everybody who jumped on this. We needed to bring some of the other members up to speed who were not able to make the meeting. But when the minutes come out and the recommendations are front and center, we are looking forward to seeing everybody in September.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thank you, Daphne, Karen, whole team of people to help us get ready for this. And thank you Nitsan for your help. And thank you Peter for being our guest speaker today. I appreciated. Thank you. And I think for now I will —

SHAWN WELCH: Thank you to Jen.

BENNETT BROOKS: Thank you to Jen always.

SHAWN WELCH: Thank you for calling everything out that we did. Calling out the ocean funding this past weekend.

And of course we had members from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Indiana, New Hampshire. It was a great weekend for us. It could not have been great without you. Thank you.

BENNETT BROOKS: Great. Thanks, everybody. I will let you go. We are couple of minutes late. Have great week.

SHAWN WELCH: Have a great weekend.

>>: Recording stopped.

CAPTIONER: Meeting dismissed.

1:16 PM (ET)