

PART FIVE: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Summary of Planning

The National Park Service takes an interdisciplinary approach to planning. The planning team for Sagamore Hill National Historic Site was composed of individuals skilled in the areas of cultural resource management, history, historic preservation, education, interpretation, collection management, landscape architecture, archeology, and natural resource management. In addition to park staff and other NPS technical staff, the planning team also included representatives of the park's key partners, among which were the Theodore Roosevelt Association, the Friends of Sagamore Hill, and the park's volunteer corps.

Leading into the planning process, numerous research projects were undertaken to provide the best available information with which to make decisions for the park's future. Subject matter experts conducted research on such topics as the park's administrative history, cultural landscape, archeology, visitor use, collections, vegetation, and wildlife (Appendix F lists the research projects undertaken). The information generated from the research projects was incorporated into the planning process.

A long- range interpretive planning workshop was held in March 2003. Forty participants representing the park, its partners, Roosevelt scholars, and other community interests gathered to discuss issues associated with visitor programming and services and the park's overall mission and goals.

Also in preparation for considering Sagamore Hill's future, a workshop on the commemorative nature of the park was led by Dr. Edward Linenthal in December 2003. The session involved several local Roosevelt and Long Island scholars as well as representatives of the park staff, the park volunteers, the Theodore Roosevelt Association, and the Friends of Sagamore Hill. The session offered an opportunity to consider the nature of commemoration itself and ways to highlight the 21st century relevance of Theodore Roosevelt.

The official public start of the planning process was the opening of the new Theodore Roosevelt history exhibit at Old Orchard. The preparation of the general management plan was formally announced, and a brochure describing the planning process was distributed to attendees.

Early in the process, the team reviewed the park's purpose as defined in its enabling legislation and the park's legislative history. The team then

developed a significance statement that identified the resources that make the park nationally significant. Building upon the significance statement, the team reviewed and revised the park's interpretive themes. The planning team also identified and analyzed the condition of the park's primary resources – those that directly support its purpose and significance. The team also developed goals that articulate the ideal conditions to which the park aspires. These elements compose the Foundation for Planning in the general management plan.

To acquaint the community and interested citizens with the National Park Service planning process, to solicit comments or concerns regarding the future of Sagamore Hill, and to report on the status of planning, the planning team held two public scoping sessions in April 2004. One session was held in Oyster Bay, and the other in New York City at Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historic Site. The Oyster Bay meeting was well- attended, attracting nearly 40 local participants. At the sessions, the team members reviewed the purpose and significance statements and preliminary park themes. Meeting participants were also invited to comment upon the park's planning issues and share their thoughts on the park's future. Comments were recorded on flipcharts and comment cards.

In June 2004, representatives of the park's staff and its partners participated in a number of comparative site visits. The purpose of the site visits was to consider how other sites with similar characteristics handled different aspects of site management and visitor services. In determining the sites to visit, particular emphasis was placed on historic period, the character and composition of the resource base, the presence of partnerships, and the site's relationship to its host community. The sites selected were:

- The Mark Twain House and Museum,
Hartford, Connecticut
- Marsh- Billings- Rockefeller National Historical Park,
Woodstock, Vermont
- Saint Gaudens National Historic Site,
Cornish, New Hampshire
- Weir Farm National Historic Site,
Wilton, Connecticut

During these visits, the planning team observed the practical application of a number of ideas being explored at Sagamore Hill, including the adaptive re- use of existing buildings, better integrating the cultural landscape into the visitor experience, and making important figures in American history relevant to contemporary audiences.

The plan's first formal newsletter – Foundation for Planning – was printed and distributed in October 2004. The newsletter reviewed the planning process and key planning issues as well as Sagamore Hill's purpose, significance, interpretive themes, and preliminary goals. The newsletter was mailed to the park's mailing list (approximately 630 addresses at the time) and posted on the park's website. The newsletter was well- received and resulted in formal comments from 18 respondents.

Also in October 2004, the park's superintendent presented preliminary management concepts to the Theodore Roosevelt Association's Board of Trustees at its annual meeting in Portland, Oregon. Posters depicting the Sagamore Hill preliminary management concepts were prominently displayed in the conference hotel's lobby. NPS staff were posted at the display and were available to take comments and answer questions from the TRA general membership.

In November 2004, the preliminary management concepts were presented to the board of the Friends of Sagamore Hill and of representatives of Sagamore Hill's Volunteers in the Park (VIPs). During the winter of 2005, additional briefings were held for the Oyster Bay Main Street Association, the Oyster Bay Town Supervisor, and again for the park's volunteers.

Formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was initiated in January 2005 with regards to the status of threatened and endangered species in the area. According to USFWS, except for occasional transient individual animals, no federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species under USFWS jurisdiction are known to be present in the project impact area. In addition, no habitat in the project impact area is currently designated or proposed "critical habitat" in accordance with the provisions of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 USC 1531 et seq.). The USFWS is responsible for the management of the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge that abuts Sagamore Hill National Historic Site. The planning team has been consulting with USFWS staff from the Long Island Complex, the administrative unit responsible for managing the Oyster Bay NWR. USFWS staff participated in a round- table discussion of natural resource management at Sagamore Hill in December 2004.

Consultation with the New York State Historic Preservation Office was initiated in January 2005. Likewise, letters regarding the initiation of the planning process were also sent to Native American tribes historically associated with this area of Nassau County. The tribes contacted included the Stockbridge- Munsee Community of Wisconsin, the Delaware Tribe of

Indians, and the Delaware Nation. In each case, contact was made with the tribal leader and, whenever possible, with the tribal historic preservation officer.

In April 2005 a second newsletter describing four preliminary alternatives was distributed to the planning mailing list and made available on the park's website. The preliminary alternatives newsletter went out to approximately 800 addressees. Following the distribution of the newsletter in April, two major consultation meetings were held. For one meeting, over 100 park neighbors from Cove Neck were invited to Sagamore Hill to discuss the preliminary alternatives. Approximately 14 park neighbors attended, including the mayor of the village of Cove Neck. During this session, park neighbors expressed particular concern about a proposal to develop a visitor use facility and associated parking across Sagamore Hill Road from the Theodore Roosevelt Home.

A second public meeting in April 2005 was cosponsored by the Oyster Bay Main Street Association. As part of a larger agenda, Sagamore Hill's superintendent presented a program describing the preliminary alternatives to an audience of over 100 people. Questions were addressed, but comments were reserved for an open house following the formal presentations, during which NPS staff accepted approximately 20 comments. The preliminary alternatives newsletter and associated public meetings generated 23 additional sets of formal comments arriving by phone, electronic mail, and letter.

In May 2005, Sagamore Hill's core planning team met to identify the preferred alternative. For each alternative, the planning team considered the potential to address park goals, the possible benefits and impacts, the preliminary capital costs, and the relevant external influences (e.g. community support). Based on this analysis, the planning team recommended that the Northeast Regional Director identify *Alternative 3: Past Meets Present* as the National Park Services preferred alternative. In a subsequent meeting, the regional director concurred with this recommendation.

In October 2005, Sagamore Hill's superintendent presented the National Park Service's preferred alternative to the Theodore Roosevelt Association general membership at its 2005 annual meeting in Washington, DC. Approximately 60 members attended the session. There were few questions or comments at the time.

The draft general management plan/draft environmental impact statement was made available for public review from January 8 through February 23, 2007. The comment period was extended to May 8, 2007 to allow sufficient time for public comment after the formal publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on March 8, 2007.

On March 27, 2007, an error was noted in *Part Four: Environmental Consequences*. A word processing- related technical problem resulted in printed text that was jumbled and unclear. A postcard describing the error and noting the availability of corrected text was mailed to every recipient on the mailing list for the draft document. A note was also made on the project web page on the National Park Service's Planning, Environmental Compliance, and Public Comment (PEPC) website along with the corrected electronic version of Part Four. This error has been corrected in the final document.

A public open house was held in Oyster Bay to solicit public comments early in February 2007. Approximately 23 people were present at the open house. Twenty- seven sets of written comments were received by the planning team. The planning team carefully reviewed the comments received and developed responses to all substantive comments in the final general management plan/ environmental impact statement.

The final general management plan/ environmental impact statement will be available for 30 days. If no comments requiring major document revisions are received during this waiting period, a Record of Decision (ROD) will be signed indicating which alternative has been selected as the final proposal, and authorizing the National Park Service to implement the plan.

The draft and final environmental impact statements accompanying the draft and final general management plans are essentially programmatic statements, presenting an overview of potential impacts relating to each management option. More detailed plans may be developed for individual actions outlined in the options. The more detailed plans would be subject to a more detailed review of environmental impacts.

Compliance with Federal and State Laws and Regulations

Laws, Policies, and Mandates

As with all units of the National Park System, the management of Sagamore Hill National Historic Site is guided by the 1916 Organic Act (which created

the National Park Service), the General Authorities Act of 1970, the act of March 27, 1978, relating to the management of the National Park System, and other applicable federal laws and regulations, such as the Endangered Species Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. Actions are also guided by the National Park Service Management Policies and the park's legislation (see appendix A). The applicable laws, regulations, and policies most pertinent to the planning and management of the park are described below. Sagamore Hill National Historic Site will be managed in accordance with these laws and policies, regardless of which alternative is ultimately implemented.

Cultural Resource Management Requirements

All cultural management activities are guided by the National Park Service's *Guideline for Cultural Resource Management*.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The laws and policies currently in effect for the protection of archeological resources include National Park Service *Management Policies*; the Antiquities Act of 1906; National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974; the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979; and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*. The laws and policies require that archeological sites be identified and inventoried and their significance be determined and documented. Archeological sites are to be protected in an undisturbed condition unless it is determined through formal processes that disturbance or natural deterioration is unavoidable. If so, the site is to be professionally documented and salvaged in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and American Indian tribes, as appropriate.

ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Certain contemporary American Indian and other communities are permitted by law, regulation, or policy to pursue customary religious, subsistence, and other cultural uses of National Park Service resources with which they are traditionally associated. To the extent permitted by law, the National Park Service will take care to protect resources in a way that will accommodate their religious value.

All agencies, including the National Park Service, are required to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners, and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of these sacred sites. Other federal agencies, state and local governments, potentially affected American Indian and other communities, interested groups, the State Historic Preservation Officer,

and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation are to be given opportunities to become informed about and comment on anticipated NPS actions at the earliest practicable time. All agencies are required to consult with tribal governments before taking actions that affect federally recognized tribal governments.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Numerous laws and policies are in effect for the protection of historic resources, including the National Historic Preservation Act, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*, and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The laws and policies require that historic resources be inventoried and their significance and integrity evaluated under National Register criteria. The qualities that contribute to the listing or eligibility for listing of historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places are to be protected in accordance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (unless it is determined through a formal process that disturbance or natural deterioration is unavoidable).

Natural Resource Management Requirements

AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) requires federal land managers to protect air quality, and National Park Service Management Policies address the need to analyze air quality during park planning. States are responsible for the attainment and maintenance of national ambient air quality standards developed by the Environmental Protection Agency. These standards have been established for several pollutants: inhalable particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, ozone, carbon monoxide, and lead. Elevated concentrations of these pollutants can have adverse impacts on park resources and visitors.

Three air quality categories are established for the National Park System areas: Class I, Class II, and Class III. Sagamore Hill National Historic Site is in a Class II area, meaning that the state may permit a moderate amount of new air pollution as long as neither ambient air quality standards nor the maximum allowable increases over established baseline concentrations are exceeded. Nassau County complies with national ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, and lead, but is in non-attainment for 8-hour ozone and particulate matter (PM- 2.5). Current laws and policies require that the air quality in the park meet national ambient air quality standards and that the indoor air quality at National Park Service facilities be healthy.

WATER RESOURCES, FLOODPLAIN, AND WETLANDS

Current laws and policies are in effect for the protection of water resources, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; the Clean Water Act of 1977; the Water Quality Act of 1987; Executive Order 11988: “Floodplain Management;” and Executive Order 11990: “Protection of Wetlands.” The laws and mandates require that: (1) surface water and groundwater be restored or enhanced; (2) National Park Service and National Park Service-permitted programs and facilities be maintained and operated to avoid pollution of surface water and groundwater; (3) natural floodplain values be preserved or restored; (4) the natural and beneficial values of wetlands be preserved and enhanced; and (5) long-term and short-term environmental effects associated with the occupancy and modification of the floodplain be avoided.

SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN

Current laws and policies are in effect for the protection of species of special concern, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, and National Park Service policies on invasive species. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires that when a project or proposal by a federal agency has the potential to impact a known candidate, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, that agency must enter into formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. National Park Service Management Policies direct the NPS to give the same level of protection to state-listed species as is given to federally listed species. The laws and policies require that federally listed and state-listed threatened and endangered species and their habitats be sustained and that populations of native species that have been severely reduced in or extirpated from the park be restored where feasible and sustainable.

WILDLAND FIRE

Current laws and policies in effect regarding fire management require that all fires burning in natural or landscaped vegetation in parks be classified as either wildland fires or prescribed fires. All wildland fires are to be effectively managed, considering resource values to be protected and firefighter and public safety, using the full range of strategic and tactical operations as described in the park’s approved fire management plan. Prescribed fires are ignited by park managers to achieve resource objectives and are to include monitoring programs to provide information on whether specified objectives are met.

NATURAL LIGHTSCAPES OR NIGHT SKY

Natural lightscapes are considered natural resources that exist in the absence of human-caused light. They vary with geographic location and season. The National Park Service management guidelines recognize that

night sky and darkness are components of the overall experience of a visitor to a national park. Agency guidelines direct the National Park Service to cooperate with park neighbors and local government agencies to minimize the intrusion of artificial light into the night scene.

NATURAL SOUNDS

The natural ambient soundscape is the aggregate of all natural sounds together with the physical capacity for transmitting sounds. Natural sounds occur within and beyond the range of sounds that humans can perceive and can be transmitted through air, water, or solid materials.

Mandates and policies require that the National Park Service preserve the natural ambient soundscapes, restore degraded soundscapes to the natural ambient condition wherever possible, and protect natural soundscapes from degradation due to human-caused noise. Disruptions from recreational uses are to be managed to provide a high-quality visitor experience in an effort to preserve or restore both the natural quiet and natural sounds.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT (1972) AND COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES ACT (1982) BOTH AS AMENDED IN 1990

Sagamore Hill National Historic Site lies within New York State's coastal zone. Activities in the park must be consistent with New York State coastal zone management policies.

Park Operations Requirements

ACCESSIBILITY

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and federal guidelines published in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 define specific access requirements for persons with disabilities to parking facilities, pathways, and buildings. The accessibility requirements apply to government facilities (Title II) and to private entities that provide public accommodations (Title III). Accordingly, park managers are to strive to ensure that disabled persons are afforded the same experiences and opportunities enjoyed by other visitors to the greatest extent practicable. Special, separate, or alternative facilities, programs, or services are to be provided only when existing ones cannot reasonably be made accessible.

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT

Sustainability can be described as the result of managing units of the National Park System in ways that do not compromise the environment or its capacity to provide for present and future generations. Federal laws, executive orders, and executive memoranda, including Executive Order 13123: "Greening the Government through Efficient Energy Management;" Executive Order 13101: "Greening the Government through Waste

Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition;” and the National Park Service *Guiding Principles of Sustainable Design* require park managers to reduce the impacts of federal government activities on the environment.

The National Park Service *Guiding Principles of Sustainable Design* directs the National Park Service management philosophy. Sustainability principles have been developed and are followed for interpretation, natural resources, cultural resources, site design, building design, energy management, water supply, waste prevention, and facility maintenance and operations. The National Park Service strives to reduce energy costs, eliminate waste, and conserve energy resources by using energy- efficient and cost- effective technology. Park managers also strive to incorporate energy efficiency into the decision- making process during the design and acquisition of buildings, facilities, and transportation systems, emphasizing the use of renewable energy sources.

RIGHTS- OF- WAY AND TELECOMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Current laws and policies are in effect in regard to telecommunication infrastructure. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 directs all federal agencies to assist in the national goal of achieving a seamless telecommunications system throughout the United States by accommodating requests by telecommunication companies for the use of property, rights- of- way, and easements to the extent allowable under each agency’s mission. The National Park Service is legally obligated to permit telecommunication infrastructure in the parks if such facilities can be structured to avoid interference with park purposes.

Laws and policies also require that park resources and/or public enjoyment of the park not be denigrated by nonconforming uses. Telecommunication structures are to be permitted in the park to the extent that they do not jeopardize the park’s mission and resources. No new nonconforming use or rights- of- way are to be permitted through the park without specific statutory authority and approval by the director of the National Park Service or his or her representative, and such use is to be permitted only if there is no practicable alternative to such use of National Park Service lands. The management of Sagamore Hill National Historic Site has determined that because of the historic significance of the park’s resources and its cultural landscape values, no appropriate locations exist for telecommunication infrastructure within the park.

Socioeconomic Requirements

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898: “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low- Income Populations” requires federal

agencies to consider the impact of their actions on minority and low-income populations and communities, as well as the equity of the distribution of benefits and risks of those actions.

In implementing the Sagamore Hill National Historic Site general management plan, park managers will comply with all applicable laws and executive orders, such as those outlined in the “Laws, Policies, and Mandates.” Consultation and coordination with appropriate federal and state agencies have been conducted during the preparation of this document. Regarding cultural resources, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was initiated in January 2005. Regarding historic properties of significance to Indian tribes, consultation with the Stockbridge- Munsee Community of Wisconsin, Delaware Tribe of Indians, and the Delaware Nation was initiated in January 2005.

Section 106 Compliance Requirements for Undertakings

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires that federal agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction take into account the effect of undertaking on National Register listed or eligible properties and allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment. Toward that end, the National Park Service will work with the New York State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council to meet requirements of 36 CFR 800 and the September 1995 Programmatic Agreement among the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service. This latter agreement requires the National Park Service to work closely with the SHPO and the ACHP in planning for both new and existing national park areas.

The 1995 Programmatic Agreement also provides for a number of programmatic exclusions for specific actions not likely to have an adverse effect on cultural resources. The actions may be implemented without further review by the New York State Historic Preservation Officer or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, provided that the National Park Service internal review finds that the actions meet certain conditions. Undertakings (as defined in 36 CFR 800) not specifically excluded in the Programmatic Agreement must be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council before implementation. Throughout the process there will be early consultation on all potential actions.

Prior to any ground- disturbing action by park managers, a professional archeologist would determine the need for archeological activity or testing

evaluation. Any such studies would be carried out in advance of construction activity and would meet the needs of the State Historic Preservation Office. Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires the National Park Service to identify and nominate to the National Register of Historic Places all resources under its jurisdiction that appear to be eligible. Historic areas of the National Park System are automatically listed on the National Register upon their establishment by law or executive order.

The following table identifies actions contained within the general management plan alternatives that would likely require review under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and under the 1995 Programmatic Agreement, and the nature of the review.

Table 5- 1: Summary of Actions Requiring Review under Section 106

Potential Actions that may Occur in One or More Alternatives	Compliance Requirements
Rehabilitate cultural landscape	Requires SHPO/ACHP review (under Alternative 3)
Rehabilitate historic cutting & vegetable garden	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Rehabilitate historic farm structures	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Develop new maintenance facility	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Rehabilitate and expand New Barn	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Construct addition on Old Orchard	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Expand system of park pathways	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Resurface parking and pathways	Programmatic exclusion IV B (7)
Reduce size of existing parking area	Programmatic exclusion IV B (6)
Remove existing visitor contact station	Requires SHPO/ACHP review
Rehabilitate & reuse Old Orchard garage	Requires SHPO/ACHP review

Section VI- G of the 1995 Programmatic Agreement among NPS, the ACHP, and the National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) also requires that NPS GMPs include a statement about the status of the park's cultural resources inventory, and that the statement indicate needs for additional cultural resource information, plans, or studies required before undertakings can be carried out.

The following plans and studies have been identified as necessary to support the implementation of proposals made in Sagamore Hill NHS's general management plan. This list may be expanded or otherwise modified as the specific requirements for individual projects become better defined.

Update Sagamore Hill NHS Cultural Landscape Treatment Plan

Prepare Historic Structure Reports for:

- Historic Farm Buildings
- Gray Cottage
- Old Orchard (Main House and Garage)

Undertake Comprehensive Archeological Survey

List of Draft General Management Plan Recipients

Primary Partners:

Boone & Crockett Club
Eastern National
Friends of Sagamore Hill
Hamlet of Oyster Bay
National Park Foundation
Oyster Bay Historical Society
Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge (US Fish & Wildlife Refuge)
Roosevelt Family members
Roosevelt scholars & authors
Sagamore Hill Neighbors
Sagamore Hill Volunteer Board
Sagamore Hill Volunteers
Theodore Roosevelt Association (TRA)
Town of Oyster Bay
Village of Cove Neck
Village of Oyster Bay Cove

Related Theodore Roosevelt Sites and Monuments

Las Vegas City (Rough Rider) Museum, Las Vegas, NM
Mount Rushmore National Monument, Keystone, SD
Pine Knot, Keene, VA
President's Park – The White House, Washington, DC
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace NHS, New York City
Theodore Roosevelt Collection, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural NHS, Buffalo, NY
Theodore Roosevelt Island National Monument, Washington, DC
Theodore Roosevelt National Park, Medora, North Dakota
Theodore Roosevelt Sanctuary, Oyster Bay, NY
USS Theodore Roosevelt (CVN- 71)
Youngs Memorial Cemetery, Oyster Bay, NY

Theodore Roosevelt- related Institutions

Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute/ Library, Hyde Park, NY
Theodore Roosevelt Medora Foundation, Bismarck, ND
Roosevelt Study Center, the Netherlands

Others

Colleges & universities
Local high schools

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
American Indian interests (Stockbridge- Munsee Community of Wisconsin, Delaware Tribe of Indians, and the Delaware Nation)
Center for the Study of the Presidency, Washington, DC
Christ Church, Oyster Bay, NY
Garden Club of America: Three Rivers and North County chapters
Raynham Hall, Oyster Bay, NY
Long Island Convention & Visitors Bureau
Long Island North Shore State Heritage Area
LI Studies Institute at Hofstra University
Nassau Suffolk Horseman's Association / Rough Riders
National Parks Conservation Association
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Nassau County Museum of Art
Nassau County Parks Department
New York State Historic Preservation Office
North Shore Promotion Alliance
Oyster Bay Chamber of Commerce
Oyster Bay Main Street Association
Planting Fields Arboretum State Historic Park (Coe Hall)
Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities
Suffolk County Parks
US Naval History Center
The Waterfront Center, Oyster Bay

Agency Consultation

New York State Department of State, Coastal Zone Management Program
New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation,
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
US Environmental Protection Agency
US Fish & Wildlife Service

List of Preparers

Core Planning Team

NORTHEAST REGION – BOSTON OFFICE
Ellen Levin Carlson, Project Manager
Justin Berthiaume, Landscape Architect
Barbara Mackey, Community Planner
Paul Weinbaum, History Program Manager

NER HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM
Sharon Ofenstein, Publications Editor

OLMSTED CENTER FOR LANDSCAPE PRESERVATION
Gina Bellavia, Program Manager
Debbie Dietrich- Smith, Historical Landscape Architect/
106 Compliance Advisor

NORTHEAST CENTER FOR EDUCATION
Patti Reilly, Director

NORTHEAST MUSEUM SERVICES CENTER
Louis Hutchins, Curator/ Historian

SAGAMORE HILL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
Greg A. Marshall, Superintendent
Monica Chirot, Administrative Officer
Lorenza Fong, former Superintendent
Brian Forseth, Chief of Preservation &
Maintenance
Scott Gurney, Interpretive Park Ranger
Noreen Hancock, Interpretive Park Ranger
Charles Markis, Chief of Visitor Services
Amy Verone, Curator
Gay Vietzke, former Superintendent

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASSOCIATION
Norman Parsons, Past President
John A. Gable, Former Executive Director
(deceased)

FRIENDS OF SAGAMORE HILL
John Hammond, Chairman

SAGAMORE HILL VOLUNTEER ADVISORY
BOARD
Milton Elis, Chairman

National Park Service Advisers/ Consultants

Peggy Albee, Manager, Historic Architecture Program, NER
Joanne Blacoe, Interpretive Planner, NER
Sheila Colwell, Senior Natural Resource Program Manager, NER
Robert F. Cook, Biologist, Cape Cod National Seashore
Richard Crisson, Historical Architect, 106 Compliance Advisor, NER Historic Architecture Program
Kathleen DiLonardo, Chief, Interpretive Planning, NER
Thomas Dyer, Office of Park Partnerships, NER
Shaun Eyring, Program Manager for Resource Planning & Compliance, NER
Mary Foley, Chief Scientist, NER
Larry Gall, Deputy Associate Regional Director, Planning & Partnership, NER
David Hollenberg, Associate Regional Director, NER
Beth Johnson, Research Biologist, University of Rhode Island (CESU)
Bob McIntosh, Associate Regional Director, Planning & Partnerships, NER
Bryan Milstead, Coastal and Barrier Network Coordinator, University of Rhode Island (CESU)
Terrence D. Moore, Chief, Park Planning & Special Studies, NER
Bob Page, Director, Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation
Giles Parker, Deputy Director, Northeast Museum Services Center
Diana Pardue, Chief of Collections Management, Statue of Liberty NM (106 compliance advisor)
Jim Pepper, Superintendent, Manhattan Sites
Steven Pendery, NER Senior Archeologist, 106 Compliance Advisor
Sarah Peskin, Director, Special Projects, NER/ Boston
Barbara Pollarine, Deputy Superintendent, Valley Forge National Historical Park
Patricia Rafferty, Coastal Ecologist, Northeast Region
Dennis R. Reidenbach, Regional Director, NER
Geraldine Santoro, Museum Curator, Statue of Liberty NM (106 Compliance Advisor)
Greg Shriver, Biologist, Northern Forest Temperate Network
Dennis Skidds, Research Associate, University of Rhode Island (CESU)

Chuck Smythe, Regional Ethnographer, NER
Stephen Spaulding, Chief, Architectural Preservation Division, NER
Chrysandra Walter, Deputy Regional Director, NER
Eileen Woodford, Civic Engagement Coordinator, NER

Other Consultants

Kathleen Dalton, Consulting Historian, Andover, MA
Jack Glassman, Bargmann, Hendrie + Archetype, Boston, MA
Edward Linenthal, Consulting Historian, Organization of American Historians
Natalie Naylor, Consulting Historian, Uniondale, NY
John Nystedt, Andropogon Associates, Philadelphia, PA
Michael O'Connell, Bargmann, Hendrie + Archetype, Boston, MA
Marita Roos, Andropogon Associates, Philadelphia, PA
Ron Thomson, Interpretive Planner, COMPASS, Whittier, CA
Kim Urbain, Urbain Design, San Francisco, CA