

Cape Cod National Seashore
Subcommittee on Dune Shack District Preservation and Use Plan
MEETING THREE
Center for Coastal Studies Library
January 12, 9am – 1pm

Draft Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Subcommittee Members: Sally Adams, Janet Armstrong, Regina Binder, Brenda Boleyn, Bill Burke, Carole Carlson, Rob Costa, Rich Delaney, Hatty Fitts, William Hammatt, Joyce Johnson, Richard Philbrick, Austin Smith, Paul Tasha, John Thomas

NPS/CCNS: George Price, Sue Moynihan, Jackie Katzmire, Trevor Staubli

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

Members of the Public: Peter Clemons, Kaimi Lum (Provincetown Banner), Mildred & Nat Champlin

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 January agenda or draft December 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 PEPC (Planning, Environment, and Public Comment) website (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/CACO>).

Preliminaries

Participants received the EA Scoping Meeting Summary produced by CBI to summarize comments submitted by the public during and following the scoping meeting held on October 19, 2009. All transcripts from the public scoping meeting, correspondence that people submitted through PEPC, and letters that people sent to NPS were documented verbatim into the database. Then all of these correspondences were broken down into comments and codified based on categories that CBI created reflecting the Dune Shacks issues and topics. CBI reviewed all of the comments and wrote concern statements, which summarized the range of viewpoints, with representative quotes pulled from the comments themselves.

One participant asked if there was a way to review all correspondence, and NPS informed the group that there would be hard copies of the entire list of comments, as well as a way to view them on the PEPC website. CBI and NPS agreed to follow up on this so that subcommittee members could review all correspondence.

Participants were also given copies of an updated list of ongoing reports concerning the Dune Shacks that included dates for comments to the Seashore, a compiled Timeline of the Dune Shacks, and a draft list of “Lost Shacks” and how they were lost. CBI welcomed comments and additional revisions.

Participants were asked to confirm future subcommittee meeting dates. Meetings were scheduled for Thursday February 11, Friday March 12, Monday April 5, and Wednesday May 12, all from 9am-1pm at the Center for Coastal Studies. Participants also agreed to reserve Thursday March 18, 9am-1pm, as a tentative snow date in case the February or March meeting needed to be cancelled due to bad weather.

Overview and Discuss Draft “Vision of Use”

CBI provided participants with a draft “Vision of Use” statement, drawn from the statements participants made on the value of the district during the November meeting. to try to pull out some common values of the Dune Shacks. This draft statement was meant to offer a starting point for a statement of shared values that the subcommittee might use to guide their deliberations, and potentially to include in their report.

One participant noted how the draft vision statement reflected many of the same thoughts from the previous subcommittee reports.

Participants made suggestions for revisions to the vision statement. They agreed to keep the statement concise, rather than overly detailed, and to keep the statement open for revisiting and alteration if needed as the process proceeded. Specific suggestions for changes included:

- Clarifying that the bullet points were in no particular order
- Adding the concept of guardianship
- Adding “owners” to include the Malicoats shack
- Including the greater understanding of nature as a value
- Adding a sentence about the need for partnership between the Seashore and the users of the district

CBI committed to revise the vision statement to reflect these suggestions, send an updated draft to participants for approval. It was also noted that a revised version of the draft preservation of use plan table of contents, which would include new documents like the vision statement, expanded timeline, etc., would be sent to participants for approval.

Public Comment

A member of the public prepared an analysis of the previous subcommittee reports, which he distributed and presented to the subcommittee. He asked the group to review the three former subcommittee reports and draw from them in ways fitting their parameters and limitations. This led to some discussion about the previous subcommittee processes and reports. Many participants agreed that the subcommittee should be aware of the former subcommittees' reports, and use them as appropriate. Participants also noted that, although the previous sub-committee recommendations were not enacted, their value as resources for current decision-making was a testament to the importance of their own work.

Overview of NPS mechanisms for Dune Shacks

CCNS Sue Moynihan presented an overview of current NPS mechanisms in place for the Dune Shacks as well as potential NPS mechanisms, which could be used for the Dune Shacks in the future. The goal was to give an overview of the characteristics of common mechanisms, for the group to keep in mind as it explores its desired plan for use and occupancy for the future. Sue stressed a desire to work with the subcommittee to try to find ways to fulfill their vision for use of the shacks within the constraints of NPS.

In walking through the existing and potential mechanisms, CCNS clarified some of the existing flexibility and also limits of each, and also how some of these rules changed over time. It was noted that none of the current mechanisms offer an option of a term "in perpetuity".

Participants asked CCNS for CFR cites for the mechanisms and information about incidental business permits, which is what Art's Dune Tours operates under. They also asked for some clarification on the flexibility of these mechanisms, including what decisions could be made by the Seashore, which went to the Region, and which required approval of Headquarters. Some questions were also asked about the use of funds, and CCNS clarified that some fees stay at the Seashore to pay for administering that program, where others (such as franchise fees) would be split 80% local / 20% to headquarters.

In relation to the mechanisms, one participant stated concerns about undergoing necessary and expensive maintenance projects on her shack when it was not certain how much longer she would live there. Other participants agreed that this is an ongoing concern for them as well.

Participants asked again about other models, and CCNS responded that this research was underway, with a goal of presenting some case studies at the February subcommittee meeting. A few participants were asked to reach out to their contacts for additional information that could also help to inform the subcommittee of similar processes. Participants agreed to first focus on what they want for the future of the Dune Shacks, and then brainstorm how it could work with the NPS mechanisms in the future.

Brainstorm/discussion on shack maintenance and repair

CCNS Bill Burke presented the section of the draft NPS Historic Structures Report concerning shack maintenance and repair. He clarified that CCNS had drafted a list of Character-Defining Features (CDF) for each shacks, such as the roofline of C-Scape, as well as some CDFs for the District as a whole. These CDFs are listed as part of the Historic Structures Report, which recommends that CDFs be preserved to the maximum extent possible in maintenance, rehabilitation, and repair decisions.

Participants requested a list of the CDF of all shacks to use as a reference tool moving forward.

Some questions were asked about the Seashore's view on some detailed issues, such as the use of insulated windows (which the Seashore did not look favorably upon.) The group agreed that a smaller group should help to draft some more detailed recommendations on maintenance and repair of the shacks as well as the implementation of new technology for the next meeting. Ginny, Sally, and Hatty agreed to participate.

Hand out and briefly discuss format of Dune Shack "Matrix"

CBI gave out a draft matrix that attempted to compile key information about the individual shacks in a simple format. Participants were asked to submit any comments on this draft to CBI prior to the February subcommittee meeting. One participant asked that the end dates under "Existing Agreements" be exact instead of just the years. This document would be a tool that participants could refer to throughout the process moving forward.

Overview and Discuss Subcommittee Operating Procedures, Groundrules, and Workplan

Participants reviewed the operating procedures, groundrules and visual map of the workplan. One participant requested that the groundrules include a statement that subcommittee members could pursue legislative action independently (talk to your Congress person, sue, etc.) and also about their option to dissent. Many participants were concerned about the objectives, which had been developed by NPS prior to the Scoping meeting as the objectives of the EA process, and it was decided to remove them from the groundrules.

Members also suggested a new title, a clarification of what it meant to abstain, a request that participants clarify if they are speaking for themselves alone rather than on behalf of their constituents, and a correction of the dates in the timeline at the end.

Participants further requested that CBI date each document handout in the future to ensure accuracy and to provide revisions in redline strikeouts so that all edits are easily recognized.

Public Comment

A member of the public questioned the practicality of a request that shack users notify NPS when making repairs on a shack, given the need to act quickly to respond to changing conditions in the dunes.

Another member of the public reminded the group that there used to be a group of shack users called the Greater Beach Owners Association, and the word “ownership” needed to be addressed by the subcommittee. Many of them had put an innumerable amount of money, time and energy into the shacks by owning and maintaining them.

Closing Thoughts

Participants were asked to start brainstorming about what they want and what the preservation and use plan would do for them. Participants would answer questions about their thoughts on public access via a web mechanism, which CBI would summarize as a starting point for discussion at the February subcommittee meeting.

Adjourned at 1pm