

Jacob, Melinda

From: Mary Lee Noonan <mleenoonan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 11:45 AM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Cc: publiccomment@bcdc.ca.gov
Subject: Marina Parking

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commission Members:

In the absence of an environmental impact report, it is unthinkable that a City of Berkeley commission would consider voting on a ferry-parking consultant's idea that potentially changes life for us all. As a resident of Berkeley for 58 years and a devoted user of the Marina, how are you listening to my voice and the voices of other Berkeley citizens? Why are my tax dollars being used to pay an outside consultant who has nothing to lose and no commitment to due process? Please stop this disgrace.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Lee Noonan
2599 Buena Vista Way

Jacob, Melinda

From: Erin Diehm <erindiehm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 3:15 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: ZAB 2/26/26 Mtg - RE Item 7G - approval of ferry service at pier

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

RE: Item 7G "Use Permit #ZP2026-0014 201 University Ave" at the 2/26/26 ZAB mtg

Dear ZAB,

The draft EIR for the proposed ferry is still pending. It is premature for the ZAB to take a position on the proposed ferry system at the Berkeley Waterfront.

Berkeley prides itself as an environmental leader – from our City's own Strategic Goals: "**Be a global leader in protecting the environment**". Yet ZAB is being asked to approve the ferry this week - prior to the release of the Draft EIR. The ferry terminal and its vessels will have significant environmental impacts across much of the Bay. For example, noise is just one consideration:

An Anthropogenic cacophony. "Sound travels faster and farther in water than in air... marine organisms have come to rely on sound production, transmission, and reception for key aspects of their lives. These important behaviors are threatened by an increasing cacophony in the marine environment as human-produced sounds have become louder and more prevalent... Anthropogenic noise is a stressor for marine animals. Thus, we call for it to be included in assessments of cumulative pressures on marine ecosystems."¹

Cumulative impacts of the ferry and all proposed projects at the Waterfront must be identified and discussed prior to ZAB taking a position. We depend on you, the valuable ZAB appointees, to make informed decisions that protect the environment for generations to come.

Given the wide-ranging scope of the ferry project, coupled with the lack of essential environmental assessment, It is too early to take a position.

Sincerely,
Erin Diehm
Berkeley Resident
Former Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Commissioner (Chair, Vice-Chair; termed-off Oct. 2025)

¹ Duarte, Carlos M., et al. "The Soundscape of the Anthropocene Ocean." *Science*, vol. 371, no. 6529, 5 Feb. 2021, p. eaba4658. *Science.org*, [doi:10.1126/science.aba4658](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba4658).

Jacob, Melinda

From: Carol Benioff <cbenioff@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 1:41 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Berkeley Ferry Terminal Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern,
Revitalizing the ferry service is long overdue. Expanded transit options is a win for everyone.
In 1925 my grandmother traveled from her home on Funston Avenue in San Francisco to UC Berkeley via street car then the ferry and then a street car in about one hour. In the late 1940s, my parents also used the ferry from Berkeley to San Francisco and back when they were students at UC Berkeley.

It is a great way to cross the bay with less emissions.
Sincerely,
Carol Benioff

Carol Benioff
carol@carolbenioff.com
www.carolbenioff.com
709 Jones Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
Studio (510) 559-8744
Cell (510) 872-0920

Jacob, Melinda

From: Katie Calvert <katiemarycalvert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 1:01 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Please do not grant Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)-Berkeley ferry plan a permit yet

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

The the members of the Zoning Adjustment Board,

I urge you to NOT grant WETA's Berkeley ferry plan a permit yet.

There are several good reasons to delay such a vote. The primary one in my opinion is that the Environmental Impact Statement has yet to be finalized and published. It seems to me quite wrong to approve a permit until the citizens of Berkeley, the marina users (many are also Berkeley citizens, but users come from other East Bay cities), and you, board members, get to read and study the report.

I have attended (online) two meetings where the SF Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board members raised serious concerns about the plan's assumptions regarding dredging needs/amounts, environmental problems caused by the wake of the ferries, and climate change/water rising plans and ameliorations not being adequate. There were other engineering issues as well as issues of providing public use of the park and marina for non-ferry users.

I do not support rushing this permit before we understand the environment issues.

Thank you,
Katherine Calvert
1204 Talbot Avenue, Berkeley, CA

Jacob, Melinda

From: Nancy Rader <nraderhome@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 10:58 AM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: WETA-Berkeley ferry plan

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Zoning Adjustments Board,

The proposed WETA-Berkeley ferry plan would dramatically reduce the ability to enjoy the waterfront recreation area that is widely beloved and used. Please postpone any permitting decision until you have addressed the many concerns that have been raised. We need greater transparency – starting with making the draft environmental impact report public – **before** any decisions are made.

Please prioritize Berkeley residents and all others who use this area for their mental and physical wellbeing, particularly those of low incomes. WETA's needs and concerns should be a distant secondary consideration!

Thank you,

Nancy Rader
1198 Keith Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94708
(510) 919-6358 cell

Jacob, Melinda

From: Ron Adler <ronadler@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 9:42 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Re: WETA Ferry

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear members of the Zoning Board

As a tax paying resident of Berkeley since 1977 I would like to register my opposition to granting a permit to WETA to proceed with their ferry plan. My opposition to the permit is based on the fact that the EIR has not been completed or released, and that the detrimental impact on current recreational users via limited parking and access will not be justified by the number of ferry users or the revenue from the ferry. I believe it is an ill conceived plan from the start, driven by a very few vested interests. The people of Berkeley will not support it. Please deny the permit.

Thank you

Ronald D, Adler MD
2904 Avalon
Berkeley 94705

Jacob, Melinda

From: Emilie <desertpeach2@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 8:13 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Feb 26 meeting ZAB re : Agenda Item 7B

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear ZAB--

It is premature for the board to pursue a zoning variance for the Berkeley ferry prior to release of the EIR.

Impact from the ferry and cumulative impact from all proposed projects at the Berkeley waterfront must be considered prior to the Board endorsing this "allowable use" at the pier. This project represents unwanted development with significant impacts to wildlife.

Thank you,

Emilie Strauss

Berkeley, CA

Jacob, Melinda

From: tomg <tomgandesbery2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 3:34 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Re: Comment: Item 7G Ferry Terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

tomg <tomgandesbery2@gmail.com>

to zab

Hello:

I am respectfully submitting the following comments related to Item 7G of the February 26, 2026, meeting of the Berkeley Zoning Adjustment Board. I am a long-time user of the Berkeley Marina, having sailed from the south basin for decades.

Please postpone the vote on this item until the impacts of the project are fully understood.

In the current and future world of Bay Area commuting, the proposed Berkeley ferry is a solution in search of a problem. It seems a bit surreal that while we are contemplating a new sales tax to save BART, AC Transit, and other transit systems from falling off a "fiscal cliff" due to low ridership, the City of Berkeley blithely marches on hand in hand with the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) in a quest to install a costly and inefficient and unneeded ferry service to San Francisco. For the cost of this new ferry, each and every potential rider could be PAID

If that wasn't questionable enough, the proposed WETA facility will be installed in a space that was set aside for the recreation and enjoyment of the general public. Sadly, the City has neglected the existing pier and the southern extent of the Marina, where there once was a popular waterside restaurant (H's Lordship's) and parking for passive and active recreation. Rather than bring the Marina, which is in reality a park, back to the standards of a normal city park, the City proposes to plop down a ferry terminal with a dedicated 500-vehicle parking lot. The whole situation is going from bad to worse.

Consider your favorite city park for a moment: what if the city came along and said, " Too bad, the lawn is old, the amenities are costly, we're going to demolish the park to put in a bus station". Pretty awful, right?

Please wait for the EIR and a more complete understanding of this project. And consider why you want it, what it will do for the City and the larger bay area community.

This is YOUR legacy!

Sincerely,

Tom Gandesbery

On Mon, Feb 23, 2026 at 3:27 PM tomg <tomgandesbery2@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello:

I am respectfully submitting the following comments related to Item 7G of the February 26, 2026, meeting of the Berkeley Zoing Adjustment Board.

Please postpone the vote on this item until the impacts of the project are fully understood.

In the current and future world of Bay Area commuting, the proposed Berkeley ferry is a solution in search of a problem. While we are contemplating a new sales tax to save BART, AC Transit, and other transit systems from falling off a "fiscal cliff" due to low ridership, the City of Berkeley blithely marches on hand in hand with the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) in a quest to install a costly and inefficient and unneeded ferry service to San Francisco. For the cost of this new ferry, each and every potential rider could be PAID

If that wasn't questionable enough, the proposed WETA facility will be installed in a space that was set aside for the recreation and enjoyment of the general public. Sadly, the City has neglected the existing pier and the southern extent of the Marina where there once was a popular waterside restaurant (H's Lordship's) and parking for passive and active recreation. Rather than bring the Marina, which is in reality a park, back to the standards of a normal city park, the City proposes to plop down a ferry terminal with a dedicated 500-vehicle parking lot. The whole situation is going from bad to worse.

Consider your favorite city park for a moment: what if the city came along and said, too bad, the lawn is old, the amenities are costly, we're going to demolish the park to put in a bus station. Pretty awful, right?

Jacob, Melinda

From: tomg <tomgandesbery2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 3:28 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Comment: Item 7G Ferry Terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello:

I am respectfully submitting the following comments related to Item 7G of the February 26, 2026, meeting of the Berkeley Zoning Adjustment Board.

Please postpone the vote on this item until the impacts of the project are fully understood.

In the current and future world of Bay Area commuting, the proposed Berkeley ferry is a solution in search of a problem. While we are contemplating a new sales tax to save BART, AC Transit, and other transit systems from falling off a "fiscal cliff" due to low ridership, the City of Berkeley blithely marches on hand in hand with the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) in a quest to install a costly and inefficient and unneeded ferry service to San Francisco. For the cost of this new ferry, each and every potential rider could be PAID

If that wasn't questionable enough, the proposed WETA facility will be installed in a space that was set aside for the recreation and enjoyment of the general public. Sadly, the City has neglected the existing pier and the southern extent of the Marina where there once was a popular waterside restaurant (H's Lordship's) and parking for passive and active recreation. Rather than bring the Marina, which is in reality a park, back to the standards of a normal city park, the City proposes to plop down a ferry terminal with a dedicated 500-vehicle parking lot. The whole situation is going from bad to worse.

Consider your favorite city park for a moment: what if the city came along and said, too bad, the lawn is old, the amenities are costly, we're going to demolish the park to put in a bus station. Pretty awful, right?

Jacob, Melinda

From: Sanjna Ashish Shah <sanjna_shah@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 2:52 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project – ZAB Use Permit.
Attachments: 2-26 Berkeley Ferry Terminal Project - Zoning Adjustments Board Support Letter.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

My name is Sanjna Shah, and a behalf of the External Affairs Vice President of the ASUC at UC Berkeley, we are submitting this letter of support for the Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project.

Thank you,
Sanjna Shah

Sanjna Shah (she/her)

University of California, Berkeley

Political Science | Class of 2028

sanjna_shah@berkeley.edu | (669) 286-0587





EAVP
Office of the
External Affairs
Vice President

2/23/2026

City of Berkeley
Zoning Adjustments Board
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project — Use Permit

Dear Chair and Members of the Zoning Adjustments Board,

On behalf of Associated Students of the University of California's External Affairs Vice President office, we are writing to express our support for the City of Berkeley's Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project at the Berkeley Waterfront. The City of Berkeley is currently finalizing a draft environmental review report for the project.

We recognize the proposed project as an important opportunity to restore public access to the Berkeley waterfront through the reconstruction of the Berkeley public pier, diversification of public transit options and increasing regional access to the Bay. From our perspective, restoring the Berkeley Pier as an active transportation and civic asset supports local businesses, workers, and visitors, while reinforcing Berkeley's role as a regional destination along the shoreline.

As representatives of UC Berkeley students, we strongly support infrastructure investments that expand reliable, sustainable, and multimodal transportation options for the East Bay. Many students commute from across the Bay Area, and expanded ferry service would provide an additional transit alternative that reduces congestion on already burdened roadways and public transit systems. Increasing transportation connectivity between Berkeley and other Bay Area communities enhances access to educational, professional, and civic opportunities for students, staff, and residents alike.

In addition, the project advances climate-conscious transportation goals by prioritizing zero-emission ferry vessels and reducing regional vehicle dependence. Students consistently advocate for sustainable infrastructure solutions that align with Berkeley's climate action commitments and long-term shoreline resilience planning. The restoration of the pier also creates valuable public space that promotes recreation, community engagement, and equitable access to the waterfront for current and future generations.

The Berkeley Ferry Terminal is included in SF Bay Ferry's adopted Strategic Plan as part of a long-term regional ferry system expansion. The proposed service would be operated with electric, zero-emission vessels, supporting regional mobility while aligning with City of Berkeley's climate, sustainability, and transportation goals. As part of the broader ferry network, Berkeley ferry service would also contribute to emergency response and evacuation capacity, strengthening the city's resilience to respond to an emergency.

We recognize the importance of careful review to ensure the project is consistent with applicable land-use regulations, public access requirements, and community compatibility. We appreciate that the project is being reviewed through the City of Berkeley's established environmental review and permitting processes, with opportunities to refine project details and mitigation measures as appropriate.

We support continued advancement of the project through the Zoning Adjustments Board review process and appreciate the Board's role in evaluating the proposed Use Permit. We encourage consideration of the long-term public benefits associated with restoring the Berkeley Pier as a transportation, access, and resilience asset for the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued work stewarding San Francisco Bay and its shoreline.

Sincerely,

Sanjna Shah

Local Government Relations Director

Associated Students of the University of California's External Affairs Vice President

Jacob, Melinda

From: Claire Kahane <crkahane@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 2:50 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: Endangered marina

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I want to voice my concern at the lack of transparency in planning for the development of the marina, and in particular the crowding out of community recreation in favor of a large-scale commuter ferry plan and its negative consequences. Moreover, the environmental impact of the current plan has not come out.

There are ways to have a ferry if Berkeley wants a ferry. But the lack of transparency and disregard for the nature-based recreation that the waterfront provides has to be called out in this planning process.

Claire Kahane
2115 Eunice Street
Berkeley, CA 94709
Website: clairekahane.net

Jacob, Melinda

From: DAVID RICE <drice2@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 2:43 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB); publiccomment@bccdc.ca.gov
Subject: Ferry Plan Permit - Waterfront

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

How about not granting a ferry plan permit until the environmental report is made public and the public has commented on it?

Isn't that good governance? Isn't that a good idea?

David Rice
1470 Keoncrest Drive
Berkeley, 94702

Jacob, Melinda

From: Terence Candell <terence.candell@sfbayferry.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 9:11 AM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Cc: Lauren Gularte
Subject: SUBJECT: 2/26/2026: Item 7.G. - Written Comments
Attachments: Transbay Coalition - Zoning Adjustments Board Support Letter.pdf; Waterside Workshops - Berkeley Ferry Terminal Project.pdf; Berkeley Chamber — Zoning Adjustments Board.pdf; BPC — Zoning Adjustments Board.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I would like to submit the attached letters as written comments for item 7 on the 2/26/26 meeting agenda. Please let me know if you'll need anything else from me for this request.

Thank you,

Terence Candell, Government & Regulatory Affairs Specialist
San Francisco Bay Ferry
375 Beale Street, Suite 310
San Francisco, CA 94105
Email: terence.candell@sfbayferry.com
Phone: +1 415-364-3187
www.sanfranciscobayferry.com





1834 University Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94703
510.549.7000
info@berkeleychamber.com

February 17, 2026

Berkeley Planning Commission
City of Berkeley
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project

Dear Chair and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to express our support for the City of Berkeley's Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project at the Berkeley Waterfront, which is currently advancing through the City's public review and permitting process.

We recognize the proposed project as an important opportunity to restore and reinvest in long-closed pier infrastructure, improve public access to the Berkeley waterfront, and support regional mobility and economic activity. From our perspective, improving access to the waterfront helps support local businesses, workers, and visitors, and contributes to Berkeley's role as a regional destination.

The Berkeley Ferry Terminal is included in SF Bay Ferry's adopted Strategic Plan as part of a long-term regional ferry system expansion. The proposed service would be operated with electric, zero-emission vessels, supporting regional mobility while aligning with local and regional environmental and sustainability goals. As part of the broader ferry network, Berkeley service would also contribute to emergency response and evacuation capacity, strengthening overall system resilience.

We also recognize the project's potential to support multi-modal access, including walking and biking connections, and to complement existing transportation options. Expanding transportation choice helps improve access to the waterfront while reducing reliance on any single mode.

We appreciate that the project is proceeding through a transparent public process, including public hearings and opportunities for community input as design and mitigation measures continue to be refined. We support continued advancement of the project through this process and encourage the City to consider the long-term public benefits associated with restoring the Berkeley Pier as an active transportation and civic asset.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued work on Berkeley's waterfront and transportation planning.

Sincerely,

Beth Roessner
CEO
Berkeley Chamber of Commerce

Berkeley Chamber
1834 University Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94703
(510) 549-7000
www.berkeleychamber.com



2026 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Jaclyn Gnusti, President
Moffatt & Nichol

Anju Wicke, Vice President
Geosyntec

Virginia Demetrios, Treasurer
Arcadis, U.S.

John Bourgeois, Secretary
Valley Water

Arielle Harris
Cox, Castle & Nicholson

Iain Baker
Pacific Gas & Electric
Amnon Bar-Ilan
Ramboll
Michele Barlow
Environmental Resource Management

Russell Barnes
Wilshire Consulting
David Beaupre
Port of San Francisco
Michael Bishop
Martin Marietta Inc
Linda A. Blue
Pacific Inter-Club Yacht Association

Scott Bodensteiner
Haley Aldrich
William H. Butler
Lind Marine, Inc.
Angela Clapp
Port of Oakland
Brian Cooney
Marsh & McLennan Companies

Eli Davidian
Environmental Science Associates
Bill T. Dutra
The Dutra Group
Martin Espinoza Jr.
Pile Drivers Local 34
Lauren Gularte
Water Emergency Transportation Authority

Brian Hubinger
Chevron U.S.A. Inc.
David Ivester
Briscoe Prows Kao Ivester & Bazel LLP
Connie Lee
Cargill

Gary Link
Marathon Petroleum Corp.
Laura Kennedy
Woodard & Curran
Pat Mapelli
Graniterock

Christian Marsh
Steel Rives LLP
Brad Sherwood
Sonoma Water
Leslie Tice
HDR Engineering

Scott Warner
BBJ Group LLC
Sumudu Welaratna
Kleinfelder
Martha Whetstone
San Francisco International Airport
Jeff Wingfield
Port of Stockton
Kristine A. Zortman
Port of Redwood City

Laura Tam
Chief Executive Officer

February 11, 2026

City of Berkeley
Zoning Adjustments Board
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project — Use Permit

Dear Chair and Members of the Zoning Adjustments Board,

On behalf of Bay Planning Coalition, we are writing to express our support for the City of Berkeley's Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project at the Berkeley Waterfront. The City of Berkeley is currently finalizing a draft environmental review report for the project.

We recognize the proposed project as an important opportunity to restore public access to the Berkeley waterfront through the reconstruction of the Berkeley public pier, diversification of public transit options and increasing regional access to the Bay. From our perspective, restoring the Berkeley Pier as an active transportation and civic asset supports local businesses, workers, and visitors, while reinforcing Berkeley's role as a regional destination along the shoreline.

The Berkeley Ferry Terminal is included in SF Bay Ferry's adopted Strategic Plan as part of a long-term regional ferry system expansion. The proposed service would be operated with electric, zero-emission vessels, supporting regional mobility while aligning with City of Berkeley's climate, sustainability, and transportation goals. As part of the broader ferry network, Berkeley ferry service would also contribute to emergency response and evacuation capacity, strengthening the city's resilience to respond to an emergency.

We recognize the importance of careful review to ensure the project is consistent with applicable land-use regulations, public access requirements, and community compatibility. We appreciate that the project is being reviewed through the City of Berkeley's established environmental review and permitting processes, with opportunities to refine project details and mitigation measures as appropriate.

We support continued advancement of the project through the Zoning Adjustments Board review process and appreciate the Board's role in evaluating the proposed Use Permit. We encourage consideration of the long-term public benefits associated with restoring the Berkeley Pier as a transportation, access, and resilience asset for the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued work stewarding San Francisco Bay and its shoreline.

Sincerely,

Laura Tam
Chief Executive Officer
Bay Planning Coalition
laura@bayplanningcoalition.org

2/16/2026

City of Berkeley
Zoning Adjustments Board
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project — Use Permit

Dear Chair and Members of the Zoning Adjustments Board,

On behalf of Transbay Coalition, we are writing to express our support for the City of Berkeley's Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project at the Berkeley Waterfront. The City of Berkeley is currently finalizing a draft environmental review report for the project.

We recognize the proposed project as an important opportunity to restore public access to the Berkeley waterfront through the reconstruction of the Berkeley public pier, diversification of public transit options and increasing regional access to the Bay. From our perspective, restoring the Berkeley Pier as an active transportation and civic asset supports local businesses, workers, and visitors, while reinforcing Berkeley's role as a regional destination along the shoreline.

Also, to make the ferry terminal as accessible as possible, we urge that the various jurisdictions collaborate with AC Transit to run connecting bus service to the terminal, as well as create physically protected bike lanes from the terminal into the rest of the community.

The Berkeley Ferry Terminal is included in SF Bay Ferry's adopted Strategic Plan as part of a long-term regional ferry system expansion. The proposed service would be operated with electric, zero-emission vessels, supporting regional mobility while aligning with City of Berkeley's climate, sustainability, and transportation goals. As part of the broader ferry network, Berkeley ferry service would also contribute to emergency response and evacuation capacity, strengthening the city's resilience to respond to an emergency.

We recognize the importance of careful review to ensure the project is consistent with applicable land-use regulations, public access requirements, and community compatibility. We appreciate that the project is being reviewed through the City of Berkeley's established environmental review and permitting processes, with opportunities to refine project details and mitigation measures as appropriate.

We support continued advancement of the project through the Zoning Adjustments Board review process and appreciate the Board's role in evaluating the proposed Use

Permit. We encourage consideration of the long-term public benefits associated with restoring the Berkeley Pier as a transportation, access, and resilience asset for the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued work stewarding San Francisco Bay and its shoreline.

Sincerely,

Carter Lavin

Co-Founder

Transbay Coalition





February 18, 2026

City of Berkeley
Zoning Adjustments Board
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Berkeley Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project — Use Permit

Dear Chair and Members of the Zoning Adjustments Board,

On behalf of Waterside Workshops, we are writing to express our support for the City of Berkeley's Ferry Terminal / Pier Replacement Project at the Berkeley Waterfront. The City of Berkeley is currently finalizing a draft environmental review report for the project.

We recognize the proposed project as an important opportunity to restore public access to the Berkeley waterfront through the reconstruction of the Berkeley public pier, diversification of public transit options and increasing regional access to the Bay. From our perspective, restoring the Berkeley Pier as an active transportation and civic asset supports local businesses, workers, and visitors, while reinforcing Berkeley's role as a regional destination along the shoreline.

Waterside Workshops supports the project because it promotes access for cyclists and is a beneficial addition to the transit options in the area.

The Berkeley Ferry Terminal is included in SF Bay Ferry's adopted Strategic Plan as part of a long-term regional ferry system expansion. The proposed service would be operated with electric, zero-emission vessels, supporting regional mobility while aligning with City of Berkeley's climate, sustainability, and transportation goals. As part of the broader ferry network, Berkeley ferry service would also contribute to emergency response and evacuation capacity, strengthening the city's resilience to respond to an emergency.

We recognize the importance of careful review to ensure the project is consistent with applicable land-use regulations, public access requirements, and community compatibility. We appreciate that the project is being reviewed through the City of Berkeley's established environmental review and permitting processes, with opportunities to refine project details and mitigation measures as appropriate.

We support continued advancement of the project through the Zoning Adjustments Board review process and appreciate the Board's role in evaluating the proposed Use Permit. We encourage consideration of the long-term public benefits associated with restoring the Berkeley Pier as a transportation, access, and resilience asset for the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued work stewarding San Francisco Bay and its shoreline.

Sincerely,



Rebecca Grove
Executive Director
Waterside Workshops

Jacob, Melinda

From: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: FW: February 26 ZAB meeting, item 7G, proposed ferry terminal
Attachments: BERKELEY PIER Formatted plus.docx

From: James McGrath <macmcgrath@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 21, 2026 1:35 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) <Planningzab@berkeleyca.gov>
Subject: February 26 ZAB meeting, item 7G, proposed ferry terminal

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I submit the following comment and the attached white paper on this item.

ACTION IS PREMATURE

Any action by the ZAB to approve a zoning permit or conditional use permit for a new ferry terminal before an EIR has been prepared and approved is premature.

21006 of the California Environmental Quality Act establishes this direction for your body:

The Legislature finds and declares that **this division is an integral part of any public agency's decisionmaking process, including, but not limited to, the issuance of permits**, licenses, certificates, or other entitlements required for activities undertaken pursuant to federal statutes containing specific waivers of sovereign immunity.

Here's what the staff report says: "ZAB is not required to make a CEQA determination concurrent with this permit approval because the permit is not effective until Council action pursuant." I find it impossible to reconcile that statement with the charge you have been given. All Berkeley bodies are charged under CEQA with considering the significant impacts of a project, alternatives that would avoid those significant impacts, and mitigation measures that would minimize those impacts or reduce them to a less than significant level. This project would entail nearly 400,000 cubic yards of dredging and an indeterminate amount of fill. It would conflict with Berkeley's 1986 Measure L. The ZAB is required to consider those impacts, and cannot do so until an EIR is certified.

There is no plan that the city has adopted that designates a site in Berkeley's waterfront as a ferry terminal. The staff report acknowledges that with this statement: "The Berkeley Marina Master Plan was adopted in 2003 and did not contemplate the closure of the Berkeley Pier nor the operation of public ferry service."

In California, General Plans are required to establish the kinds, locations, and intensities of allowable land uses. Zoning is required to be consistent with General Plans and implement those plans. There is no certified land use plan that designates this site for a ferry terminal, or indicates the allowable intensity of use. Such a designation is necessary to change the zoning and give even preliminary approval to the proposed permit.

In 1986, Berkeley voters adopted Measure L, which requires a public vote before open space in the city can be used for other purposes. Because it was adopted by the voters, that measure remains in force. The specific language provides:

That **no public parks** (hereinafter defined) or **public open space** (hereinafter defined) owned or controlled or leased by the City of Berkeley or agency thereof, **shall be used for any other purpose than public parks and open space, without The Berkeley City Council first having submitted such use to the citizens for approval by a majority of registered Berkeley voters** voting at the next general election.
(ORDINANCE NO. 5785-N.S.)

The proposal before you would put structures on public open space granted to the city, in an area designated as a waterfront park by the Bay Conservation Development Commission, and not designated for those purposes in any adopted city plans. It clearly requires a public vote under that ordinance.

PARKING

The staff reports states that the city and its consultants have collected 588 days of parking counts that establish the pattern of recreational parking. That is simply not true. The requirement that a ferry terminal not usurp recreational parking is contained in the Bay Conservation and Development Commission's Bay Plan. That plan establishes policy standards that recreational uses and parking that support those uses are protected. The reports prepared by city traffic and parking consultants establish that peak recreational use of the lands south of University occurs between noon and one. The counts that they do have show that the peak time for recreation occurs after school lets out for summer and many recreational programs start up. **The city has not collected any parking counts on the lots closest to the proposed ferry terminal where recreational parking might be usurped between 12 and 1 during the peak recreational season. NONE.** For the two south basin lots, the city only collected 12 days of data, all at 4:00. Even with those limited counts past the time of peak usage, those lots were as much as 96% full. For the 90 spaces along Seawall Drive which are also used for recreational access, the city collected only 6 days of parking counts during that recreational period, all at 4:00 pm. Even after peak use, those spaces were as much as 63% utilized—but the city plans to eliminate all but 20 of those spaces, directly usurping recreational access.

Any findings that the ZAB proposes to adopt must be factually based, and must bridge the analytical gap from the regulatory standard to the Board's decision. The current report accepts the city's flawed claims that they have ample data without considering any of the many rebuttals that have been submitted. Findings that do not address the problems with the city's data collection are not defensible.

DREDGING

According to material that the city has submitted to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, approval of this project would entail more than 370,000 cubic yards of dredging. That new dredging would certainly have significant adverse impacts and is regulated under BCDC's Bay Plan, the Federal Clean Water Act, and the State's Porter-Cologne Act. The ZAB has a responsibility to evaluate alternatives such as a location within the Berkeley marina basin that would avoid those significant impacts.

THERE IS AMPLE TIME TO CONSIDER THE EIR

As noted in the staff report, there is no funding for implementation of this project and no EIR has been circulated for comment. The staff report before you shows no evidence of the many comments that have been submitted, or provides findings that have a factual basis. There is no need to act on February 26, 2026.

Jim McGrath

A white paper that is available on our web site, <https://www.saveberkeleypier.org/>

is attached and should be provided to the ZAB members.

BERKELEY PIER-FERRY PROJECT WHITE PAPER

Jim McGrath
February 10, 2026

With Berkeley about to release a draft EIR for a new ferry terminal project on a designated waterfront park in Berkeley's waterfront it makes sense to examine the issues that proposal raises. How much will it cost, who will pay? Does the project benefit or harm equity for residents? What are the environmental impacts, and potential benefits? I've served long terms on the Waterfront Commission and the Parks and Waterfront Commission and studied the ferry project since it was proposed in 2008. I've prepared this white paper to make sure that the facts are out there and a debate over this project can be open and informed.

ECONOMICS

Capital

In a memorandum of understanding that went to the City Council on March 12, 2019, Berkeley agreed to pay "all costs associated with public access elements of the Project." (page 4, Construction Assumptions)

In 2021, the city estimated the cost of the project to be \$121.7 million, which included \$38.2 million for two electric ferries. The city's costs were estimated to be \$14.0 million for landside improvements and \$13.9 million for the recreational portion of the pier. (Staff report and presentation for City Council Work Session December 7, 2021. See also Community Workshop #3 presentation)

On December 9, 2025, in response to PRA 25-2672, the city provided a partial update of those cost estimates. At that time, the cost estimate for the project, not including the two ferries, was estimated to be \$131,133,445. That estimate projected the landside costs that are the city's responsibility to be \$24,625,495. Under the MOU, the city is also responsible for the cost of the recreational part of the pier. The pier is now estimated to cost only \$14 million for both the ferry terminal and the recreational section, so the city would be responsible for roughly half of that \$14.4 million. Thus, it appears that the city's costs have increased from \$27.9 million to \$31.8 million. The updated costs did not include revised estimates for ferries. If we assume the same \$38.2 million for ferries from the 2021 estimate, **the project is now projected to cost \$169.3 million**, with the city responsible for nearly \$32 million of the capital cost.

Subsidies

The established goals for transit include having fares generate at least 40% of the revenue required to operate the systems. The most recent report for WETA, the ferry company, included in the Board agenda packet for January 2026, showed that only 26% of the operational costs, and none of the capital costs, are generated by ridership. WETA reduced fares to compete with BART, which resulted in greater ridership but still requires about \$3 of subsidy for every dollar generated by fares. WETA planning documents have estimated the annual subsidy required for a new Berkeley service to be \$6 to \$12 million a year. (For comparison, the current budget for the marina is about \$7 million). Other WETA planning documents forecast that they will exhaust subsidies for the existing system by 2030. Nothing in the current MOU between WETA and Berkeley requires Berkeley to pay for part of these subsidies, but WETA Board members have called for dedication of property taxes or TOT funds from hotels to cover half of the needed subsidy. WETA's Berkeley Ferry Service Business Plan, dated March 17, 2022, includes this statement:

Local Funding

It is not expected that the City of Berkeley will subsidize operations of the ferry services from its General Fund. However, local (City) funding sources may also be established, similar to the funding provided by a local property tax charged in Bay Farm Island or a portion of Contra Costa County sales tax revenue for the Richmond service to provide an operating subsidy. One option could include a Transient Occupancy Tax surcharge on hotel night stays in the Marina that would reinvest revenue in the Berkeley waterfront and support maintenance of the pier and shared parking facilities.

Landside facilities maintenance

Under the MOU, Berkeley is required to develop and maintain landside facilities, including recreational facilities, a dedicated parking lot for ferry riders, and implementation of a parking management plan, or TDM. The city has not provided estimates for those costs. An earlier report by their Transportation consultant Nelson/Nygaard estimated that a less elaborate TDM than currently proposed would cost \$340,000 a year (*2022-01-31 Draft Parking and Mobility Framework - Nelson Nygaard* page 3a). The city proposes dedicating 250 spaces to ferry riders. Full use of those spaces for 50 weeks every weekday could generate revenue. There are 250 spaces, the commuter ferry would run 5 days a week for 50 weeks—that is 62,500 potential parking days. Recovering even the lowest estimate, \$340,000 a year for a parking management plan from full utilization of those spaces 50 weeks out of the year would cost \$5.54 per day. A higher estimate was also included, \$550,000, which would \$8.80 per day. Even if every space was occupied every day and they paid the proposed \$6 per space parking fee,

parking would only generate \$375,000. If half of the ferry riders were regular commuters, and opted to purchase an annual pass for \$500, revenue would drop to \$250,000, less than the lowest estimate of the operational costs. These costs would be borne by the city. Berkeley chronically collects less parking revenue and fines than the operational cost of parking meters and the garage, with the shortfall as high as \$9 million in FY 2022.

PARKING

Berkeley has consistently claimed higher numbers for parking spaces and data on existing parking use. Recreational parking is specifically protected under Bay Plan policies adopted by BCDC. The city has not made a good faith effort to identify the recreational uses that are protected by that policy or counted usage during peak periods. There is a limited set of parking areas which support existing recreational use and are within easy walking distance of the proposed ferry terminal. Those lots include Seawall lot, filled under a BCDC permit to support recreational use at Shorebird Park and the former H's Lordships restaurant, 320 spaces; Seawall Drive, 90 spaces used for sightseeing and fishing; Skates/N lot, 137 spaces supporting a restaurant and overflow parking for the Yacht Club; South Cove East, 96 spaces; and South Cove West, 86 spaces. That is a total of 729 spaces, not the over 2000 spaces sometimes claimed by city in public presentations. The city plans, between an exclusive negotiating agreement with TSA for leasing the old H's Lordships restaurant, restriping the adjacent lot, and reducing recreational parking along Seawall Drive by 70 spaces, to increase the parking supply to about 430 spaces ("Preliminary Parking Management Plan", submitted to BCDC for Design Review Board meeting of November 3, 2025, page 7), dedicate 250 spaces for the exclusive use of ferry commuters, and dedicate another 150 of those spaces for the exclusive use of a new tenant. If implemented, that plan would increase the number of parking spaces in this critical area to about 839, but then reserve 400 spaces for commuters or the restaurant.

The tests under the Bay Plan are first, whether the remaining 439 spaces would provide for existing and increased recreational use. A second test is whether the 250 spaces reserved for ferry riders would be sufficient, and if not, whether riders can be prevented from usurping the remaining recreational spaces.

Berkeley has not commissioned a comprehensive study of existing recreational uses that might be protected under the Bay Plan. However, Save the Berkeley Pier and the San Francisco Boardsailing Association obtained a report from Placer AI analyzing visitors to the waterfront between June 1, 2024, and May 31, 2025. We provided a copy of that report to the City. That report showed a total of 1.8 million visitors to the Berkeley Waterfront and Waterfront Commercial area. Looking only at the Berkeley Waterfront Data, it showed 600,000 visits, an

average of over 1640 per day, with peak use during the summer well over 2,000 per day. The data also showed the time of day that recreation visits occur with peak use between noon and 1:00. This data matches that collected by Kittelson, the City's parking consultant.

While the city has claimed to have over 18,000 data points on parking, they have collected almost no parking counts during the summer when both Kittelson and Placer AI identified peak recreational use. Weekdays are the most critical period because weekday commuting is expected to have more passengers than weekends, and ample data shows that the weekends are already frequently very busy with most parking spaces occupied. For the two South Basin lots, the city only collected 12 days of weekday parking. That data was collected only at 4:00 pm, well after peak use, and still showed as much as 96% of the parking spaces occupied. The city only collected days of parking data for the 90 spaces along Seawall Drive, also all at 4:00 pm. Even after peak recreational use, those spaces were as much as 63% occupied. On some of the weekdays when the South Basin lots were counted, the lots at Skate's and O were also counted. Only 8 counts were taken, all at 4:00 pm, and sometimes lots were as much as 63% full. The city has argued that ample space is available in the Skate's lot, and that the timing of ferry travel and restaurant use makes joint use of that lot possible. As such, the city now claims that an additional 75 parking spaces for commuters will be available in the Skate's lot. While that is certainly possible, a total of only 8 counts during summer weekdays, all at 4:00, does not establish the pattern of use of that lot in a way that shows when dinner patrons start to arrive and when ferry parkers might leave. The cocktail hour certainly overlaps with departing ferry passengers, so such analysis is essential.

Heavy use of other lots by recreational users is also found in the background reports. For example, Nelson/Nygaard, the city's initial parking consultant reported in "Revised Short-term Recommendations for Waterfront Parking Management", September 11, 2018, that "...South Cove East lot experiences as much as 90% occupancy." Similar problems were noted at the J and K lots and L & M lots, where the report noted that "During weekdays, centrally located lots, particularly the J&K Lot and the L&M Lot, experience as much as 89% and 93% occupancy, respectively. "

Turning to the critical second question, will 250 spaces suffice for a new service, and how many passengers are Berkeley and WETA planning for? In most of their documents, Berkeley only anticipates 915 passengers departing from Berkeley on weekdays. But WETA's Business Plan, dated Marcy 17, 2022 and relied on by the city, forecasts 2110 trips in 2040. That would be 1055 departing passengers, 140 more than the city estimates. The capacity of the system proposed is even greater. Eight morning departures on a 250-seat ferry, at the 80% capacity that WETA uses in some of their documents, has the capacity for at least 1600 departing passengers. In the material submitted to BCDC's Design Review Board, the city proposes to

eliminate public parking at 70 of the 90 spaces along Seawall Drive. Those parking spaces support recreational use and are protected by Bay Plan policies. As noted before, the limited parking counts completed for those spaces shows as many as 63% occupied, **so the loss of 70 spaces directly usurps recreational parking.** Existing use of those spaces supports swimming and winging activities at the cove adjacent to the restaurant. Those activities are explicitly protected by Bay Plan policies, and organized swims with up to 100 participants have been observed.

The city claims that 250 parking spaces at 199 Seawall lot, with a transportation demand management program and protection of recreational parking in the South Basin lots will prevent usurpation of recreational parking, the Bay Plan standard. But the math simply does not work, even for 915 departing passengers. At existing Bay Ferry Terminals, 40% to 60% of the commuters drive and park. With the planned departure of 915 passengers, that is 366 to 549 passengers seeking a parking space and a supply of only 250 spaces unless some arrangement for additional parking is made. The Skate's lot has only 133 spaces and the city proposes to dedicate 75 of those spaces to ferry parking. This brings the count of parking to 325 spaces, with at least 366 and more likely 549 passengers seeking a parking space. The city makes unsupported claims about alternative modes of access which are not supported by substantial evidence and are contradicted by existing practices. I'll discuss mode split below.

TRANSPARENCY

I have had to submit many Public Records Act requests to get information from the city. This information, like the raw data of traffic accounts, was not posted on the city website. Often I had to do this to track down false statements that city staff had made in public meetings. I will give three examples to illustrate that this is an endemic problem. It doesn't matter if these false statements are provided intentionally to mislead the public, or the result of sloppy work. They characterize the city staff's inability to present accurate information.

On June 7, 2023, Parks and Recreation staff briefed the city Planning Commission on the Waterfront Specific Plan, which included a footprint for the ferry. At that meeting, they presented slides that showed the South Cove lots lightly used, at 5%. But at that time City staff had in hand the September 11, 2018, report by Nelson\Nygard that stated "The South Cove lots have multiple users...**resulting in a peak period in which the lots are full.**"

After receiving years of comments expressing concern about the impact of ferry parking on recreational use, city staff made a presentation to the Berkeley Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission in March, 2025. Their slides claimed that they had "over 18,000 data points." By the November 23, 2025, DRB meeting the city had modified its claim, and then

claimed to have 583 daily counts and 60 midday counts. But most of those counts were taken during the off-season; the city has only 11 weekday counts at the South Basin lots during the peak recreational season—all at 4:00 pm, well after the peak use at 12:00 to 1:00. The city has even fewer counts for Seawall Drive and Skates lot.

Disinformation is presented to citizen groups in the city. I attended a meeting of the Rotary Club on July 30, 2025. In response to a question about restoring the pier without a ferry, Roger Miller stated that was impossible because it would cost \$76 million. I asked for documentation of that cost—and never received it. On July 7, 2025, Berkeley's consultants had provided the city with an estimate for pier construction, 22 feet wide and 1080 feet long, of \$10,000,960. Adding in demolition and pile construction, the total cost was estimated at about \$14 million. So a new recreational pier 2,000 feet long—4 times the recreational length the city proposes as part of a pier-ferry project, would cost less than \$30 million. Not \$76 million.

ZERO EMISSIONS?

Battery powered ferries remain in the developmental stage for runs of the length of the Berkeley to San Francisco route. WETA has entered into a contract for three 150 seat electric ferries at a cost of \$46 million. They are also planning to retrofit the larger, 400 seat ferries that serve the Oakland/Alameda to San Francisco route. WETA has relied on grants for purchasing ferries, and while they have announced plans to electrify their operations over time, they have qualified that commitment with "if feasible." This statement from WETA's web site makes it clear that they depend on external funding:

WETA will need an infusion of federal, state and local funds to achieve the aggressive plan to transition 50% of the fleet to zero emissions by 2035. Ability to implement this plan hinges on new funds becoming available, but also includes some of WETA's existing funding streams for vessel replacement projects.

The 2022 business plan also assumes diesel ferries, stating that the costs of electric ferries are not yet well defined. Even with fully electric ferries, a commuter system will not achieve zero emissions. Ferries operate through water, which significantly increases the amount of power required to move the boat and passengers. Passengers who are lured away from BART by the lower fares that WETA has instituted, and drive rather than walk or drive further to a ferry terminal will increase energy use. Until there is complete non-carbon sources for electricity, this will increase carbon emissions.

In our comments on the notice of preparation, we asked for an emission and energy comparison between ferries and other modes of transportation, using BTU's as a common metric to allow a

fair comparison. Any claims that ferries are zero emission made in advance of an EIR are at best speculative.

MODE SPLIT—HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL REALLY ARRIVE BY CAR?

Rather than preparing a defensible analysis of mode split based on the pattern of use at similar ferry terminals and Berkeley's experience with two small ferry operations that have since ended. Berkeley developed a mode split based on assumptions. High on hope, very low on underlying evidence. Perhaps most egregious are the estimates of bicycle use. In their Bicycle plan Berkeley reports that 8.5% of commuters used bicycles in 2014, relying on the American Community Survey. But bicycle use for commuting has dropped dramatically. Using the same source, the ACS, which is collected by the US Census, datausa tracks that decrease. <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/berkeley-ca/> showing a drop to 4.75%. The MTC reports 4.8% for Berkeley here: <https://vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov/indicators/commute-mode-choice#section-Y4WAO7rizpS4w4pQW0DgJ>

Rather than use these well-supported and credible reports, Berkeley's consultant Kittelson has recommended a baseline of 16% as a mode share (March 7, 2025 Parking and TDM Plan page 10). This is more than three times the observed pattern, but fits neatly into the talking points that people won't really drive to the marina to take the ferry. In proposing this unrealistic mode split, Berkeley and Kittelson have ignored readily available information. For years, Prop SF and Tidelines operated small ferries out of Berkeley. The September 11, 2018, Nelson Nygaard report stated that 91 passengers used the Prop SF service and 129 passengers used the Tidelines service. The city collects per passenger fees, so it can easily determine how many passengers used those services on a single day. There are readily available ways to check the mode split. There are secure bike lockers near the access dock which can only be used with a cell phone app. That means that there is time specific occupancy data. Alternatively, Placer AI, and perhaps other firms, collect cell phone locational data. That data is claimed to be accurate to within 15 feet, which makes it capable of capturing travel on the Bay Trail to the vicinity of the small ferries.

The claim of a 16% share, increasing to 22%, made in the background documents is unreasonable in other ways as well. I frequently go to the marina in the morning to crew on the Pegasus and take Berkeley school kids out onto the Bay. I almost always go by bicycle and pass the bike cages. I am usually the only bicycle in the marina. I have spoken with one woman who rides her bike to the ferry regularly; she says she no longer takes her bicycle on the ferry because the salt air is hard on it. We are both outliers; MTC reports that bicycle commuting averages about 2 miles. Even with electric bicycles, the distance travelled is short. In 2023, 134 Berkeley residents received a free electric bicycle. This use was monitored and

reported. It averaged 13 miles a week, less than two miles a day. This agrees with the MTC reports. Very few of the potential ferry passengers live within two miles of the marina, and neither the city nor WETA have generated any origin and destination information that would support a higher mode split than the 4.75% reported by the MTC.

<https://watersideworkshops.org/street-level-cycles/berkeley-e-bike-equity-project/#:~:text=134%20Berkeley%20residents%20benefited%20from,a%20car%20or%20motor%20vehicle>

With the rather optimistic assumption that 5.9% of commuters from the ferry system's catchment area would ride to the ferry, that means that only 54 passengers would arrive by bicycle.

ALTERNATIVES

Stakeholders at the marina have long urged the city and WETA to consider terminals within the marina. Such an alternative would dramatically decrease costs and conflicts with the existing recreational uses. Now the city has submitted their partial design to BCDC in preparation for review by BCDC's Engineering Criteria Review Board in late February. Those plans show that an open bay terminal would require more than 370,000 cubic yards of dredging, at an estimated cost of at least \$25.8 million. Those costs would be avoided if the ferry route came inside the marina, as it does in Richmond. There the cost of a new ferry terminal was only \$20 million, less than 1/8th of the current proposal.

The Clean Water Act requires a rigorous analysis of alternative for any project like this that entails nearly 400,000 cubic yards of dredging as well as new fill for a wave protection breakwater. An in-harbor alternative would eliminate the need for substantial dredging and save over \$100 million.

ALTERNATIVES TO FIXING THE PIER

At many of the public meetings that I have attended, city staff have argued that the pier can only be replaced as part of a transportation project, and that only a transportation project can generate money for replacing the recreational pier. As noted above, they have grossly exaggerated the cost of a new pier. All the public listening sessions that the city has held have avoided any discussion of a stand-alone recreational pier. Frustrated with the closure of the pier, in 2021, I approached Senator Nancy Skinner and asked her for help funding a replacement for the pier. At my urging, the city asked for financial help. Their request resulted in an earmark for Berkeley in AB 179, a trailer bill for the budget adopted in mid-2022. That bill would have allowed the city to use those funds for more than half the cost of a 2,000 foot

replacement pier. The bill simply provided “\$15,000,000 to the City of Berkeley for the Marina and Pier projects.” The city chose not to spend the money on restoring the pier.

There will be future opportunities for funding for improving recreational access. The legislature has placed several bonds on the state ballot which have passed and were administered by the State Coastal Conservancy. While there is no immediate source of funding for replacing the pier, it might be much more feasible to secure \$24 million for a recreational project than \$160 million for a park and ride commuter terminal in a waterfront park.

HIGHER PRIORITIES

As this White Paper makes clear, I believe that restoring a recreational resource in Berkeley’s largest park is a higher priority than a ferry terminal. But the city has identified over \$100 million in deferred infrastructure needs in a March 28, 2025, memorandum to the City Council Re; Department Capital Improvement and Minot Maintenance Update.

Financial analysis prepared for the pier-ferry plan and the now-stalled Waterfront Specific Plan promise no direct revenue from a ferry terminal but speculate that returning passengers might boost restaurant revenues by 20%. Of course, that has not been seen in Jack London Square, where multiple restaurants have closed despite the presence of a ferry terminal. As shown above, ferry commutes are unlikely to even cover the cost of managing the parking lots.

On the other hand, the existing boating facilities generate about 2/3 of the revenue for the marina fund—more than \$4 million a year. Sustaining that revenue should be a higher priority. Replacing docks and pilings, repairing sidewalks and parking lots used by paying tenants, and making the repairs needed at the South Cove should all be higher priorities.