

**FORT MONROE
FEDERAL AREA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
March 21, 2008 ~ Meeting Minutes**

The Fort Monroe Federal Area Development Authority (FMFADA) meeting was held on March 21, 2008, at the Bay Breeze Community Center on Fort Monroe.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Call to Order and Opening Comments. The Honorable L. Preston Bryant, Jr., Chairman.

Chairman Bryant called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

The Chairman started the meeting by announcing that there was a very full agenda for the day's meeting.

B. Roll Call. Chairman Bryant

Present:

Secretary Viola Baskerville, Dr. Alvin Bryant, Secretary L. Preston Bryant, Jr., Marc Follmer for Robert Crouch, Delegate Tom Gear, Catharine Gilliam, Deputy Secretary Lynnette Hammond for Secretary Patrick Gottschalk, Mr. Robert Harper, Dr. Wayne Lett, John Quarstein, Robert Scott, Tommy Thompson, Secretary Jody Wagner.

Executive Director Bill Armbruster, Conover Hunt, Melissa Magowan for Army Liaison Colonel Jason Evans, Hampton City Council Liaisons Joe Spencer and Dr. Charlie Sapp were also present.

Absent:

Dr. Rex Ellis, Delegate Phil Hamilton, Dr. Kanata Jackson, Senator Mamie Locke and Senator John Miller.

C. Approval of Minutes from the February 13, 2008, Meeting

A quorum of Authority voting members was achieved at 1:34 p.m.

MOTION. Chairman Bryant moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Minutes were adopted unanimously.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Bryant asked to proceed quickly to the open public comment. With no public comment offered at that time, Chairman Bryant mentioned there would be another public comment opportunity at the end of the meeting, and moved on to introduce Mr. Bill Armbruster as the new Executive Director of the FMFADA and invited him to begin his presentation. The final segment of the Public Comment included input from four individuals. (Appendix I)

III. REPORTS & BRIEFINGS

A. Executive Director's Report. Bill Armbruster, Executive Director

Mr. Armbruster thanked the Board and remarked that he considers it an honor and privilege to serve as Executive Director to the FMFADA. He summarized the goals of the planning: To protect the historic place and keep it vital; open it up for public usage; establish a large-scale open space park; seek economic sustainability; and to allow new development within strict limits. He stated that this is a unique opportunity to preserve and present Fort Monroe's significance to local, regional, state and national audiences. Mr. Armbruster remarked that the key to the future of Fort Monroe is based on community cooperation. He said over the past few days he has met with the following: the Mayor of Hampton, the Hampton City Manager, Director of Finance and many city personnel working on the planning. He has also met with most of the Hampton Citizen appointees for the FMFADA as well as key state officials and senior staff. Mr. Armbruster stated he has also met with other stakeholder agencies as the Citizens for a Fort Monroe

National Park, and some of the Army Commanders on Fort Monroe. He stressed that all the agencies need to work together and that this process is a team effort.

Immediate priorities. Mr. Armbruster listed what the immediate priorities of the FMFADA will be. First is to complete the revised reuse plan for June approval. The HUD application must be completed for August submission, and that Rick Russ and David Knisely were working on it. He added that we must adhere to the timeline in all the efforts to include the Reuse Plan, HUD documents and the Programmatic Agreement.

Action steps. Executive Director Armbruster summed up what his action steps as the new Executive Director were to include moving the FMFADA office to Old Quarters #1 on Fort Monroe. He stated that this would provide more staff and meeting space as well as adequate parking. He added that a Deputy Director and Project Manager position were advertised on the FMFADA and state website, and were to be filled in early May. He thanked Conover Hunt for her past 10 months work as Interim Director, and said that her leadership during that time kept the project moving forward at a critical juncture. Mr. Armbruster commented that the transition from the City of Hampton acting as fiscal agent to the Commonwealth was fully underway, and thanked the City of Hampton for serving so well in the past year.

Financial Report. (Appendix II) Mr. Armbruster explained that all FMFADA expenses are in line as he referred to the current financial report. He said as of 2/29 the FMFADA has used 41.5% of its annual FY2008 state allocation, and that he hoped the fiscal agent transfer was accomplished before asking for another draw from the state. He added that the State allocation for FY 2009 is \$922,000 with the plan being to fill in with additional OEA grant funds. The current OEA amendment is \$1.42 million for January 2008 to December 2008. This amendment was submitted to OEA in January and is under review.

New Consultant Firms. Mr. Armbruster said they have added two new consulting firms. Economic Research Associates will be accomplishing the tourism study for \$95,000. Bay Area Economics will work with Blount Hunter on economic updates and pinpointing costs of future maintenance and operations for \$95,000. Both expenses are covered in the existing budget.

Public Affairs/Issues. Mr. Armbruster described the FMFADA website (www.fmfmada.com) as the main communication vehicle for the Authority. The site allows the public to track the planning openly, gives the FMFADA a voice to address community questions/concerns, and will eliminate confusion.

Closing Remarks: Mr. Armbruster concluded his report by saying that change is very much a part of not only our national discourse but regionally and locally as well. "We tend to get nervous about changing. We are here today because BRAC 2005 has directed change for the future of Fort Monroe." He added that we should not fear change but embrace it and work together to insure that although Fort Monroe's mission is changing, future generations will look back and say we were good stewards of the incredible historic legacy and community that is Fort Monroe.

B. Update on BRAC timeline. David Knisely, Garrity and Knisely

BRAC Attorney David Knisely presented an updated BRAC timeline along with a chart depicting the Reuse Plan & HUD Application Key Dates and Milestones. (Appendix III) Mr. Knisely stated that if everything goes according to plans we could start a probable disposition in mid 2009. He added by mid 2009 the FMFADA should be in a position to prepare for predisposition, and that there is a need to continue on track. He stated "we are where we need to be." He stated the HUD application will be in accordance with the Reuse plan, and that he will be looking for the Board to approve it. Mr. Knisely said he would then proceed with a major item, which is the public process. This must be done to meet BRAC specific requirements. Knisely commented that the Draft Reuse Plan should be on the FMFADA website at the end of April in order to be available for public comments.

C. Update on New Scenario. Victor Dover and Amy Groves, Dover, Kohl and Partners

Mr. Dover began his presentation by going over key concepts. He stated that Dover Kohl's goal was to reuse and simplify the original Draft Reuse Plan. Then they would accept public comment on a working document that will be posted on the web. The difficult part he said is that this must be posted on the web

by the third week of April, and that was a short amount of time to put a draft out. He directed the Board to the 11 x 17 handouts (Appendix IV). Referencing a question that Dr. Lett had at the February 13th Board meeting, Victor Dover stated that the Diagram of Map #2 answered Dr. Lett's previous question to produce a map that shows existing construction next to new construction. He then directed the Board to Map #3 which combined both the management zones with the Scenarios. He added that Dover Kohl would work on filling in the details and answering questions i.e., parking needs and green space. In an effort to get the Reuse Plan in a simpler form; Dover Kohl plans on doing this by using three basic tools: an Executive Summary, the Reuse Plan and a Technical Support Manual. Mr. Dover's presentation outlined several anticipated revisions and directions, as well as examples how different details would apply to each Scenario with Scenario 1 used as an example. His presentation also portrayed the Wherry Housing area's development with three different options: with a new neighborhood, existing conditions, and extension of the open park space. Mr. Dover ended his power point presentation posing two questions to the Board. The first of which is if the Board thought the three-document approach was right. The second question was if the Board agreed with the "uncommitted land reserve" approach as applied to the Wherry Housing area, with the "future use of Wherry area to be determined later?" At that Mr. Dover concluded his presentation. Chairman Bryant asked the Board if they had any questions.

Questions/comment: Delegate Gear asked where we were at as far as the National Park Service's Recon Study. Response from Chairman Bryant: The Recon Study was supposed to be done in late February or early March. He stated he has called them to find out the status, and will try to call them again. He does not know if the National Park Service understands the urgency of the timing of the report, and that he has not heard back from them. Mr. Harper stated that the three document approach proposed by Dover Kohl seemed like a reasonable approach. Secretary Bryant asked if the three document approach could be put on the website with explanations for public comment. Mr. Tommy Thompson agreed with that but stated we would need to change the level of detail.

Secretary Bryant to Victor Dover: Is the three document approach considered acceptable based on Dover Kohl's experience? Mr. Dover replied that in his experience the three document approach is acceptable in that one larger document takes too long to get through. He stated that this is a living, working document that you update as you go.

Secretary Bryant to David Knisely: Would this approach subscribe to DOD? Response from Knisely: This is a good way to go, and that HUD and the Army likes this approach. Response from Victor Dover: Dover Kohl has used this approach in other BRAC documents, and that is where this idea came from.

Tom Gear asked to go back to the Dover Kohl slide with the housing on it, and asked how much existing housing he thought they could fill with leasing? Mr. Dover's response: Fort Monroe will have to be marketed over 20, 30 maybe 50 years to recruit users for a proper lease. He stated Fort Monroe is a unique property with opportunities for housing, lodging and waterfront property giving it an advantage; that it is marketable. He warned we do not want to put all our eggs in one basket. We must consider each category and decide on how much is too much to create an environment where people will want to stay. Mixed use will reduce the burden of one aspect over another, and much of this can be learned from the economic study about to be done.

Delegate Gear to Victor Dover: How do you propose we sell the land? Victor Dover's response: The land would be long term leases. Bryant to Gear: Let me emphasize we will not sell off the assets. Everything will be leasing arrangements.

Delegate Gear to Victor Dover: How will the leases be handled? Victor Dover's response: They will be short term and long term leases. Steve Owens, OAG response: Short term leases would be 20-25 years, long term leases would be 50, 75, 99 years.

Dr. Bryant to Victor Dover: How much coordination will be involved with the 106 planners and the NEPA planners? Response from Mr. Dover: Dover Kohl is working with David Dutton who is working with Kathleen Kilpatrick on the PA. The documents will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Advisory

Group who will be working with the 106 and the Historic Preservation Office, Kathleen Kilpatrick. He stated that all parties are very much aware.

Dr. Bryant to Victor Dover: Will it push it to an Environmental Impact Study (EIS)? David Knisely's response: He is in constant communication with the Army and thinks it will not be too long before the Army decides whether it is doing an EIS.

Victor Dover to Board: What is your opinion of the "uncommitted land reserve" approach to the Wherry Housing area, and did the Board want to discuss the three options and postpone the decision on Wherry housing? Secretary Bryant's response: We need flexibility for a changing market, and the National Park Service is moving at its own pace. The Reuse Plan must incorporate the input from the National Park Service Recon Study. Dover to Preston Bryant: this approach does give you the flexibility, for a time when you are ready.

Secretary Jody Wagner to Victor Dover: Are you asking for approval on the three documents as part of the Reuse Plan? Mr. Dover's response: Then we could put these into hard copy.

MOTION. Secretary Jody Wagner motioned to approve Dover Kohl's three document approach to the Reuse Plan and to concur with the "uncommitted land reserve" approach to the Wherry Housing Area. Mr. Robert Scott seconded.

Mr. Harper said that he had concerns with the words "uncommitted land reserve." Chairman Bryant to Mr. Dover: how would "uncommitted land reserve" be used with the management zones. Mr. Dover's response: The Reuse Plan would say the Author would reserve the right to decide the land use in that area when the time is right.

Chairman Bryant to Victor Dover: If at some point we want to build in that area what is the process? Kathleen Kilpatrick's response: The Programmatic Agreement would support this since it is a contingent agreement providing framework with decision making into the future.

Chairman Bryant asked Secretary Wagner to sustain the motion until Ms. Kilpatrick does her presentation on the Programmatic Agreement, and that we are not ready for a vote.

Dr. Lett to Chairman Bryant: If we make a tentative decision on the lower and upper third of Fort Monroe and then change it, it will give people the impression that the original decision was not accurate.

Mr. Dover commented: Today we want a draft of what we *think* we are considering, and that this is not a final decision.

John Quarstein to Victor Dover: Did the drawings account for parking since there is not enough parking. The third drawing of the Uncommitted Land Reserve that was an extension of the open space park did not include historic references, and that he would like to see that drawing with history in mind. Response from Mr. Dover: There are 200 parking spaces by the parade ground inside the moat that will be removed. The most aggressive scenario for parking calls for 850 spaces which would be a surplus of parking spaces.

Delegate Gear to Preston Bryant: what about the presentation on the museum complex, where do we stand? Ms. Hunt's response: That concept was a recommendation from the Civil War Symposium. The area inside the moat has a strong public focus, and is on the list for the Board to approve, but do not get ahead of ourselves on this. She reminded the Board that the June deadline for the Draft Reuse plan is not the end of the planning process. It will be a "bubble plan" which is a concept plan. We have not committed to the idea of a museum complex, but it is still on the table.

D. Plan for Economic Updates. Blount Hunter and Anita Morrison, Bay Area Economics

Mr. Hunter presented a power point presentation (Appendix V). He claimed there is retail opportunity for a possible 75,000 square feet of potential rental space that may be reused. He stated the original FADA did

not acknowledge tourism in their economic analysis. The first FADA estimates focused on income, but did not include many of the expenses, including the \$15 million figure provided by the Army of what it costs to maintain Fort Monroe. Expenses like fire stations, schools and basic city expenses were not included in the original estimates. He said the estimates they are working on will have an emphasis on continuing financial support. Mr. Hunter then introduced Anita Morrison of Bay Area Economics who has been brought in to bring new options to the Board. Ms. Morrison gave an overview of her company and highlighted that her company had worked with many other military bases to include the Presidio (Appendix VI). She said that one task BAE would do is to look at individual buildings and decide what would be the best way to move them from public to private.

Questions/Comments: Mr. Scott to Ms. Morrison: In reference to City required services, is Fort Monroe considered part of the City of Hampton, and would Hampton be able to tax Fort Monroe: Mr. Thompson replied that Fort Monroe is on the boundaries of the City of Hampton. Ms. Morrison to Mr. Scott: Part of BAE's research would be to approach the different governments to see who is providing what service.

Dr. Bryant to Ms. Morrison: Could the Wherry Housing area provide initial income for the short term? Ms. Morrison's response: Wherry Housing might be good for 4 or 5 year leases to bring in some initial income.

E. Plan for Tourism.

Chairman Bryant introduced Bill Owens from Economic Research Associates. Mr. Owens gave an overview of the qualifications of his company ERA as well as examples of the many projects they have been involved in. (Appendix VII) ERA specializes in Tourism and Attraction Development, Resort Development and Recreation Economics. He explained that ERA would conduct an attraction feasibility study, and compared their work with Lake Lanier to Fort Monroe. He stated that Lake Lanier was successful by looking for niche or special interest groups for leasing properties, and that ERA would work closely with Bay Area Economics. They will also look for any partnership potentials. He commended the National Park Service being involved, as the National Park Service brand is an advantage.

Questions/comments: Delegate Gear to Bill Owens: What does National Park Service "brand" mean? Mr. Owens response: When an area is designated as a National Park it usually means a higher level of quality for a park. There is more to do, they are considered cleaner and safer. Many people will seek out destinations branded as a National Park.

F. Completing the Section 106 PA. Kathleen Kilpatrick, Director of Historic Resources and David Dutton, Dutton and Associates. Ms. Kilpatrick announced that they now have a good draft of the Programmatic Agreement, but would not be presenting it today as they first wanted to share it with the Consulting Parties at the 106 meeting on Monday, March 24. This will begin a period of comments from all the consulting parties. She added that since November they have refined the management zones and associated treatments. Other major milestones: There will be public meeting on the PA and management zones held in Hampton, Norfolk, Richmond, and Washington DC. She then gave an overview summarizing what the P.A. is and why it is necessary. She concluded with a brief timeline for the completion and execution of the PA. 1) Final draft with public input by 6/26/08 2) Reuse plan revision is being guided by the contents of the PA even before signed 3) PA will be ready for signature late July early August, following review by legal counsel.

Ms. Kilpatrick then introduced David Dutton of Dutton and Associates. Mr. Dutton reviewed the FMFADA's responsibilities under the PA, which include development detailed historic preservation standards and educational and visitor orientation programming. He stressed that the historic preservation standards will guide all future work at Fort Monroe and is a corner stone of the PA. Mr. Dutton pointed out that the Army is given the responsibility of assisting the FMFADA in identifying available materials that may be used in developing educational and visitor orientation programs. He noted that both the development of historic preservation standards and educational and visitor orientation programs are both provided for in the FMFADA's Bylaws as tasks to be completed by the FMFADA's Historic Preservation Advisory Group.

Mr. Dutton summarized the continuing review process established in the PA indicating that this is the key operational section of the document. He highlighted the role of a newly established Fort Monroe Historic Preservation Officer position in the review process and pointed out that as the potential for adverse effects increases, so does the level of review and number of participating review agencies. Mr. Dutton also reviewed the administrative provisions of the PA noting procedures for resolving disputes and amending the agreement.

Mr. Dutton concluded the presentation by reviewing the schedule for completion of the PA and its signature. He indicated that following review and comment by the consulting parties, the agreement would be made available for public comment after which the parties would begin to move toward finalization and signature, which he anticipated would occur in August.

Questions/comments: Secretary Bryant to David Dutton: How long is the review period on the PA?
Dutton's reply to Chairman Bryant: Every year.

Dr. Bryant to Mr. Dutton: we need to outline our responsibilities; Fort Monroe is like a city...we will need codes, compliances. Secretary Bryant to Dr. Bryant: This is part of the process, Ms. Kilpatrick and Mr. Dutton are guiding the state, and then the state will guide the FMFADA.

Robert Scott to David Dutton: how long is allowed for the review process? Mr. Dutton's response: The consulting parties have 30 days to get their responses back, so the review process depends on how long it will take to get the responses back.

At that point the discussion was turned back to Victor Dover, since the PA information presented by Ms. Kilpatrick and Mr. Dutton would clarify Dover Kohl's proposals.

Mr. Dover to Board: again asked the Board to consider the three document approach and the uncommitted land reserve approach with the future of use of the Wherry area to be determined later.

Secretary Bryant to Board: what if we posted the information on the web and asked for public comment.

Mr. Thompson to Board: would like to see a division of the motion, keeping both issues separate.

MOTION. Dr. Bryant made the motion to approve the first item to adopt the three document approach to the Draft Reuse Plan. Mr. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dover to Chairman Bryant: What about the "uncommitted land reserve approach" in regards to the Wherry housing area with the use of the area to be determined in the future? Chairman Bryant's response: We need to insure that approach is in line with the 106 and the PA. Robert Scott's response: Maybe we can change the title to "potential redevelopment area." Chairman Bryant's response: we need to have more discussion on this.

Tommy Thompson stated that he felt uneasy with a decision of this magnitude, and if approved this would be a reversal of the last 2 years work. He felt this is the wrong thing to do, and that he feels this would just be delaying the plan they already have been working on. Dr. Bryant's response: This would not be going against what has already been planned, we would still be recommending applications to all the other zones, except Wherry housing until we get more information. If approved this would allow for no delay in the process, and would give extra time to decide on Wherry housing.

Secretary Wagner agreed that approval of determining the use of Wherry housing in the future, would actually not delay the entire approval of the Reuse Plan. This would keep the other zones in line with the applications already recommended, and just leave the Wherry area to be decided at another time.

Victor Dover added that it could be called another name other than “uncommitted land reserve.” Mr. Armbruster said that he actually suggested this approach to Dover Kohl to allow the approval of the Reuse Plan to move forward, and that this would give the Board more flexibility. In his experience more details can trigger more delays, and perhaps the Board needs to come up with a better phrase.

Bob Harper commented: We chose Scenario I since the first meeting and then modified with Scenario 4. At this point recreating Scenario 1 would be confusing. Any Scenario we chose will leave flexibility with the 106. He agreed with Mr. Thompson.

John Quarstein's comments: We still need the third drawing handed out by Dover Kohl to reflect the historical landscape. We need a more accurate drawing before we can make this decision.

Ms. Gilliam added that she approves of Dover Kohl's drawings. This approach will allow us to continue the planning process. We can move ahead with the plan, we are not deciding disposition options at this time. Secretary Wagner agreed that we need to do this.

Chairman Bryant asked the Board to decide on adopting the pending zone for the Wherry Housing area. Robert Harper said no, that we should post this first on the website for public comment. Dr. Bryant suggested the Board wait for the studies to be complete on tourism and economics before deciding on this; that the Board deserves more information.

Secretary Wagner commented that the Board is in agreement on 90% of the management zones. This would give the Board extra time to decide the future of the 10% that is the Wherry area. This would keep the 106 process moving forward without delays.

MOTION: Secretary Bryant called for a vote to adopt the “Land Reserve” approach with a roll call vote going back to the sustained motion that was made by Secretary Wagner and seconded by Robert Scott. The result of the vote was:

Ayes: Baskerville, P. Bryant, Folder, Gear, Gilliam, Hammond, Scott and Wagner.

Nays: A. Bryant, Harper, Lett, Quarstein, Thompson.

Absent: Ellis, Hamilton, Jackson, Locke, Miller.

Abstain: none.

Dr. Lett called for an amendment to the motion by suggesting deleting the phrase “uncommitted land reserve” and replacing it with “designation to be determined.” Response from Delegate Gear: Mr. Chairman is the FMFADA required to follow Roberts Rules of Order? The motion has already been voted on; I think we need to turn this over to our legal counsel Mr. Owens.

Chairman Bryant took another roll call vote to adopt the “Designation to be determined” approach to the Wherry Area. The result of this vote was unanimous to adopt this motion.

G. FMFADA Communications. Trudy O'Reilly, O'Reilly Public Relations. Ms. O'Reilly said the FMFADA website is up and running, and thanked the City of Hampton for their help in sharing their information on Fort Monroe previously posted on their website. She said the website has already gotten 14,000 hits in February and 10,000 hits so far in March, so there is evidence that people are looking at the site and staying on it for periods of time. She summed up her comments by saying “We are going to be measured by our actions.”

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Appointment to Executive Committee. Chairman Bryant appointed Delegate Phil Hamilton to the Executive Committee to fill the vacancy left by Senator Marty Williams.

V. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Bryant invited those who had signed up to speak during public comment opportunity to come forward. (Appendix I)

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Seawall repair and enhancement. Dr. Charlie Sapp that after Hurricane Isabel the Federal Government had appropriated \$26 million to repair and enhance the seawall on Fort Monroe. Of that amount he said \$12 million was not appropriated, and that the FMFADA Board needs to find out what the status of the remainder of the money is. Secretary Bryant asked Executive Director Bill Armbruster to work on that status.

B. Resolution: transfer of two \$40,000 VNDIA grants from Hampton. Mr. Armbruster said prior to the formation of the FMFADA, the City of Hampton had received two \$40,000 grants from VNDIA. Mr. Armbruster has been working with David Dickson of the VNDIA on getting the grant money transfer to the FMFADA, as opposed to the City of Hampton turning the grant money back to VNDIA. Mr. Armbruster then asked the Board to pass a resolution to transfer the grants to the FMFADA.

Questions/comments: Mr. Dickson of VNDIA told Chairman Bryant that the FMFADA is not ready to accept the grant money as there are more steps to coordinate between the City of Hampton and VNDIA. Secretary Bryant asked for a head nod from the Board to approve the transfer. Response from Joe Spencer: has this been cleared by the Hampton City Manager, because this is the first I have heard of this. Bill Armbruster's response: yes we have been coordinating with Karl Daughtrey on this. Chairman Bryant said Mr. Armbruster will continue to work out the details on this.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Bryant asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was moved, seconded, and carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m

Respectfully submitted:

The Honorable Mamie E. Locke
Secretary/Treasurer

MEL/jfb

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I Public Comment:

1. Steve Corneliussen, representing self. Mr. Corneliussen made reference to a picture on the Citizens For a Fort Monroe National Park website, saying that his son in law placed the picture on the site. He complimented the FMFADA on allowing the time for much needed public discussion.
2. Colonel I. Neill McInnis, representing self. Colonel McInnis thanked the Board for keeping the Board meetings open to the public. He also stated that he agreed Wherry Housing should be torn down.
3. Gerri Hollins, representing the Contraband Society. Ms. Hollins invited Executive Director Bill Armbruster to meet with her group, and announced there will be a full feature film on the Contraband Society to be produced by a company called INVA.

APPENDIX II Executive Director's Report Handout

APPENDIX III Update on BRAC and Timeline Handout

APPENDIX IV Update on New Scenario Handout

APPENDIX V Plan for Economic Updates Handout

APPENDIX VI Bay Area Economics Handout

APPENDIX VII Plan for Tourism Handout

