

# BERKELEY MARINA FERRY FEASIBILITY STUDY

Workshop 2, Breakout Group 3 | August 10, 2021

## Breakout Session Notes

### Comment

#### Waterside-

- There is a survey of fisherman and swimmers based on previous schemes. They don't like the Fishhook scheme. They prefer the previous Anchor scheme, similar to the new sword scheme as the ferry vessels stay farther north.
- Would like to see the existing pier reconstructed
- The Berkeley Pier was a regional resource, enjoyed by many people from other areas as well as Berkeley residents.
- A wider pier is preferred.

#### Landside-

- It is difficult to comment on the landside options without ferry ridership estimates. Need to know the premise.
- 400 people signed a petition to complete the BMASP planning study first
- <https://sign.moveon.org/petitions/tell-berkeley-officials-to-not-sell-out-the-marina>

### Comment

#### Waterside-

- City needs to finish BMASP study first, it is way too premature to look at pier configurations
- Emulate historical precedents- in the 1920's an economic analysis indicated a 2.7 nautical mile pier length to the ferry was most economical, this is likely still true. Use a double ended ferry as was used in the 1880's
- Ferries should look into mooring inside the marina, create synergy with the doubletree hotel.
- The south end of skates marks the line out to deep water.

#### Landside-

- Need to think outside the box on parking. With a 2.7 nautical mile pier length, shuttle buses could serve the ferry and eliminate all parking.

### Comment

#### Waterside-

- He's a preservation architect. The existing pier does not need to be torn down.
- The process is a waste of time, the City is doing a disservice by collapsing the pier into the WETA project.

**Notes – Workshop 2, Breakout Group 3**  
Berkeley Marina Ferry Feasibility Study

- Wants to see the BMASP stud completed first.

**Landside-**

- To ease conflict, demolish the former HS Lordships Building. It is a tear down, no one will lease it as it would take \$7 Million to refurbish as a restaurant.

**Comment**

**Waterside-**

- Was a ferry passenger on the WETA Alameda ferries, given the marine security requirements, how could recreational use work along side the ferry operations?
- Likes the pier schemes but doesn't fee like he has enough information to choose one.
- The engineers are wrong to ignore the southern storms.
- Disappointed the 'tourist' ferry wasn't discussed in this meeting.
- The kayak/ windsurfer launch is in an area with too much wave activity for kayakers, windsurfers would like it.

**Landside-**

- He currently works at the marina; the landside impacts are his primary concern. Parking is already a challenge. How can the City ensure that his business doesn't go under due to lack of parking?
- What percentage of the current ferry passengers don't drive? They all probably drive

**Comment**

**Waterside-**

- User of the smaller ferries & WETA ferries. Supports expanded ferry service.
- No strong opinion on the pier concepts

**Landside-**

- Clustered parking preferred.
- Biek paths and secured bike storage important

**Comment**

**Waterside-**

- No comments

**Landside-**

- Incorporating infrastructure that promotes alternatives to driving is important, this includes protected bike lanes as well as support for future electrically powered mobility devices that may be ubiquitous in the future.

## Comment

### Waterside-

- Kayak launch location is too wavy.

### Landside-

- Important to protect the parking of recreational users

## Comment

### Waterside-

- Has a soft spot for ferries, her father led an effort in the 1970's to promote ferries.
- How would kayaks hugging the shore be protected from the ferry vessels?
- What is the masterplan 'big picture' for the marina?
- Morn's the closure of the existing pier

### Landside-

- Protect the free access to the water for fishing and recreation

## Comment

### Waterside-

- Unable to join the meeting on zoom, phoning in
- Ferry fan but disappointed with the presentation- should decouple the pier project from the ferry
- Waves are an asset, breakwater would impact these
- Minimize dredging

### Landside-

- Re-assess parking requirements based on the Larkspur ferry experience, the limited parking was quickly maxed out. Favors a parking structure
- Coordinate with AC Transit
- Recreational users can't use transit due to large equipment so important to protect their parking