

**Cape Cod National Seashore**  
**Subcommittee on Dune Shack District Preservation and Use Plan**  
**MEETING TWO**  
**December 8, 2009 10:30 am – 2:30 pm**

**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

*Subcommittee Members:* Sally Adams, Janet Armstrong, Regina Binder, Bill Burke, Carole Carlson, Rob Costa, Rich Delaney (Chair), Hatty Fitts, Joyce Johnson, Richard Philbrick, Austin Smith, Paul Tasha, John Thomas

*NPS/CCNS:* George Price, Sue Moynihan, Sandy Hamilton

*CBI Facilitation Team:* Stacie Smith, Patrick Field, Meredith Sciarrio

*Members of the Public:* Peter Clemons, Nat Champlin, Mildred Champlin, Paul Champlin, Jane Rosett.

**Introductions and Welcome**

Participants were asked to introduce themselves and their affiliations to the group. CBI outlined the agenda for the meeting, and participants were asked to submit any additions or corrections to the December agenda or November meeting summary by the end of the week to CBI. It was noted that once these documents were approved by the subcommittee that they would be accessible to the public via the CCNS website called PEPC (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/CACO>).

CBI distributed reference binders for participants to refer to throughout this process. Participants were informed of all the documents, and it was noted that more would be added to the binders as the process continued. One participant suggested a voluntary sign-up of subcommittee members' email addresses for if they want to communicate among each other. Participants were reminded that if they wanted to reach everyone to please contact CBI.

**Overview of Individual Shacks**

CCNS Bill Burke presented a detailed overview of the Dune Shacks using information collected from federal records. Participants supplemented the presentation with additional facts from their personal knowledge and history in the dunes.

Participants shared the following additional details of the Dune Shacks:

- Cohen Shack
  - It was once two separate shacks and was moved inland from beach. It is located inside the historic provincelands defined border and used to be part of a group of cottages by the lifesaving station.
- Fleurant Shack
  - It was once tightly constructed but deteriorated quickly after Leo Fleurant's passing. The shack was resurrected through volunteer work including the dune shack community. Currently the shack is leased to 2019.
- Adams Guest Shack
  - It has a solar trailer inverter separate from the shack, which generates energy for one outlet, one light, and one electric pump, as well as hot and cold water. When the shack was moved, Title V septic was required.
- Adams Shack
  - The shack moved after 1978 and the French doors were rescued from Brooklyn in the 1950s.
  - It has a solar trailer inverter separate from the shack, which generates energy for one outlet, one light, and one electric pump, as well as hot and cold water. When the shack was moved, Title V septic was required.
- Champlin Shack
  - The shack has never been moved and stands on a piling foundation of wood posts. It has a mechanical pump and generator as well as wide pine board flooring from 100+ year-old barn in Truro. The shack has the well-known nickname "Mission Bell" because it has a large bell from an old schoolhouse in Michigan. This bell has been used as a landmark for directing boats. It was also noted that there are old telephone poles buried in the sand from when Associated Bell provided phone service to the shacks until at least the 1950s.
- Werner Shack
  - The V-shaped wood stop inside of the door is used to stop wind blown water from coming inside
- Malicoat Shack
  - This shack is privately held and was not part of the presentation, but was noted to keep in mind because it's in the District. Since it is privately owned, any alterations to the shack are not subject to federal policies like the other shacks.

- Margo-Gelb Shack
  - Jan Gelb was a printmaker and a painter, and Boris Margo was also an artist. There was writer who frequented the shack and wrote about black holes, name unknown.
- Tasha Shack
  - This shack was blown apart in a winter storm in the 1960s and then rebuilt. It is kept minimally maintained although it was even more rustic when Harry Kemp lived there.
- Malkin-Ofsevit Shack
  - It was moved back from the ocean in the 1960s. Then was completely rebuilt in the 1990s by volunteers after a fire. NPS noted that the shack needed to be justified retroactively with the porch matching the original 1917 shack in order to be considered a contributing element to District. It was also mentioned that the foil sheets on an interior wall were used for fire protection.
- Fowler Shack
  - This shack was maintained for fifteen years by Peter Clemons and Marianne Benson. The attached car garage was necessary to protect the windshield from sand as the long-term residents resided in the shack almost year-round.
- Chanel Shack
  - The father and son were artists but unsure of whom painted the interior murals.
- Braaten Shack
  - This shack has solar panels and wind power, which the District has agreed to as long as they're not conspicuous. It was noted that there is uncertainty between the new technologies and keeping the shacks historic.
- Watson-Schmid Shack
  - This shack has floorboards of recycled wood from the lifesaving station and shingles from an old boat house.
- Wells Shack
  - It has recycled wood from the Peaked Hill Station.
- Jones Shack
  - This shack has been rebuilt three times; the first fell to the side, and the second was buried.
- Armstrong

- This shack was moved in 1983 due to ocean encroachment. It is the only remaining shack in the eastern group.

CBI stated they would compile these comments with the NPS presentation into a cohesive document for future reference.

### **Overview Starting point of Timeline/Story line of the history of the Dune Shack Historic District**

Participants received timelines of the Dune Shack District produced by NPS dating from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century to November 2009. They also received details about the three ongoing NPS reports regarding the Dune Shacks: Cultural Landscape Report, Historic Structure Report, and the National Register Nomination.

Participants were informed that they would need to submit comments on the draft Historic Structure Report by *March 1, 2010*, and they could contact Bill Burke if they wanted to review the draft hard copy of the Cultural Landscape Report. For the National Register Nomination, it was noted that the subcommittee work could instruct the nomination, and anything that the subcommittee produced could be forwarded to the researchers.

Some participants were concerned that the documents used for the National Register Nomination would not accurately or fully capture the information about dune shack families and their connection to the land. It was suggested that the subcommittee could write additions to supplement the Determination of Eligibility (DOE) based off of discussions at subcommittee meetings. Additionally it was noted that the group would not be able to conclude if the Keeper of the Register made the right decision with regards to the TCP designation, but to acknowledge that in her role she did have the authority to make that decision.

### **Overview of the NEPA Process**

Participants learned the steps that the NPS would be taking in a NEPA process which included: gathering options, determining if they fit the purpose and needs, grouping them in packages of alternatives and comparing these packages to what CCNS offers, analyzing the alternatives, choosing a preferred alternative, opening up time for public comment, approving the preferred alternative, and then drafting the general plan.

The subcommittee's role in this process would be to review all of the different issues and develop a range of reasonable alternatives. These alternatives and the discussion around creating the alternatives would all be valuable and would help to inform the NPS and CCNS in writing the general plan. It was noted that it is not required for the

subcommittee to come to an agreement on their own preferred alternative but would be beneficial if they did.

Some participants questioned how effective the subcommittee could be if their recommendations could be declined for the general plan. It was mentioned that the subcommittee should make sure that their alternatives are financially sustainable and follow NPS policies in order for their alternatives to be considered feasible. Also since the subcommittee is a part of the Advisory Commission, the subcommittee itself would be reporting to the Commission. The question was raised whether the Subcommittee could make recommendations regarding legislation versus administrative action.

CCNS and NPS encouraged participants to be innovative and creative when generating both what they want and how the alternatives might be crafted to meet the goals. They should focus on what they want the overall plan to look like by: discussing what they want to achieve, developing ways they can reach these objectives, and addressing any problems. It was noted that legislative action is generally outside the purview of this subcommittee unless “minor” changes to legislation would enhance the general administrative solution developed by the Commission. At least one participant expressed concern of not being too limited at this point in the discussion.

In order to keep everyone informed throughout this process, subcommittee members who are on the Advisory Commission will verbally report to the AC on the subcommittee’s progress. Similarly, CCNS will distribute copies of the subcommittee’s meeting summaries to the District Commission.

### **Review key topics for the Preservation and Use Plan**

Participants reviewed the draft Table of Contents for the Preservation and Use Plan. It was indicated to them there would be large focus on sections 3-5, 9, and 12-16 in upcoming meetings.

### **Overview and Discuss Subcommittee Operating Procedures, Groundrules, and Workplan**

Participants were asked to submit comments on the groundrules and workplan to CBI before the January subcommittee meeting. Some participants requested that the important deadlines for the three ongoing NPS reports be noted in the workplan.

### **Next Meeting and Scheduling**

The group listed the following items for next month’s agenda:

- Discussion of Groundrules and Workplan
- Discussion of common principles for what the subcommittee wants to achieve
- CBI and CCNS/NPS working on compiling models from elsewhere to see comparable examples to this process (in January or February)

Participants scheduled the next subcommittee meeting for Tuesday January 12 from 9am-1pm at the library at the Center for Coastal Studies.

**Adjourned at 2:30pm**