

**Fort Hancock Working Group Meeting #4
December 8, 2021**

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The Fort Hancock Advisory Committee Working Group, convened to discuss and consider issues related to the Stillman project proposal, met via webinar December 8, 2021. The agenda focused on considering possible issues and impacts related to parking.

The meeting was attended by the following Working Group members: Dorothy Guzzo, NJ Historic Trust; Eileen Murphy, NJ Audobon; Bill Kastning, Monmouth Conservation Foundation; Tim Leonard (for Lauren Cosgrove), National Parks Conservation Association; Dr. Harold Zullo, NJ Sierra Club; and FACA member Kate Stevenson. Additionally, Committee co-chairs Shawn Welch and Gerald Glaser attended; Gateway Superintendent Jennifer Nersesian and Consensus Building Institute Senior Mediator Bennett Brooks facilitated discussions; and Patti Rafferty, Chief of Resource Stewardship for Gateway, presented on parking issues. Karen Edelman with Gateway took discussion notes.

Discussion: Parking

The bulk of the meeting focused on parking - one of several topics related to the Stillman proposal that Working Group members had identified at earlier meetings as warranting in-depth discussion.

Patti Rafferty, Chief of Resource Stewardship for Gateway, provided a presentation to inform workgroup discussion. Her presentation centered on several topics related to parking: issues and impacts of parking related to leasing; ; considerations for location and management of parking related to leasing; existing and projected parking requirements; and potential parking options and alternatives. Below is a summary of her key points and Working Group feedback.

Possible Issues and Impacts

P. Rafferty kicked off the discussion by identifying some issues and impacts related to potential leasing parking needs and asked Working Group members to identify additional issues and impacts important to consider. A link to her full presentation can be accessed at forthancock21.org.

Below is a list of additional topics Working Group members cited as important to better understand.

Permeable surfaces	Road salts and oil runoff	Visual quality (extent to which design can mitigate impacts)
Americans with Disabilities Act considerations	Engine idling impacts	Noise related to revving engines, radios, etc.
Solar panel coverage	Electric car needs – charging stations, impact on grid	Fit with original Congressional vision for Gateway

Possible Considerations

P. Rafferty presented an overview of possible parking considerations (e.g., possible best practices, needs and principles related to parking design, maintenance and management) and asked Working Group members to identify additional considerations for parking (presentation can be found on www.forthancock21.org) Working Group members offered a number of additional suggestions to consider. Specific ideas are listed below.

- Design-related

- Ensuring surfaces and pavements are permeable
- Making sure any new parking is ADA-compliant
- Maintaining open space, protecting the “view-shed”
- Providing for wildlife crossings
- Creating opportunities for more mass transit
- Operations- and Maintenance-related
 - Minimizing salt usage
 - Putting in place “no idling” and similar operational rules
 - Staying consistent with the intent of the enabling Congressional legislation (climate-friendly, providing equal access)
 - Using overflow sites to accommodate event parking

Existing and Potential Parking Needs & Options

To inform discussions, P. Rafferty shared with the Working Group estimates of current and potential parking requirements for Fort Hancock partner-occupied and/or leased buildings and buildings available for lease. Based upon this hypothetical analysis of potential uses and occupancy of buildings available for leases, as of November 2021, she estimated the potential need for an additional 176 parking spaces for all partners and leased buildings (up from an estimated 87 current spots). She also identified for the group hypothetical options to increase parking capacity to facilitate historic preservation through leasing – drawing on existing parking spaces, adding additional space (both on and off street), and removing some parking. She emphasized that the information was being provided to spark conversation and feedback and should not at all be considered an evaluation, alternatives analysis or any decisions regarding parking at Sandy Hook or the Fort Hancock leasing program

The presentation (forthancock21.org) triggered a number of clarifying questions, with Working Group members wanting to understand the extent to which future parking needs will likely be seasonal (answer = not likely) and whether parking estimates reflect the high end (answer = yes, likely a maximum count). Comments also centered on: (1) making use of overflow parking facilities for event; (2) considering siting of wildlife crossings to minimize conflicts; (3) assessing safety concerns for children tied to a shift to on-street parking; and (4) focusing future parking needs in clusters (though it was noted that future lessees will likely value the convenience of having parking directly outside their residences).

Climate Change Follow-Up Discussions

B. Brooks noted that, though the Working Group discussed climate change at its previous meeting, there was insufficient time to discuss a number of the issues raised by participants. He noted the need and intention to revisit the topic in the coming months and cited several key questions and topics that merit additional discussion.

- Concerns about evacuation / emergency routes tied to storm surge, etc. What are the specific concerns? How might they be mitigated? Are they different / more pronounced than current risks? If so, how?
- What are your concerns / thoughts about disclosure to flood plain /flooding risk? To what extent is that covered by current policy and where might there be gaps?
- Does infrastructure investment deepen risk associated with climate change / sea level rise impacts? How significant a concern is this? What steps could be taken to diminish this concern?
- To what extent does a project like the Stillman proposal sustain or undermine ecological/cultural resources given future sea level rise / flooding concerns?

- Some of you expressed concerns about site developers “benefitting” from site adaptation / mitigation undertaken by NPS. To what extent does current NPS policy address / not address those concerns?

One Working Group member suggested that the list be expanded to include a full cost/benefit analysis of possible project impacts.

Next Steps

Below are specific next steps identified during the meeting:

- Gateway: Distribute parking presentation; 2003 Environmental Assessment; 2006 Cultural Landscape Report
- Gateway: Create shared drive with foundational documents relevant to Working Group discussions (e.g., enabling legislation and Gateway founding principles, National Historic Preservation guidance, examples of successful re-use efforts elsewhere, etc.)
- Gateway: Agendize for a future Working Group meeting discussion of Gateway’s founding vision and possible implications for the Stillman project
- Eileen: Provide guidance on possible areas for wildlife crossings
- CBI: Draft and distribute a discussion summary (this document)