

Cape Cod National Seashore
Subcommittee on Dune Shack District Preservation and Use Plan
MEETING 9

Provincetown Community Center
Wednesday, June 2
9am-1pm

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Subcommittee Members Present: Sally Adams, long-time dune shack family; Janet Armstrong, long-time dune shack family; Regina Binder, Representative of Provincetown Community Compact; Brenda Boleyn, Representative of CCNS Advisory Commission; Bill Burke, Cultural Resources Program Manager, NPS; Rob Costa, Art's Dune Tours; Rich Delaney, Chair of CCNS Advisory Commission; Hatty Fitts, Representative of OCARC; Bill Hammatt, Representative of CCNS Advisory Commission; Joyce Johnson, Representative of Truro; Austin Smith, Representative of Friends of CCNS; Paul Tasha, Representative of Provincetown; John Thomas, Representative of Provincetown.

Subcommittee Members Absent: Carole Carlson, Representative of Peaked Hill Trust; Richard Philbrick, Representative of CCNS Advisory Commission.

CCNS and NPS: George Price, Sandy Hamilton, Sue Moynihan

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

Members of the Public: Gail Cohen, Will Hapgood, Julie Schecter, Andrew Clemons, Peter Clemons, Marianne Benson

Action Items from Meeting:

- CBI to schedule workgroup meeting for public access chapter
- Bill to refine Cultural Landscapes chapter
- CBI to edit and fine tune all draft chapters
- CBI to draft chapter 4
- Need to define programmatic
- CBI to develop a progression of the stewardship and occupancy charts to show progress
- Group chapters 3, 9, and 10 in the order of the report
- CCNS/NPS to discuss subcommittee's criteria with the Regional Office
- CBI to verify that criteria is the same as in the public access chapter

Introductions and Welcome

Participants introduced themselves, including names and affiliations. CBI outlined the agenda for the meeting. It was noted that once meeting summaries and draft agendas 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 were invited to review the draft May meeting summary and submit any additions or corrections to it by the end of the week.

Participants received an overview of comments and questions from the public and Advisory Commission meetings on May 24. One participant commented that the subcommittee's presentation was well done. She added that, since this was the first time many Commission members had heard this information, the Commission was encouraged to review the subcommittee's progress report and come back to the subcommittee with any additional questions.

A comment was made that the goal of this process is to reach consensus or broad agreement, but if the subcommittee is unable to do so then the differences can be noted for the Commission through options or alternatives.

Review Draft Report: Stewardship and Occupancy

CBI presented an overview of the information to be drafted into the chapter on stewardship and occupancy. There were still significant details that needed clarification from subcommittee members. The presentation indicated that there were four main points to this chapter: framework for shack allocation among uses (Options A, B, and C), mechanisms for NPS use, criteria for selecting among applicants for a shack, and any other advice about categorizing shacks for residential vs. programmatic/public use.

For the framework, Option A was a division of use between residential and programmatic/public stewardship (about 50% each), both having goals for long-term leases and including medium-term leases as options but not divisions within the primary framework. Option B included a separate division of medium-term leases (about 20% of shacks for 3-5 years) to include either residential or programmatic/public use. Option C arose from discussions with some members and divided the shacks according to "dwell time", the amount of time that someone stays in a shack during a lease. The dwell time categories were: residential long stays, mixed residential/programmatic stays (hybrid), and programmatic/public short duration stays.

One participant stated that she preferred Option C, because stewardship wouldn't be tied to an individual type of steward and it was more reflective of the real dune lifestyle. Another participant asked who would be responsible for managing the shacks in the mixed duration category. Stacie responded that this would need to be determined. It could be individuals or non-profits, though it could be problematic for a non-profit if the shack was sometimes used

residentially without a structured process for allocation. The criteria for leasing of these shacks would need to highlight that they be used for both residential and programmatic/public uses.

Shack Categorization

A participant suggested that the subcommittee review the shack categorization chart which had been drafted by a subcommittee workgroup prior to the Advisory Commission meeting. She added that it was helpful in understanding Option C.

The draft shack categorization chart was shown, which identified the historic use, size, condition, amenities, and location/proximity of each shack.

One participant noted that the historical uses of the shacks were very similar to the current uses. A member of the workgroup commented that some of the functions of the chart were to indicate which shacks would be best suited for different uses, which needed maintenance, and which would be easier for long-term vs. short-term use.

A participant asked how Option C would be administered. Another participant responded that Zara's shack was an example of the mixed duration use. She explained that Zara has a lease with NPS and a separate agreement with PHT, allowing them a certain number of weeks in exchange for maintenance. Another participant added that Zara's shack was a successful model for mixed duration that should be presented in the report as a case study to show various options of dwell time/use.

It was suggested that mixed duration could function mechanistically through subleases. Bill responded that subleasing was not an easy process with either special agreements or leases, and they would require the Director's approval. George commented that the subcommittee could recommend the concept of mixed duration and leave the mechanism to be determined later. A participant asked if they could use a different term than sublease but essentially have it be the same idea. Another participant asked if there could be a non-profit set up to manage 2-5 year stays. George responded that it would depend on the parameters, but it could be in the realm of possibilities. It was noted that if a non-profit was issued a special agreement for a mixed duration shack, then it would go through the non-competitive process. George added that the NPS headquarters would have to consent to the regional office panel's decisions on special agreements.

A participant asked what the difference was between an agreement for 5 years with a 5 year renewal option and a non-competitive 10 year lease. Sue explained that agreements are with organizations with a direct visitor benefit and that do not need large repairs, and leases are more primarily used with organizations for properties needing major repairs. She gave an example of the Kugel-Gips House, a CCNS property in Wellfleet, which needed a long lease because of the amount of repairs that needed to be done. She added that the dune shacks would not need \$50,000-100,000 of work, and this was a different territory for CCNS to have a non-competitive lease of a building in good condition.

One participant asked if PHT would be issued agreements or leases. Sue clarified that OCARC has a five year agreement which has been extended to the end of this process, and PHT has an annual Special Use Permit and pays rent. Another participant asked if non-profits could keep on extending the five year renewals. Sue responded that they would need to apply again after the five year renewal period, but nothing was held against them as a previous agreement holder.

Framework Options

Having now been presented with Option C, participants were asked for their preference between Options A, B, and C.

Most participants agreed against Option A and focused on Options B and C. One participant favored Option B, because it incorporated medium-term leases as a tool but added that she liked the dwell time concept. It was suggested that the framework could reflect 40% residential long-duration, 40% programmatic/public short-term stays, and 20% mixed use hybrid of residential and programmatic.

Another participant commented that there was more flexibility to have up to 10% going to either residential long-duration or programmatic/public short-duration, instead of 20% assigned to hybrid use category. Some other members agreed.

One participant commented that members seemed to be confused between stewardship and dwell time. She clarified that for Option C the duration addressed the dwell time in the shack over the course of a year, rather than total number of years of the agreement/lease. Another participant explained that the idea of dwell time came from reviewing the traditional uses of the shacks. She added that this was also related to the criteria to help CCNS determine who should be granted each shack.

Another participant suggested that the subcommittee should list what they believe to be the appropriate use for each shack, since the leasing decisions would be made at the regional office. Stacie clarified that George and future Superintendents would decide the category for each shack (residential or programmatic/public), and the regional office would then decide which applicant would be issued an agreement or lease for the shack. A participant commented that what the subcommittee identifies as an appropriate use for an individual shack may not be that helpful 10 or 20 years in the future. George added that the subcommittee could be more prescriptive about the shacks, but he is more concerned about the percentages per category and that they are clearly delineated.

A participant stated that including the chart of how the shacks are currently being used should be helpful to NPS. Another participant suggested having this information and the previously mentioned case studies as an appendix to the report for clarification on how the subcommittee developed the criteria.

It was noted that the more prescriptive the subcommittee is with their report, the more guidance they would be giving to NPS, but there would also be less flexibility over time.

Criteria

Participants were informed that there are five standard criteria contained in any RFP for a lease according to Section 18.8 of Park regulations. These criteria are:

1. The compatibility of the proposal's intended use of the leased property with respect to preservation, protection, and visitor enjoyment of the park;
2. The financial capability of the offeror to carry out the terms of the lease;
3. The experience of the offeror demonstrating the managerial capability to carry out the terms of the lease;
4. The ability and commitment of the offeror to conduct its activities in the park area in an environmentally enhancing manner through, among other programs and action, energy conservation, waste reduction, and recycling; and
5. Any other criteria the RFP may specify.

Also it stated that if the property to be leased is an historic property, the compatibility of the proposal with the historic qualities of the property is to be an additional selection criterion.

A participant asked who has the discretion over weighing the criteria. Bill responded that they would all be weighted evenly, to his understanding. Another participant added that criteria 1 and 5 could help support the consideration of the subcommittee's criteria. It was also noted that the subcommittee will not need to include any criteria in their list which are already written within these five required criteria.

A participant asked about the financial capability of an applicant in comparison to an applicant's ability to perform the maintenance. George responded that if there is a lease for a certain amount of money or an agreement for repairing the shack, then the applicant would need to be able to demonstrate that they could pay all bills. He added that the lessee for Kugel-Gips house had to prove his financial ability and the ability to perform the maintenance/repairs, including some in-kind contributions. Another participant added that they could note the ability and knowledge to maintain the shacks under the subcommittee's criteria.

Participants reviewed their suggested criteria for long-term individual leases. This list included:

- Extensive experience or history of involvement with the particular shack;
- Extensive experience or history of involvement with the District;
- Ability to pay fair market rent;
- Ability to perform preservation maintenance on the Dune Shacks;
- Knowledge of and attention to the remote and fragile environment of the District;
- Desire and commitment to engage in the district as a whole;
- Desire and commitment to protecting and promoting the values (practices and beliefs) of the historic district and perpetuation of tradition and cultural identity;
- Availability to use the shack or have a proxy use it.

One participant commented that the phrase "extensive experience with the particular shack" would exclude new families from the shacks. It was explained that this was intended for the long-term families and their kin who have been out in the dunes for years. Another participant commented that experience in the shacks could be proven and documented.

Participants reviewed their suggested criteria for long-term organizational lease or agreement. This list included:

- Ability to pay fair market value rent;
- Demonstrates the managerial capability to carry out the terms of the lease;
- Experience preserving and managing historic resources in remote and fragile environments;
- Experience partnering with the National Park Service;
- Experience managing programs to meet federal objectives;
- Ability to carry out programmatic activity with direct visitor benefit, developed in partnership with the NPS, that advances the mission of CCNS and protects the values of the historic district;
- Ability to provide a meaningful educational component to its program and be available to members of the interested public;
- The ability and commitment to conduct its activities in the park area in an environmentally enhancing manner through, among other programs and actions, energy conservation, waste reduction, and recycling;
- The compatibility of the proposal with the historic qualities of the property.

Participants reviewed their suggested criteria for medium-term individual leases. This list included:

- Ability to perform preservation maintenance on rustic structures and knowledge of surrounding environment;
- Ability to pay fair market rent;
- Desire and commitment to protecting and promoting the values of the historic District and perpetuation of tradition
- Desire and commitment to engage in the district as a whole;
- Availability to use the shack or have a proxy use it.

NOTE

- Artists, long-term dune dwellers, and the general public given opportunity for selection during the process
- Opportunity for new entrants into the values, culture, character, and practices of the District

It was explained that it doesn't list "extensive experience" under medium-term leases to allow for new people to come into the District. Also it was noted that the suggested medium-term leasing criteria was much broader to allow for more possibilities.

A participant suggested that there needed to be a criterion requiring contribution to public access for long-term individual leases. It was explained that this was covered by the criterion on desire to engage the District as a whole, and also there was more included on this topic in the public access chapter. A participant suggested that the criteria and the public access chapter should both reflect that the long-term stewards would need to provide a public value. Another participant suggested that there should be additional criteria for long-term individual leases to ensure that the current long-term families would be able to stay in the shacks as long as possible.

One participant was concerned that the first criterion for individual long-term leases was too narrow, because it referred to experience and involvement in a particular shack. She added that the value is the use of shacks and the shack environment, and they already have criteria that allow for specific families to have a generous opportunity to use the shacks. Another participant commented that she was fine with this criterion because it would perpetuate the significance of the historic District, but she was not sure that it could be written with the phrase “particular shack”. Another participant added that the particular shack phrase was important, because they should not be trying to displace people from a shack in which they have had a specific history. She also quoted the Wolfe report stating, “Long-term dune dwellers express considerable pride regarding their shacks. They love their own shacks. Many I spoke to complimented other people’s shacks, and then explained what features made their own shack the best of the bunch”. The participant added that the connection to a particular shack was at the core of the cultural value of the District. Many other participants agreed with keeping the particular shack phrase in the criterion. One participant added that as long as people kept up their responsibilities and use/interest, then it would not be more valuable to the District to make the process more arbitrary. Another participant suggested it could be rephrased “put emphasis on a particular shack”, which would indicate that there was a preference to a particular shack but would not be specifically tied to a shack.

One participant asked for NPS/CCNS’s reactions to the subcommittee’s criteria and if they thought these criteria would be acceptable to NPS leadership. George responded that he thought that the subcommittee was on the right track and putting the building blocks in place for defining the goals of the District. He added that the draft report was still vague on the contribution of individual residents, but he felt that the subcommittee was in a good place. Also George reminded the group that the language needed to continue beyond this group, and he recommended again that there should be a standing subcommittee on the dune shacks, which would have a yearly review to make sure that goals were being met and to have consistency for NPS/CCNS. Sue noted that there’s a lack of precedence to refer to on this topic. She added that she was concerned about the first criterion, because this is supposed to be a business arrangement without favoritism. Sue noted that the discussion had shifted from long-term use to long-term users. She suggested that the subcommittee should quote the Wolfe report even though NPS did not approve the TCP designation. Bill responded that the first criterion should exist in some form, but that it would only account for a small value when reviewing the full list of criteria. Sandy asked if it would be helpful to the subcommittee for Bill, George, Sue and herself to discuss the criteria with the NPS regional office before the next meeting. The subcommittee agreed that this would be helpful to have input from the regional office.

A participant stated that he also noticed the shift from referring to long-term use to long-term users. He reminded the subcommittee that they needed to be able to sell their report to the public as well as NPS, and he was not confident that they would reach a consensus if the criteria supported the same long-term families keeping their shacks in perpetuity. It was noted that the public access options should be made clearer in the criteria for all leases and agreements.

Public Comment

A member of the public commented that they needed a clear definition of the term “programmatic”. She explained that PHT has been running a program for 20 years, but it has not been recognized as a program. She added that one way of getting around some of the issues discussed today as an alternative would be the mixed use hybrid approach, which PHT supports. This would also be a way of keeping long-term families in the shacks as caretakers of a non-profit shack for a period of time, fulfilling different needs. She added that some people get attached to the shacks very quickly, so it’s not easy for them to give up their places either. Then she suggested the Watson-Schmidt shack as another example for a case study. It has a historic lease, but the family thinks it’s best when it’s used and encourages people to go in and use it when they’re not there so that it is well maintained. She stated that the Wolfe report was a phenomenal piece of research for the families who were there, but it is incomplete. She warned that the subcommittee should not rely on the Wolfe report alone to embody the history of the District, because the dune shack history is broadly based and not singularly attached to a few families. She stated that she would love to see the long-term families stay in their shacks, but the subcommittee needs to pay attention to the shacks for which the future of use is unclear.

Another member of the public stated that he was very confused by the term “stipulation”. He said that the best definition that he had heard by Andrew Ringle, former NPS Superintendent, was “an agreement with owners”. He commented that there were owners out in the dunes and the term “long-term residents” had removed the concept of ownership and had powdered over the arrangement. He stated that he understands the concerns around ownership, but he wants subcommittee members to understand that the shacks were taken from people and they fought for them. He added that the reason the subcommittee exists is because of the owners, and the model for when the shacks were leased was a stipulation. He asked what a stipulation was in the beginning of CCNS. He noted that he is not talking about taking ownership back, but he resented hearing long-term residents as being “in the way” of progress. He added that non-profits have been out there but haven’t gone through years of costly litigation with the government. He restated that the term “long-term residents” does not cover the history of them as owners of the shacks.

Sue responded to the question about the term “stipulation”. She stated that the way it was defined was as a “stipulation of settlement” using the phrase “in full compensation for the just taking of”, to acknowledge the concept of taking the shacks away. The member of the public explained that he wanted the concept of ownership to be noted that it did at one time exist. He added that the subcommittee exists because it’s part of the problem that they’re trying to resolve.

A third member of the public commented that she no longer supported the dune dwellers and instead supported those who she felt have experienced real injustice and tragedy, but most of them have passed. She suggested that Joyce Johnson should have her own shack or should receive Ray Wells shack. She added that dune dwellers should be able to choose who receives their shacks after they pass. She stated that she supports the Vevers, who she felt had a right to rebuild or have the use of a dune shack. She commented that many shacks were destroyed by the CCNS, and she suggested that more shacks be built for the non-profits or rebuilt. She stated that the subcommittee was illegitimate because there was not a representative from the lessees: Dunns, Beebes, Schusters. Also she commented on the Historic Register status and stated that all

of the shacks have been altered and moved in some way, so the Del Deo shack should not be excluded from the Historic Register.

It was noted that everyone was allowed to come to these subcommittee meetings, as they have been open to the public.

Options C1 and C2

CBI developed new framework charts based on comments at this meeting: options C1 and C2. For Option C1, the stewardship was divided into long-term families and kinships, interested individuals and kinship groups, and long-term organizations with approximate percentages of 40%, 20%, and 40% accordingly. The duration for long-term families was 20 years, for interested individuals was medium-term, and for long-term organizations was a goal of long-term, but medium-term by agreement. Then the chart indicated dwell time as being mostly long with potential mixed duration for both long-term families and kinships and interested individuals and kinship groups. For long-term organizations, the dwell time was short duration. It was explained that this chart showed the possibility of a non-profit having an individual as their shack's caretaker for 2-3 months per year. It was also noted that the primary emphasis was still on the two long-term groups and the medium-term group.

Option C2 differed from Option C1 in that it allowed for some medium-term leases under each stewardship category. It also identified the interested individuals and kinship groups as having a mixed duration for dwell time split between residential and programmatic uses (hybrid option), while the long-term families would only have long duration stays and the long-term organizations would only have short duration stays.

Participants were asked if they wanted a category for medium-term or if the medium-term option should be available under each type of stewardship. One participant was worried that there was not an existing mechanism to support a hybrid duration. Bill responded that currently they are informal agreements and suggested that they could be too complicated for the Park to continue doing. Bill added that he was unsure that it would work to just have verbal agreements between the individual and the non-profit concerning dwell time, such as the current agreement between Zara and PHT, because if there's a dispute between the involved parties then it could be problematic. Another participant reminded the group that George did not want a framework that would not have allowed for Eugene O'Neill to come into the shacks. CBI explained that they're trying to get more clarification from the group on the middle category by showing different options in C1 and C2.

It was asked hypothetically whether an individual and a non-profit—such as Zara and PHT—could compete as a joint unit and cosign for a lease. Bill responded that it could be possible. It was also asked if it would be more successful for a non-profit to apply for a non-competitive lease, and then have an agreement with an individual to be caretaker of the shack for a number of months. Another participant responded that a non-profit could not have a residential situation. Sue responded that the overarching trust concept would not work, but having an individual as a caretaker possibly could since there are already similar relationships in the NPS. Bill commented

that it would not be easy for a non-profit to have an agreement to the shack and then give time to a long-term family member. He added that there could be numerous people who think that they should be able to have caretaker agreements with the non-profits.

A participant referred back to the shack categorization chart and indicated how the historic use is very similar to the shacks' uses today. She commented that they need to find a way to perpetuate the benchmark of mixed use. Subcommittee members agreed that there are multiple types of mixed use, including mixed use across all shacks and mixed use within an individual shack, and this is a very important character of the District. One participant suggested that within the criteria they could state that perpetual mixed use would be supporting the goals of the District.

A few subcommittee members asked to see the progression of the framework charts to see how they got to this point, and noted that they will need some simplicity in the report for the Commission and NPS.

The group agreed that they valued mixed use across shacks and within shacks, but that it would be clearer to allocate shacks into categories based on type of use and duration rather than dwell time. Therefore, the original Option B was highlighted as the provisional choice of the group.

Review Draft Report: Public Access

The subcommittee reviewed the revised draft chapter of the report on public access. This clarified public access activities and divided them into the categories of (a) interpretation, education and outreach, (b) day access, and (c) short-term occupancy.

A suggestion was made that the phrase "all long-term stewards" should be changed to "all stewards". It was noted that it does not list environmental/natural resource assistance as an option, but this could be listed under the criteria. A participant suggested that there could be a public event to help clean up the dune shack area, so it could be listed as a public access option and contributing to environmental knowledge. Another participant suggested that an event like this could be linked to the Friends of the CCNS as well. One participant suggested writing that the list of options was "by example only" so that it would not be limiting and other options could be developed in the future.

Participants were asked if they agreed with the expectation to contribute to category A and encouragement to contribute to category B. One participant responded that he felt applicants would be enhancing their competitiveness with additional access options listed in their proposals. He supported criteria such that the more public access activities an applicant could engage in, the more attractive the applicant would be.

Bill responded that traditional use of the dune shacks was very private, so he did not think that it would be appropriate to encourage open houses for shacks with individual long-term leases. He added that he would not want to transform the mix of uses and force a type of use with a lot of public access, because it would be contrary to history. A participant agreed that it would create a dilemma for a long-term user to choose between their privacy and their shack. She added that she

would support public access as an element but not “the more, the better”, because privacy and solitude is a major aspect of the dune culture, especially with long-term use.

Another participant asked who was considered to be “the public”, since many of the long-term families have friends and acquaintances that use their shacks. One participant responded that everyone is a member of the public, but if someone stays in a shack by invitation, this is not public access. A participant commented that access by invitation is done by the non-profits as well, and they serve a myriad of people. Another participant commented that anyone could go out there on a dune tour or go to the beach, so there is no need to have open public access inside the shacks. An additional participant reminded the group that it’s a small area of land with a small number of shacks, so there is only a certain amount of people who can be out there at once.

A participant noted that since public access will be an important issue, it might make sense for the NPS to consider reconstructing shacks that were destroyed, allowing for more public access. Bill responded that it was an option but typically reconstruction is not desirable in the NPS. He suggested that it be noted in the report as an option/opportunity. Another participant suggested that it could be a public access option to learn how to construct a shack and could use volunteer labor as has been done in the past.

CBI asked for a few people to volunteer for a phone meeting to refine the chapter and come back to the subcommittee with fine-tuned options. Rich, Rob, Janet, Sally, Ginny, and Julie volunteered.

Review Draft Report: Cultural Landscape Issues

Participants reviewed the draft chapter of the report concerning cultural landscape issues. One participant stated that there was no evidence of people in the chapter, and it should also reflect the people and not just the land. Bill agreed that he could add more information about people to the chapter. A participant commented that it was problematic to state that gas-powered generators were not historic, since they have been used in multiple shacks for years. Bill responded that it was written as an attempt to prevent all shacks from becoming too modern. Some participants asked how loud the gas-powered generators are and if they affect the solitude of the dunes. One participant responded that you could hear it about a quarter of a mile away, and some participants responded that this was too loud. Another participant suggested that there be some accommodation to allow the generators but with some restrictions on how long per day or time of day to use them. A comment was made that the generators are much quieter than boomboxes from the public. Another participant suggested that dune dwellers could build a small doghouse around it to help muffle the noise, and added that generators can be necessary for the shacks. Bill stated that he would verify that the amenities in this chapter were comparable to those in the physical structures chapter.

A participant asked CBI about the differentiation between chapters 3, 9, and 10, and if they could be combined into one chapter. CBI responded that they are issues that would be included in the EA. Bill stated that the chapters should not be combined, but could be grouped in the order of the report.

Next Steps and Process

Participants were asked how they would like to move forward with edits and comments. One participant stated that the report would not be completed in time and would be rushed due to the CCNS deadlines. Another participant agreed that there has been a huge amount of work done and valuable time given by the subcommittee, and felt that there was not enough time left to do it right. A third participant stated that it would be doable for the subcommittee to get comments in on all of the chapters within a week.

Sandy explained extending the deadline wasn't possible, as NPS is waiting for the Commission recommendation in order to complete the research for the EA. She added that if the subcommittee could not come to an agreement on all points then it would be fine for them to give options and preferred alternatives to the Commission. One participant commented that this has been a 50 year problem, and the seasonal economy makes it more difficult for subcommittee members, working multiple summer jobs, to attend any more meetings right now. Sandy explained that there's a finite amount of money available, and when she raised the issue in her office she didn't receive a positive response for more funds or more time. Another participant asked what would happen if the Commission has questions or modifications to the subcommittee's report. A Commission member explained that if the subcommittee reaches consensus on their recommendations, then the Commission will likely accept them. It was also stated that there will be a public notice for the Commission's July 19 meeting so that everyone is aware and can attend.

It was asked what would happen to any subcommittee edits to the report made on June 24, because the subcommittee would need to agree to the final report and should try not to do that in absentia. A participant requested that the report be finalized by July 6 so that it could be presented to the Provincetown Board of Selectmen on July 12. Another participant suggested a final meeting on the week of June 28. CBI stated that they would review their schedules and contact the subcommittee as soon as possible about potential dates and times for an additional and final subcommittee meeting.

Public Comment

A member of the public commented that Eugene O'Neill has been referenced multiple times, and he owned his shack. He added that it's important to remember that O'Neill was more than a passing individual. The member of the public also had concerns about a path being used by the public between Zara's and Fowler's shacks that was destroying the beach. He asked that the non-profits look into this with access issues. Bill responded that someone at CCNS could discuss the issue with him and the non-profits to help resolve the problem.

Another member of the public stated that the dune shack area is also historically part of the NPS, and would now be condos if it was not protected from development. She acknowledged that public access should be determined by whether individuals are contributing some public

involvement to provide a better benefit to the District and not by having the public be able to walk through every shack.

A third member of the public asked Sue why she has stated that there is nothing in writing about the dune dwellers being good for the District. Sue responded that she did not recall that statement but that she thought it was important for the subcommittee to be sure to articulate that the dune dwellers are good for the District.

Adjourned at 1:15pm