

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, April 1, 2015
Approved Verbatim Minutes¹

FERRY LANDING PROJECT / EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BRIDGEWAY AND ANCHOR STREETS – STUDY SESSION

Applicant: The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District

Owner: City of Sausalito

Staff: Schinsing

Description: The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District is proposing to demolish the existing passenger boarding systems at the Sausalito ferry landing which is east of the intersection of Bridgeway and Anchor Street (APN 065-073-05) and replace them with new passenger boarding systems. The intent of the project is to replace aging facilities, extend the life of the facilities, and improve vessel loading for all passengers by standardizing boarding operations. The proposal includes a new 150-foot long by 53-foot wide concrete float, a new 90-foot long by 19-foot wide steel gangway, and a new 96-foot long by 25-foot-wide pile-supported concrete pier that will extend from the existing landside pier.

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing on the Ferry Landing project with the purpose being to make a recommendation to the City Council on a determination of the Design Review Permit findings, provide direction as appropriate, and continue the hearing to April 15, 2015.

Planning Commission

PC Chair Joan Cox

PC Vice-Chair Bill Werner - Absent

Commissioner Susan Cleveland-Knowles

Commissioner Vicki Nichols

Commissioner Morgan Pierce

Historic Landmarks Board

HLB Chair John McCoy

HLB Secretary Natascha Fraser - Absent

HLB Board Member Aldo Mercado

HLB Board Member Shasha Richardson

HLB Board Member Ben Brown

¹ A video recording of this meeting is available at: <http://www.ci.sausalito.ca.us/>.

1 CHAIR COX: Good evening, everybody. Hi, everybody. Welcome to the special
2
3 meeting on Wednesday, April 1, 2015 of the Planning Commission and the Historic
4
5 Landmarks Board. Thank you, everybody, for being here. I'm going to call the meeting
6
7 to order on behalf of the Planning Commission and ask Danny Castro to call the roll.
8

9 DANNY CASTRO: Thank you, Chair Cox. Would you like me to begin with the
10
11 Historic Landmarks Board roll call?
12

13 CHAIR COX: If you could do the Planning Commission, and then I'll turn it over
14
15 to John McCoy to call the Historic Landmarks Board meeting to order.
16

17 DANNY CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner Pierce.
18

19 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Present.
20

21 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.
22

23 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Here.
24

25 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.
26

27 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Here.
28

29 DANNY CASTRO: Vice-Chair Werner.
30

31 CHAIR COX: He's absent.
32

33 DANNY CASTRO: He's absent. Chair Cox.
34

35 CHAIR COX: Here. Okay, now I'll turn it over to Chair John McCoy to call the
36
37 Historic Landmarks Board to order.
38

39 CHAIR McCOY: Good evening again to everybody. I'd like to call to order the
40
41 special meeting this April 1, 2015 of the joint session with the Planning Commission and
42
43 Historic Landmarks Board of Sausalito. Danny, could you take the roll?
44

45 DANNY CASTRO: Thank you, Chair McCoy. Board Member Brown.
46
47

48 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Here.
49
50

1 DANNY CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

2
3 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Here.

4
5 DANNY CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

6
7 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Present.

8
9 DANNY CASTRO: Secretary Fraser. She is absent, excused. And Chair McCoy.

10
11 CHAIR McCOY: Present.

12
13 CHAIR COX: First item on our agenda is approval of the agenda. May I have a
14
15 motion?

16
17 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: So moved.

18
19 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

20
21 CHAIR COX: All in favor? So the motion carries 4-0 by the Planning
22
23 Commission.

24
25 CHAIR McCOY: I'll request the same motion from the HLB.

26
27 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to accept.

28
29 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.

30
31 CHAIR McCOY: All in favor? Motion moved 4-0 for approval.

32
33 CHAIR COX: Next on our agenda are public comments on items not on this
34
35 agenda. Is there any member of the public here this evening who would like to comment
36
37 on an item not on our agenda this evening? And of course the only item on our agenda
38
39 this evening is the Ferry Landing project. Seeing none, we'll move on to discussion.

40
41
42 In a moment we'll ask for declarations regarding public contacts, but first, several
43
44 of you have asked to know whether any members of our City Council are here tonight.
45
46 In a moment I will ask them to stand up and introduce themselves, but I wanted to let all
47
48 of you know that this is a meeting of the Historic Landmarks Board and the Planning
49
50

1 Commission. Any members of the City Council who are here this evening are here only
2
3 to observe, and in order to avoid any Brown Act implications, I would ask that you not
4
5 address comments and questions to the members of the City Council who may be here
6
7 this evening, but respect their right to listen and learn like all of the rest of us.
8

9 So with that, are any members of the City Council here this evening? I think I saw
10
11 our mayor earlier. Thank you, Mayor Tom Theodores, and then we have City Council
12
13 Member Jill Hoffman.
14

15 All right, and now I'll ask for any declarations regarding public contacts. I'll start
16
17 off and again say I have spoken with numerous members of the public regarding this. I
18
19 have received numerous emails, and any emails that were not also sent to staff I
20
21 forwarded to staff so that the record is complete. Who else would like to declare any
22
23 contacts?
24

25 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I would make the same statement. I've spoken with
26
27 numerous members of the public, and have received emails, and I have forwarded them
28
29 accordingly.
30

31 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I have not received any personal emails, but I did
32
33 speak with the public when I did my site visit down at the ferry landing the first day the
34
35 story poles were up. We didn't discuss the merits of the project, and I referred them to
36
37 submit their comments as part of the public record.
38

39 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I've also had several conversations
40
41 with members of the public, and I received no emails.
42

43 CHAIR COX: Thank you, and I'll turn it over to Chair McCoy to ask the same of
44
45 the members of the Historic Landmarks Board.
46
47

48 CHAIR McCOY: Would anyone like to go first?
49
50

1 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Several members of the public have spoken with
2
3 me about their views regarding the Ferry Landing project, and I have received no
4
5 emails.
6

7 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I've had a few conversations with members
8
9 of the public. I've not had any emails.
10

11 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Nothing.
12

13 CHAIR McCOY: And I as well have spoken with numerous members of the
14
15 public.
16

17 CHAIR COX: I'm noticing some people raising their hands in the back here. I
18
19 think all of us have to be aware that we don't have enough microphones for each of us
20
21 to have one, so when we are speaking, we have to speak loudly and into the mic so that
22
23 everybody in this large room can hear us.
24

25
26 With that, the item on our agenda tonight is the Ferry Landing project, and I will
27
28 turn it over to staff for a report.
29

30 LILLY SCHINSING: Thank you, Chair Cox. Welcome to all the Planning
31
32 Commission members, and the Historic Landmarks Board members, and all the public
33
34 who are here this evening. My name is Lilly Schinsing and I'm your Administrative
35
36 Analyst with the City.
37

38 The purpose of the meeting tonight is a public hearing to receive a presentation
39
40 from the Golden Gate Highway and Transportation District on their proposed project, to
41
42 provide feedback, and to review the Design Review Permit findings.
43

44 The agenda this evening is the same process as a Design Review Permit for the
45
46 City. I will present a staff report. Then we'll hear a presentation from the District. Then
47
48 we'll have Commission and Board questions. Then we'll have public comment. Then
49
50

1 finally there will be a time for the Commission and Board members to provide comment
2
3 and direction, and then continue the meeting for two weeks times to the meeting of April
4
5 15th.
6

7 In terms of the process, the District has been planning to renovate the existing
8
9 ferry landing and replace it with a new ferry landing since 2008. Per state law, the
10
11 District is not required to comply with the City's zoning and building ordinances, and is
12
13 also exempt from the Sausalito Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board
14
15 permitting for a Design Review Permit. However, the site the ferry landing is located on
16
17 is owned by the City of Sausalito, and as the landowner of that site the City Council at
18
19 their February 10th meeting of this year directed a public process to review the District's
20
21 proposed project, and that process simulates a Design Review Permit process. The
22
23 public is invited and welcome at all of the meetings I'm about to talk about.
24

25 The first meeting was held on March 11, and it was a study session with the
26
27 Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board. The purpose of that meeting was
28
29 to receive a detailed description of the proposed project, ask questions, and then
30
31 provide feedback for the District. The District subsequently submitted a formal
32
33 application to the City after they considered feedback from the community and direction
34
35 from the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board at that March 11th
36
37 meeting.
38

39 Tonight we have our second meeting in a series of four meetings, and the
40
41 Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board will receive a presentation from
42
43 the District on their revised design, and then begin to determine whether or not the
44
45 Design Review Permit findings can be made for the project.
46
47
48
49
50

1 The third meeting, which will be on April 15th, will be another joint meeting with
2 the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board, and that will be to make a
3 recommendation to the City Council on whether or not those design review findings can
4 be made for the project.
5
6
7
8

9 The fourth and final meeting in the series will be the City Council hearing, which
10 will be held on May 5th. At that meeting the City Council will consider the HLB and
11 Planning Commission's determination and decide if consent can be granted for the
12 project in accordance with the terms of the lease.
13
14
15
16

17 If Council grants consent, the District is planning on requesting a hearing in front
18 of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, or BCDC, on May 2nd.
19
20

21 At the March 11th study session meeting with the Planning Commission and HLB
22 the District presented a variety of alternative designs for the gangway truss, the access
23 gate, and the railings. Based on feedback received at that meeting, the District will be
24 presenting their proposed design tonight.
25
26
27
28

29 There were many questions asked at that March 11th meeting, both from the
30 public and the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board. Staff wrote
31 down all of those questions and forwarded them on to the District for response. The
32 District has provided responses, late correspondence this afternoon, and we did make
33 copies of that for the Planning Commission and HLB members, as well as copies for the
34 public, which are at the front tables.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Additionally, the Commission and Board requested additional materials and data
43 from the District during the course of the March 11th meeting. Those items are listed on
44 the screen here and were incorporated into the response that the District provided today
45 that's in front of you.
46
47
48
49
50

1 In terms of the existing conditions, the existing board system sits on two parcels,
2
3 mainly over water, that are both owned by the City of Sausalito, and measures
4
5 approximately 17.5 acres. The existing system consists of 110-foot long by 42-foot wide
6
7 steel float, a 70-foot long by 5.5-foot wide steel gangway, and an approximately 96.5-
8
9 foot long by 8.5-foot-wide pile-supported timber and concrete access pier. This access
10
11 pier connects to a 95-foot long by 20.5-foot wide landside pier.
12

13 The District leases approximately 51,402 square feet from the City for their
14
15 operations. The site is designated as an Open Area in the General Plan, and it is also
16
17 zoned as an Open Area.
18

19 The specific purposes of the open space in public zoning districts are to preserve
20
21 the existing City-owned open space and parks, and to provide guidelines for
22
23 development and use of facilities on City and federally owned land. Additional specific
24
25 purposes of the Open Area zoning district are to ensure the retention of certain open
26
27 water areas and shoreline areas for water oriented activities in conformance with the
28
29 General Plan, to enhance the natural and scenic qualities of the waterfront, and also to
30
31 accommodate the needs of navigation.
32

33 In terms of the site's historic context, the site is located in the Historic Overlay
34
35 District in Sausalito. The purposes of the Historic District include promoting the
36
37 conservation, preservation and enhancement of historic or architecturally significant
38
39 structures and sites that form an important link to Sausalito's past; in addition to
40
41 encouraging the protection and reuse of structures, sites and areas that provide
42
43 significant examples of the past, or that are landmarks in the history of architecture; and
44
45 also to provide a appropriate settings and environments for historic structures among
46
47 other purposes.
48
49
50

1 Staff has provided a detailed review of the historic context of the ferry landing site
2
3 in the staff report that we produced for this meeting, and I'm just going to go over some
4
5 of the highlights of that historic review for you.
6

7 In 1868, the Sausalito Land and Ferry Company was incorporated and made
8
9 ferry trips from Sausalito to San Francisco from the original ferry landing, which was at
10
11 the foot of Princess Street.
12

13 In 1875, construction began on the railroad by the North Pacific Coast Railroad,
14
15 and then two years later the Sausalito Land and Ferry Company turned all of their ferry
16
17 operations over the railroad itself.
18

19 In 1875, a new ferry landing and railroad were constructed north of the one at
20
21 Princess Street in the approximate area of the existing ferry landing site.
22

23 In 1903, commuter electric trains were added to the railroad line. There was an
24
25 extensive redesign of the ferry wharf itself and the tracks. Those tracks were
26
27 rearranged, and then a new two-story terminal building was constructed with two-level
28
29 loading slips for the double-ended ferryboats.
30

31 In 1922, the Golden Gate Ferry Company secured landing sites at the foot of
32
33 Princess Street in almost the same location as the original Sausalito ferry landing
34
35 location previously in the 1800s, and began running an auto ferry, which was dedicated
36
37 to efficient service for the motorists over to San Francisco.
38

39 In 1923 the Northwestern Pacific Railroad began competing with the Golden
40
41 Gate Ferry Company to carry cars over to San Francisco, and demand was so high for
42
43 automobile transport over to the city that on the July 10th weekend in 1926 the
44
45 combined Golden Gate and Northwestern Pacific ferries carried over 70,000
46
47 automobiles just that one weekend.
48
49
50

1 In 1929, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad and Golden Gate Ferry Company
2
3 were merged to form a new company. Also in the same year the Golden Gate Bridge
4
5 District was organized with the principal task of building the Golden Gate Bridge.
6

7 In 1937, the Golden Gate Bridge was opened up to traffic and it slowed demand
8
9 for the auto ferryboat substantially, because people were now able to drive over into the
10
11 city.
12

13 In 1941, the ferryboat Eureka made it's last regular run to Sausalito for the
14
15 Southern Pacific Golden Gate Ferries company, and then both commuter and steam
16
17 train service was also eliminated from Sausalito in 1941.
18

19 In 1942, the railroad tracks were rerouted and new track was laid in the
20
21 Marinship for the ship building effort for World War II. Both of the ferry landings were
22
23 abandoned.
24

25 In 1969, there was a study that was commissioned for a ferry system to be
26
27 operated by the Golden Gate Highway and Transportation District, and in 1970 the
28
29 District began its public ferry service between San Francisco and Sausalito pursuant to
30
31 a lease agreement with the City and the District.
32

33 In 1995, the District began reconstruction of the ferry landing by removing the
34
35 abandoned timber piles, a steel gangway, and a floating dock, and then installing the
36
37 access pier, a steel floating dock and an aluminum gangway.
38

39 In 1998, the City began work on the construction of the access pier and other
40
41 improvements to the ferry plaza area.
42

43 That brings us to today and the current proposal. The current proposal is new
44
45 boarding facilities, which will be located in approximately the same location in the
46
47 leased area as the existing facilities. They're proposed to consist of a new 150-foot long
48
49
50

1 by 53-foot wide concrete float, a new 90-foot long by 19-foot wide steel gangway, and a
2
3 new 96-foot long by 21-foot wide pile-supported concrete access pier that will connect
4
5 to the existing landside pier.
6

7 During construction of the new ferry landing there will be a temporary landing that
8
9 would be installed southward of the existing ferry landing to provide service during the
10
11 construction.
12

13 The District, in their presentation this evening, will discuss the purposes of their
14
15 project and go into detail on the project's design.
16

17 We just wanted to provide some detail on those features that were changed from
18
19 the prior meeting on March 11th. The revised design contains three different features
20
21 that were changed. It should be noted that the District has provided two different color
22
23 options for the Board and Commission; one is a steel color, and the other is a blue
24
25 color, and I'm just showing the steel in these images here.
26

27 The gangway is, again, 90 feet long and 19 feet wide with a 16-foot wide clear
28
29 walkway. The gangway framing will consist of two steel tube trusses, which are going to
30
31 be 8 feet tall on each side of the gangway. The top of the trusses would be 5 feet above
32
33 the walkway surface, and the overall height of the truss has been reduced by 3 feet
34
35 from the previously designed arched cord that you saw at the March 11th meeting. It's
36
37 also been reduced in height by 1 foot from the flattop cord that you saw at that meeting.
38
39

40 The access control gate is proposed to be located at the end of the new access
41
42 pier. The District selected what they call the "simple" gate design—they presented that
43
44 at your March 11th meeting—that has no roof or a curved header above it. The gate is 8
45
46 feet tall and consists of two 8-foot wide swing doors, and the gate framing will consist of
47
48 galvanized steel pipes.
49
50

1 With respect to the float, the float design has not changed from the March 11th
2
3 meeting. It is going to be constructed of concrete, it will be held in place by five 60-inch
4
5 diameter steel piling, two of which will be located at the front of the float and three at the
6
7 rear.
8

9 The access pier would be 21 feet wide and 96 feet long, with a 5-foot wide and
10
11 31-foot long belvedere, or a bump out, on each side of the pier. The pier has been
12
13 reduced in size from 25 feet to 21 feet. The access pier will be constructed of concrete
14
15 and supported by 15 24-inch diameter steel piling. Galvanized street railing will be 42
16
17 inches tall with vertical steel pike pickets between a rectangular top and bottom rail. It
18
19 should be noted, and staff mentioned this at the last meeting, that staff did have a
20
21 conversation with BCDC staff on March 6th and BCDC reported that they're still
22
23 continuing to recommend the installation of the belvederes on the access pier.
24

25 CHAIR COX: Can you say that again? I missed it. The BCDC is willing to...

26
27 LILLY SCHINSING: No, the BCDC has their same position as they did at the last
28
29 meeting; they're still recommending that the belvederes remain.
30

31
32 The charge of the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board is to
33
34 determine if the findings for a Design Review Permit can be made for the District's
35
36 project. The Commission and Board will have a meeting in two weeks to finalize and
37
38 forward the recommendation to the City Council. Staff has prepared tables, which are in
39
40 your staff report, address each of the required findings, with staff comment alongside.
41
42 We're asking tonight that the Commission and Board discuss each finding to ensure
43
44 that you agree with the staff comment. We've also identified several findings that staff
45
46 suggest the Commission and...
47
48
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Lilly, pardon me just a second. I think someone accidentally hit the
2
3 light switch back there. Thank you.
4

5 LILLY SCHINSING: So we're recommending tonight that you go through each of
6
7 the findings to determine if you concur with staff's comments. We've indicated several
8
9 findings that we recommend you discuss in depth to determine if you can make the
10
11 finding or not, and those include the ones that I'm pointing to right now and have
12
13 highlighted on the screen: compatibility with the Historic District, consistency with the
14
15 Hillside Design Guidelines, design character of the project, project scale and the context
16
17 of the surrounding buildings and structures, views from public and private property,
18
19 privacy, and crowding and overwhelming neighboring structures.
20

21 CHAIR COX: Lilly, were you asking us to comment on all of those this evening?
22

23 LILLY SCHINSING: Yes.
24

25 CHAIR COX: Unfortunately, we just received a 15-page document from the
26
27 Golden Gate Bridge District that answered a lot of the questions posed by us and
28
29 members of the public. I did not receive it in the email. Was it emailed out to us? I didn't
30
31 see it in the email.
32

33 LILLY SCHINSING: We received it this afternoon.
34

35 CHAIR COX: It was sitting on our dais this evening, so an issue that I have is
36
37 that I'm concerned about the ability of these two bodies to comprehensively comment
38
39 on all of these matters, not having had an opportunity to review the District's responses
40
41 to the very questions raised by these bodies at our last meeting.
42

43 I'm going to stop for a second. It looks like someone fell in the back. Okay.
44

45 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, if we could just point out, if people are going
46
47 to sit up against this wall here, there's a little lip between the floor and it's a hazard.
48
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, did everybody hear the City Attorney? If anybody's going to
2 sit against the wall, there's a lip that extends out from the wall, so please be cautious
3 not to trip on the lip.
4

5
6
7 COUNSEL WAGNER: And Chair Cox, if I may. I'm going speak loudly, so
8 hopefully people can hear me.
9

10
11 With respect to the findings, whatever direction we can get from the Planning
12 Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board this evening will help staff craft the
13 document that returns to you on the 15th, with the understanding that you may have
14 additional comments or revisions to that information when it returns to you on the 15th
15 after you've had an opportunity to not only digest the document that you received this
16 afternoon or this evening, but also the input that you receive tonight from the public and
17 from the District. So we understand that that might change.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 CHAIR COX: I appreciate that. I would just ask as a matter of process for our
26 next meeting, I note, and I will bring this up later, that there are several questions that
27 have not yet been answered by the District. I would ask that any materials from the
28 District be included in the packet next week, or otherwise that the meeting be
29 postponed, so that members of the public as well as members of these boards can
30 review and digest and intelligently incorporate all of that information into our decision,
31 since the next meeting will be our last meeting. So that would just be a request.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 COUNSEL WAGNER: And I'm sure that the District heard you loud and clear.
41

42 CHAIR COX: All right, Lilly, did you get to complete your presentation?
43

44 LILLY SCHINSING: I have a couple of items here.
45

46 In terms of environmental review, in 2012 the District certified a Mitigated
47 Negative Declaration for the project under the California Environmental Quality Act, and
48
49
50

1 in 2014 was granted a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental
2 Protection Act, and staff determined that additional environmental review is not
3 required. We wanted to note that there was a typo in the staff report under the
4 Environmental Review section. We have made that correction on the web version of the
5 staff report and also emailed the board members, but we wanted to make it clear that
6 it's our opinion that additional environmental review is not required.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 In terms of story poles, the District demonstrated the size of the float with buoys
14 in the morning on Saturday, March 21st and Sunday, March 22nd, and they also installed
15 ropes on Friday, March 19th to demonstrate the size of the new access pier and the
16 gangway. Photographs were taken by staff; they were also taken by the Southern Marin
17 Fire Department using a ladder truck, and we also had photographs taken by a San
18 Rafael High School student using a drone, and those photographs are a part of the staff
19 report that the public can access online.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 That concludes my portion of the staff report. Our recommendation tonight is to
29 accept the presentation from the District, then to take public comment, then to discuss a
30 recommendation to the City Council on a determination of the Design Review Permit
31 findings, provide direction as appropriate, and continue this hearing to Wednesday, April
32 15th. With that, I'm going to turn it over the District for their presentation.
33
34
35
36
37

38 CHAIR COX: Before that, let's see if there are questions of staff. I'll turn it over
39 to the HLB for any questions of staff.
40
41

42 CHAIR McCOY: I have just a question. Lilly, if you could just do me a favor and
43 go back in the staff report, if you could a little more slowly go through the findings, the
44 specific ones that you would like us to focus on this evening, so we can highlight those?
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 LILLY SCHINSING: Starting on Table 1, it's Finding 1 and Finding 8, and staff
2
3 has made comments on the side of that table indicating that the Commission and Board
4
5 should discuss that finding in more detail.
6

7 For Table 2, we don't have any items that we want to call your attention to. For all
8
9 of these items we would like to make sure you concur with our comment as well. The
10
11 items I'm talking about right now are just specific in depth comments by the Commission
12
13 and Board.
14

15 Then moving on to Table 3, the findings are Finding 1, Finding 2, Finding 3,
16
17 Finding 4, Finding 9 and Finding 13.
18

19 CHAIR McCOY: Thank you.
20

21 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. Lilly, I have one other question.
22
23 Can you please repeat the revised dimensions of the truss?
24

25 LILLY SCHINSING: The truss is 8 feet tall total, but it's 5 feet tall above the
26
27 walking surface of the gangway itself. It's 90 feet long, 19 feet wide, and it has a 16-foot
28
29 wide clear walkway.
30

31 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I had a question. Lilly, would you repeat the
32
33 specific items that were modified in the new design?
34

35 LILLY SCHINSING: That was the height of the gangway, and that was
36
37 reduced... It depends on what version of the gangway you're looking at. The arched
38
39 gangway that you looked at last time is reduced in height by 3 feet. For the flattop
40
41 gangway that you looked at last time, it's reduced in height by 1 foot.
42
43

44 The other modification is the access here. There was an option at the last
45
46 meeting of 25 feet or 21 feet, and they reduced it to 21 feet in width.
47
48
49
50

1 Then the other selection by the District is the design of the gate itself. If you'll
2 recall, you had three different options at the last meeting. They've selected the simple
3 gate without the top roof.
4

5
6
7 CHAIR COX: Any questions from Planning Commissioners? Commissioner
8
9 Pierce.

10
11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Just one question. Can you remind us of the
12 minimum required depth of the water for the new float that is proposed, I guess relative
13 to mean sea level?
14
15

16
17 LILLY SCHINSING: That would be a good question for the District themselves.
18

19
20 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.

21
22 CHAIR COX: Other questions from Planning Commissioners?

23
24 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I was wondering, normally when
25 we get a staff report for design review findings we have a staff recommendation, and
26 staff gives their professional opinion about whether the findings can be met or not, but
27 most of these do not include an opinion. Can you explain the reasoning for that?
28
29

30
31 LILLY SCHINSING: The findings that I called out earlier in response to Chair
32 McCoy's question, those are the findings that staff is struggling with and would like the
33 Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board to weigh in on. The other
34 findings that we didn't call out, we essentially wrote those findings in a comment form
35 for you, that if you didn't have comments on those findings we would take those and
36 translate them into findings for the project.
37
38

39
40 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, thank you. Also, I think there
41 was a question last week about the scope of the landside improvements and what the
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 City's plans for that were. I didn't see that in the staff report. Is that answered in a
2
3 different document?
4

5 LILLY SCHINSING: The planning for the landside improvements have not begun
6
7 at this point.
8

9 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Is there a status of what's
10
11 happening with that?
12

13 CHAIR COX: If I may, I did notice Question 41 says, "What landside
14
15 improvements are required? How will they be paid for, with increased taxes or bonds?"
16
17 and the answer from the District is, "The landside areas are owned by the City and are
18
19 outside the District's leased area. The District has secured a federal grant and has
20
21 offered to pass through \$2 million for landside improvements, which scope is to be
22
23 developed during a future public participation process led by the City."
24

25 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Then on page 16 of 22 I have a
26
27 question about the finding that relates to obstruction of public views and primary views
28
29 from private property. Normally we look at views only from residential parcels as being
30
31 protected under the General Plan. Is that the case here, or is the Yacht Club not
32
33 considered with the private?
34

35 LILLY SCHINSING: The Yacht Club is on public, City-owned property, so we
36
37 included that in potential view impacts, public view impacts essentially. We did provide
38
39 some thoughts there for you, and some photographs.
40

41 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: So you're considering the
42
43 Sausalito Yacht Club to be public?
44

45 LILLY SCHINSING: As it is on City property, correct.
46
47

48 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, those are my questions.
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Lilly, in looking at our staff report and briefly glancing through the
2
3 questions and answers from the District. I didn't see any answer to a request for the life
4
5 cycle cost projections, and I also saw that the District does not yet have data on how
6
7 many passengers/bikes each vessel can hold. I think I saw something that said it's still
8
9 searching for that information. Do you have an ETA on that information?
10

11 LILLY SCHINSING: That's also a good question for the District.
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay, any other questions?
14

15 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I had one follow up question regarding the \$2 million
16
17 funds that the District would pass through for landside improvements. Are there any
18
19 stipulations for how that money is to be spent?
20

21 COUNSEL WAGNER: Not that I am aware of. Perhaps the District is aware of
22
23 any restrictions on those funds and can address that question as well.
24

25 CHAIR COX: Okay, then we will turn it over to the District for presentation. As
26
27 we did at the last meeting, may I ask that the various members of the District who are
28
29 here this evening introduce themselves, and then we'll look forward to a presentation.
30

31 COUNSEL WAGNER: And Chair Cox, you may want to note for the people who
32
33 are in the back that there are a couple of open chairs up here, if people want to come
34
35 and sit.
36

37 CHAIR COX: Oh, great. So there are chairs up front if anybody is in the back
38
39 standing up. Also, while we're listening to the presentation, I am collecting speaker
40
41 cards, so anybody who would like to speak, I would encourage you to fill out a speaker
42
43 card.
44

45 COUNSEL WAGNER: And Chair Cox, if they deliver those to the staff table,
46
47 we'll get them up to you.
48
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Great, thank you. All right, did the District want to introduce
2 themselves?
3

4
5 EWA BAUER: My name is Ewa Bauer. I'm the chief engineer for the Golden
6 Gate Highway and Transportation District.
7

8
9 JAMES SWINDLER: My name is Jim Swindler, and I'm the Ferry Division
10 manager.
11

12
13 JOHN EBERLE: Good afternoon, my name is John Eberle; I'm the Deputy
14 District Engineer at the Golden Gate Bridge District. I'll let the other key members
15 introduce themselves.
16
17

18
19 MICHAEL CONNERAN: Michael Conneran, legal counsel for the District.
20

21 CAROLINA WALLIN: Carolina Wallin, civil engineer.
22

23 BO JENSEN: Bo Jensen of Moffatt & Nichol, the consultant to the District
24 (inaudible).
25

26
27 PRIYA CLEMENS: Priya Clemens, (inaudible).
28

29 CHAIR COX: Thank you.
30

31
32 JOHN EBERLE: Thank you, Chairs Cox and McCoy, and Commissioners, for
33 being here and allowing us to present again tonight. Again, my name is John Eberle and
34 I'm the Deputy District Engineer at the Bridge District, and I'll be going to the
35 presentation.
36
37

38
39 The Golden Gate Ferry provides public transportation service between Larkspur,
40 Sausalito and San Francisco. We've been operating our ferry service since 1970, over
41 40 years. We are the largest ferry operator on the bay. Last year we had over 2.3 million
42 passengers that we carried across the bay. To Sausalito, approximately 793,000
43 passengers.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 The reason for the project is we want to replace our aged ferry landing structures
2 to keep them structurally sound. As I said, we've been operating since 1970 and of our
3 facilities, not just Sausalito but San Francisco and Larkspur, are in need of repair. At the
4 time that we do repair we also want to bring these facilities into compliance with current
5 ADA requirements.
6
7
8
9

10
11 We've also identified secondary benefits of the project. We want to improve our
12 operational efficiencies. Running public transportation needs to be subsidized. It's being
13 subsidized by tolls across the Golden Gate Bridge. To the extent that we can improve
14 operations, we could reduce the amount that we subsidize our transit facilities.
15
16
17
18

19 The way that we are looking to improve our operations is we want to standardize
20 the main deck loading of vessels. Currently in Sausalito we load vessels on the main
21 deck, however, in San Francisco and in Larkspur we load off the upper deck, so that is
22 an operational problem for us.
23
24
25
26

27 We are also looking to better manage the loading and unloading of passengers,
28 including bicycles. As you all know, there are a number of bicycles in Sausalito. Loading
29 them on the main deck, unloading them on the upper deck in San Francisco, again,
30 creates operational inefficiencies.
31
32
33
34

35 Another benefit of the project is to upgrade emergency preparedness. We want
36 to be able to allow this facility to last in an emergency, and we also want to allow it to be
37 able to accommodate other ferry providers, not just here in Sausalito, but also San
38 Francisco and Larkspur.
39
40
41
42

43 This is a map showing the vicinity of the project. As you can see, the project is
44 located to the east of Bridgeway, adjacent to the parking lot. Also, Sausalito Yacht Club
45 is to the north, and the Commercial District is to the south.
46
47
48
49
50

1 Here's an aerial view that shows the existing facility. As was stated previously,
2
3 the float is a steel float, 42 feet wide by 110 feet long. The gangway is 70 feet long by 5
4
5 feet, 7 inches wide. There's a dogleg here approximately 96.5 feet long in total and 8.5
6
7 feet wide, and the landside pier, which is approximately 20 feet wide.
8

9 These photos show the conditions of the existing facility. As stated, the steel float
10
11 is aging. Also, the ramps and gangplanks on the float itself are not in compliance at all
12
13 times with current ADA conditions and requirements.
14

15 Here's a photo showing the existing float when weather is not as nice as it
16
17 typically is in Sausalito. As you can see, the waves come up over the float itself. The
18
19 float is steel and it is hollow; it is in need of repair. We do have to pump out the float and
20
21 make sure it still operates day-to-day, so we are really in need of replacing this facility.
22

23 And here speaks to the operational needs that we're talking about. We have a
24
25 narrow gangway and a narrow pier, and we have single door boarding and
26
27 disembarking in Sausalito. When there's an issue with the boarding, traffic just stops
28
29 and stands on the pier, the gangway, and the float until the boarding can continue.
30

31 So what are we proposing on our project? We're proposing improvements to the
32
33 float, boarding platforms, the gangway and the pier itself.
34

35
36 The arrows point out. The large, gray area to the far right is the concrete pier.
37
38 That's 150 feet long and 53 feet wide. There are hydraulic gangplanks that extend off
39
40 the boarding platform. Those reach out to the vessels, are 8-feet wide, and there are
41
42 two of them. Currently there is only the ability to board and unboard from one door on
43
44 the vessel. Those go to a boarding platform that is 16 feet wide. The hydraulic
45
46 gangplanks are spaced 48 feet center-to-center.
47
48
49
50

1 The boarding apron is necessary, because different vessels have different free
2 board, so the boarding platform must be raised and lowered in order to accommodate
3 the gangplanks on our different vessels. The boarding apron is there to, again, provide
4 compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines.
5
6
7
8

9 The boarding platform then goes to a fixed landing, which goes to the gangway.
10 The gangway is 90 feet long and 16 feet clear width.
11
12

13 Here are the Americans with Disabilities Act ramp requirements. The main point
14 here is that the running slope may not exceed 1:12. On our current facility we have both
15 a gangway, which is this...
16
17
18

19 MALE (audience): Can you show that slide one more time?
20

21 CHAIR COX: I'm going to ask folks not to call out from the audience. If you have
22 questions, you can ask your question when you approach, and if we need to re-show a
23 slide, we will. Because not everybody can hear what everybody is saying and just to
24 have an orderly presentation, I would ask that you hold your questions until it's your turn
25 to speak.
26
27
28
29
30

31 But I will ask, since we did interrupt, you said the ramp run couldn't exceed 1:12.
32 Can you explain what you mean by the ramp run?
33
34

35 JOHN EBERLE: The slope on the ramp. If you go in a horizontal direction, per
36 12 units you are allowed to rise or lower one unit.
37
38

39 Here is a picture of the existing facility. To the left is the fixed access pier, and
40 attached to that is the gangway, which is hinged on the left side and then sits on the
41 float on the right side. It raises and lowers with the tide on the float. During tide
42 conditions of -1.1 or lower, this gangway is not in compliance with the 1:12 slope. In
43 addition, the gangplanks on the float itself to the vessel are not in compliance.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 Here is a rendering that shows that the lowest possible tide at Sausalito, the
2
3 gangway slope at the water is 1:9.5. The new gangway, 90 feet long, will allow it to be
4
5 1:12 or flatter during all conditions.
6

7 The operational needs. Currently boarding and disembarking from vessels is
8
9 through one door. The current ramp width from the float to the vessel is 4 feet wide.
10
11 Ridership, again, was 793,000 last year. The weekday average ridership, 1,944; and
12
13 weekend, 3,758. So we have a lot of people we're trying to board and come to and also
14
15 leave Sausalito. The narrow facilities impact the boarding and disembarking, so during
16
17 our design we want to improve these operations.
18

19 The vessels are being retrofitted with two 8-foot wide doors. The project will
20
21 provide two 8-foot wide ramps that will connect to those doors, to the float. The two 8-
22
23 foot ramps will then connect to the 16-foot wide boarding platform. These new wider
24
25 facilities will greatly improve boarding, disembarking and our operations.
26
27

28 This slide shows the different vessels that the District has. The vessel to the left
29
30 is called a Spaulding class vessel; that's a typical vessel that is used in Sausalito. The
31
32 other two are high-speed catamarans, which are not used as frequently in Sausalito. All
33
34 of these vessels have a little different configuration, but the facility has to be designed
35
36 so that it can accommodate all of them.
37

38 Here's some information on the District's fleet. We have three Spaulding class
39
40 vessels and four high-speed catamarans. The Spaulding class can hold a capacity from
41
42 630 to 750 passengers, 150-200 bicycles, but depending upon the mix of passengers
43
44 with and without bicycles, we can go up to 250 bicycles. The catamarans are smaller,
45
46 400-450 passengers, and the bicycle capacity is smaller also, 20-35 on some, up to 100
47
48 on the Del Norte.
49
50

1 Here's a depiction of what the float would look like with the different vessels. As I
2 stated, currently we only have one door that may be used in Sausalito, so we're going to
3 have two 8-foot wide doors on all the vessels. The gangplank will attach to those doors.
4
5 This will allow boarding from two locations rather than one, and disembarking from two
6
7 locations rather than one. The 8-foot doors will then come to a 16-foot wide platform on
8
9 the float. The 16-foot width is necessary because of the float coming off of the two 8-
10
11 foot wide doors. That 16-foot width then continues to the gangway and through the
12
13 access gates onto the access pier.
14
15

16
17 When determining how wide to make the facility we looked at some level of
18
19 service considerations. Level of service for passengers is determined by how closely
20
21 spaced passengers are when they walk and they are queuing. We looked at a level of
22
23 service D/E, which is taken as approximately ten square feet area per person, average
24
25 flow of 20 passengers per foot width per minute. With this condition, normal walking
26
27 speed is slightly restricted, and this is consistent with the observed conditions at the
28
29 ferry.
30

31
32 Now, in queuing we took a level of service C/D also, which is for queuing a much
33
34 smaller area; it's about 3-7 square feet per person. Space is provided so that there is no
35
36 physical contact, but it is very close, and again, this is consistent with the observed
37
38 conditions at the facility.
39

40
41 This slide is a representation of what would happen at the facility were we not to
42
43 make any improvements with the projected growth that we are seeing at the site. What
44
45 we did is in 2009 we were looking at our passenger counts, and we have projected
46
47 about a 4% growth rate and projected this out for 20 years, and this is how the
48
49 passenger counts shown on the slide were arrived at. So there are 408 offloading
50

1 passengers, and 512 waiting passengers. This is a 85th percentile, so that means that
2
3 15% are greater than this, and all the rest are at this level or lower.
4

5 So with the current condition, with the narrowness of that one doorway and the
6
7 gangplank and the pier and the gangway, it takes about seven minutes to unload
8
9 people. That's considering that there are no other issues or problems associated with
10
11 unloading, that no one is stopping, no one is taking photos, and people are just walking
12
13 in a uniform manner off the vessels.
14

15 Once those passengers clear, then we did a similar analysis of how long it would
16
17 take to load. Since we only have one door and narrow facilities, we can only board
18
19 passengers and/or bicycles one at a time, so they're sequential rather than
20
21 simultaneously. So if you assume that you're going to load bicycles first, we have about
22
23 13 minutes for the bicycles, and if you then add the passengers afterwards, you have
24
25 nine minutes, for a total of about 22 minutes.
26
27

28 The problem with this is we have to keep to our schedule, and what this does is
29
30 we are leaving behind passengers at the facility. We have boats with a capacity of up to
31
32 750 people, but we have to leave when we get to about 300 people and bikes, because
33
34 it's taking so long to board and we need to make our crossing to get to San Francisco to
35
36 pick up commuters who are waiting at that location to come back to Sausalito. What we
37
38 want to do is be able to load our boats to the capacity of the people waiting or capacity
39
40 of the vessels.
41

42 Here you can see offloading on the top, so people are coming off. Once all of
43
44 those people clear the area, then people may start loading on the bottom. You can see
45
46 on the bottom at the access gate is a natural choke point where only one bicycle at a
47
48 time is actually making it through here; which really slows down the flow.
49
50

1 Again, here you can see people lined up, waiting to get in, but the access point is
2 narrow. People trying to get through onto the pier. And that's the access point on the
3 landside pier. And again, if something happens, the vessels, with only one door,
4 everything stops and people are waiting until that is cleared.
5
6
7
8

9 So what we looked at was a 21-foot wide pier adjacent to our 16-foot wide
10 gangway and boarding platforms and our 8-foot doors. Using the same numbers just for
11 comparison purposes and the same rate of flow, offloading is reduced to about three
12 minutes, and loading, we'd be able to do simultaneously. Bicycles and pedestrians
13 would be able to load together rather than waiting for sequential loading, as is the case
14 today. And we estimate for just comparative purposes, about six minutes for that. So the
15 total is about ten minutes versus 30 minutes.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This is just a comparison showing if we didn't do anything and we were
24 continuing with our current facilities what the lag would be in trying to accommodate this
25 many passengers. What it would do is we wouldn't be able to load the boats.
26
27
28
29

30 I wanted to at this time talk a little bit about the project background. There were
31 some comments that there was no real notice of this project until very recently, and so I
32 wanted to go over a little bit of the project background and the different presentations
33 that the District made to the City of Sausalito.
34
35
36
37

38 On June 24, 2008, we provided our introduction to the project.
39

40 On March 10, 2009, we provided an update on that project, which spoke about all
41 of these items that we're speaking of today: aged facilities, ADA requirements, and
42 improving operational efficiencies.
43
44
45

46 On June 1, 2010, we presented conceptual designs of the project, including the
47 size of the float, the size of the gangway, and a pier.
48
49
50

1 On September 28, 2010, we again made a presentation to the City Council,
2
3 updating them on the project.
4

5 On May 3, 2011, we presented an update on the project and we received a
6
7 consensus from the City Council at that time to proceed with the improvements as they
8
9 were shown in that presentation.
10

11 On September 17, 2012, the District filed a notice of intent to adopt a Mitigated
12
13 Negative Declaration for the project, and submitted its draft Initial Study Mitigated
14
15 Negative Declaration document to the City of Sausalito.
16

17 On September 25, 2012, we presented the project again to the City Council, and
18
19 informed City Council that on October 2, 2012 we would be holding a public meeting on
20
21 the project in the Sausalito City Hall chambers.
22

23 We held that meeting on October 2, 2012 from 6:00 to 8:00pm in the City Hall
24
25 chambers.
26

27 On October 18, 2012, the District received the City's comments on the ISMND
28
29 environmental document. The District addressed the City's comments.
30

31 On December 18, 2012, the District filed its notice of determination for the
32
33 project. That was the time when the CEQA environmental clearances stated by Lilly
34
35 were completed.
36

37 More recently, on September 23, 2014, the District made an update on the
38
39 project to the City.
40

41 On December 2, 2014, we again made a presentation, and we were requested to
42
43 come back to the City Council on February 10, 2015, at which time the City Council
44
45 approved the public review process for the project.
46
47
48
49
50

1 And as was stated, March 11, 2015 was our first joint meeting with the Planning
2
3 Commission and Historic Landmarks Board.
4

5 At our first meeting we received some feedback on the project and we were
6
7 asked to look at different historical features of the City of Sausalito to see if the project
8
9 could be designed more in keeping with the City's Historic Landmark District and with
10
11 the features of Sausalito.
12

13 Again, a little background. The ferries initially did provide transportation for
14
15 vehicles; this was before the Golden Gate Bridge was up and operating. You can see
16
17 here a vehicle coming to board, see they're going to Sausalito from San Francisco, or
18
19 leaving Sausalito, and you can see the big overhead sign.
20

21 This was the facility in Sausalito. They were front-loading vessels, because they
22
23 did take vehicles and the vehicles drove in.
24

25 As was mentioned, that ferry service ended in 1941 and there was no service for
26
27 a while, and then in 1970 the District began operating. You can see here we
28
29 constructed a facility just to the south of the old facility where the ferries would come in,
30
31 the front loading ferries where vehicles could drive on, but this was not for vehicles;
32
33 there were passengers, so there's a float.
34

35 You can see here the float to the right, adjacent to the piling of the old facility,
36
37 and there's a gangway attached to the float and the pier to the left.
38

39 Here you can see how the views were blocked by the existing facility, so it was
40
41 quite dramatic. As part of the project that was completed in 1995, these pilings were
42
43 removed.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 So again, here is the Sausalito Historical District, and Golden Gate's facility is
2 located partially within and partially outside of that district; the float and gangway are
3 outside, the access pier and the landside pier are inside.
4

5
6
7 For some background on some of the features of Sausalito that were looked at
8 when the design was being contemplated, the pier itself is really just a continuation of
9 the landside pier. The features that could be really looked at are the gangway and
10 access gate; those are the main features.
11
12

13
14
15 When looking at Sausalito and the Historic District what we noticed were these
16 arch designs throughout the City. We also noticed, closer to the ferry facility itself, the
17 Yacht Club has an arch design on the roof. It also has at its gangway down to its pier a
18 portal with an arch over the top of it. And you can see here in the plaza itself, even the
19 benches, if you look at the underside of the benches, there is this curved arch element.
20
21

22
23
24 So that was a little bit of why we were looking at this arch on the truss and the
25 arch on the gate, however, at the last meeting we heard that the arch element is not
26 desired, so we have since eliminated that from our plans and plan to resubmit with an
27 squared truss and a simple gate without these arch elements.
28
29

30
31
32 One of the other discussion points was the color. We initially showed white and
33 blue. White and blue, we consider them to be nautical colors, and also when visiting
34 Sausalito we have seen the white and blue at a number of locations, even on the City of
35 Sausalito logo. Here are some of the restaurants off of Bridgeway, and also I think this
36 is the Historical Society building, which is a white structure with blue.
37
38

39
40
41 So those were some of the reasons why we selected the white and blue colors,
42 but we heard at the last meeting that those are not desired, so we are no longer
43 proposing white. White is not in our proposal. We're proposing galvanized where the
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 railings are, where there are steel elements. The concrete will be concrete, in keeping
2
3 with the remaining landside pier, which is not moving. Then as far as the truss, we are
4
5 open to either a blue or a galvanized color.
6

7 Then there was a discussion on some of the design elements at the last meeting.
8
9 What we heard from the Planning Commission, Historic Landmarks Board, and
10
11 Sausalito residents' comments were reduce the size of the access pier and reduce the
12
13 width. Reduce the height of the gangway. Use a gray or darker color if you're going to
14
15 have colors on the gangway. Keep the railings similar to the existing. Use a simple gate,
16
17 and please provide some story poles equivalent demonstration so that people can see
18
19 what it looks like out in the site as opposed to the renderings.
20

21 As was noted, we originally proposed a 25-foot wide pier, and we have reduced
22
23 that to 21 feet, so we are no longer proposing a 25-foot wide pier.
24

25 The gangway itself has been reduced. We now have a total height of 8 feet from
26
27 the walkway itself; that translates to 5 feet, 1 inch from the top of the pipe down to the
28
29 surface of the walkway.
30

31 Here you can see a comparison of what was presented at the last meeting. The
32
33 top one is the 9-foot gangway, it was about 6 feet above the walkway, and we are now
34
35 proposing 8-foot total with a 5-foot distance from the walkway.
36
37

38 Here you can see the rendering: the top one is 6 feet above the walkway, and the
39
40 bottom one is 5 feet above the walkway.
41

42 Here you can see how that gangway would look from the access pier, the top
43
44 one again is a taller gangway and the bottom rendering is an 8-foot gangway.
45

46 Colors, again, as I mentioned before, we originally had white and blue, so we
47
48 have gone away from the white. We are now considering gray or a galvanized look at
49
50

1 the top rendering, and the bottom one is the dark blue on the gangway. Also, we're
2
3 proposing that the gate would match the color of the gangway.
4

5 The pier handrail, again vertical pickets matching the existing, and the color
6
7 would match basically the galvanized steel matching the existing.
8

9 We had a number of gate options that we showed last time, and we heard that
10
11 simplistic is what is desired, so we went with what we call our simple swing gate. Again,
12
13 these are 8-foot wide openings, so we're showing two openings that would have 4-foot
14
15 panels, which would equate to the 8 feet at this location. Also, it would have a center
16
17 post elevated above the 8-foot tall gate for some lighting and security cameras. Here
18
19 are some architectural drawings of that gate.
20

21 The gate itself we are locating out at the end, closer to the gangway, oriented
22
23 and perpendicular to the gangway, as shown on that red line that says, "Location of the
24
25 gate." We're keeping the gate out, because we want to provide public access as much
26
27 as possible on this facility. The gate would allow people to come out further onto the
28
29 water and have better public access at this site. The belvederes are still shown here,
30
31 because those would also provide better public access at this facility.
32

33 The story pole equipment demonstration. On Saturday, March 21st and Sunday,
34
35 March 22nd we attempted a story pole demonstration. This photo by Anthony Scapozzi
36
37 (phonetic) shows the aerial view that he took with his drone. You can see the outline of
38
39 the new 150-foot pier, 150 feet long by 53 feet wide. It translated to the north, because
40
41 of the tides. We were having problems keeping the floats in alignment, but for reference,
42
43 it extends about 65 feet further to the east of the end of the pier, and on the north of the
44
45 pier it extends approximately 13 feet. Then you can see the outline of the 90-foot long
46
47 gangway, and the outline of the new access pier.
48
49
50

1 Here is just a reference point. This is the existing 21-foot wide landside pier,
2 which is not being touched. You would walk down to the end of this, and at the end
3 there are two green ropes, which are still out there, and they will turn slightly to the right.
4 Here you can see the outline of that rope, which represents the 21-foot wide pier. That
5 would extend over to approximately the end of the existing pier, where the existing
6 gangway is. You can see the buoys in the water, representing the northeast edge of the
7 proposed float.
8

9 Looking from the south to the north, you can't really tell too much of the gangway
10 or pier, but you can see how the float itself would extend further out to the east into the
11 water.
12

13 Here is the story pole showing the width of the new gangway. The white tubes
14 show the 19-foot out-to-out width with all the structural members, and the rope on the
15 right and left show the height, that 6-foot, 1-inch height, that we were proposing at the
16 time. We have since reduced that to 5-foot, 1-inch.
17

18 So again, to wrap up, the District is proposing to replace its existing ferry terminal
19 with a new float, new gangway, and new access pier. We're proposing a simple swing
20 gate on a 21-foot wide access pier. We're looking at either galvanized or blue colors for
21 the gate and the gangway itself. The gangway has been lowered so that the height of
22 the cord is approximately 5 feet about the walkway, for a total height of 8 feet. The
23 planking on the gangway itself is an extruded plastic that allows filter light to go through,
24 again, either gray or blue.
25

26 Views from the plaza itself show the orientation of the float, and the access pier,
27 and the gate. Here it is in the blue color.
28

1 And looking from the Yacht Club you can see here the orientation of the pier with
2
3 the belvederes, and the gangway, and the float with a gray and a blue color.
4

5 Again, another view from the plaza, in gray and in blue.
6

7 Another element that we spoke of that is included in this project, and I just want
8
9 to touch on briefly, is the transformer. There was a question about where this
10
11 transformer would be located. This is the location of the existing transformer at the edge
12
13 of the parking lot. To the right is the City's transformer. In the red box is the approximate
14
15 location of where the District's transformer would be located.
16

17 We also spoke last time about moving the ticket vending machines, because in
18
19 addition to a transformer we'll be having some electrical panels closer to the site. We
20
21 initially thought of locating these ticket vending machines further south in the plaza, but
22
23 after consideration we have elected not to do that, and what we're looking at now is
24
25 keeping the ticket vending machines where they are, putting the electrical panels
26
27 adjacent or behind it, and if necessary, possibly relocating a few news racks if additional
28
29 space is needed.
30

31 With that, I'll close the presentation.
32

33
34 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I'm going to turn it over to Chair McCoy for questions
35
36 from the Historic Landmarks Board.
37

38 CHAIR McCOY: Thank you very much, John, for that presentation. Do any
39
40 members of the Historic Landmarks Board have questions for the District?
41

42 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. Has there been any
43
44 consideration, or could you reorient the gate? I thought you moved it. Could it be in a
45
46 more perpendicular position to the shore or the park, as it is now, so that it does not
47
48 obviate the view toward Angel Island?
49
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: Are you talking about the gate?
2

3 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes, the gate.
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: Sorry, I wanted to go back to this plan view that shows the
6 orientation of the gate. Here it is here. The gate can be in either of two locations:
7 perpendicular to the pier itself, or it could be perpendicular to the gangway. The
8 orientation that we are selecting is perpendicular to the pier itself, because it's the
9 smallest width and would therefore be the smallest structure out there that would be
10 visible. In order to put it in a position that you are looking at, it would go on a diagonal
11 across this pier. If you see where the two blue lines are, that is the approximate angle
12 that I think you're requesting to put the gate. It would not function properly and we
13 couldn't put it in that orientation.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you for that presentation; it was very
24 informative and helpful. It looks like you've made some strides toward reducing the size
25 of elements of this design. One question that was raised by one resident to me was
26 about the 4% growth figure, and whether that's realistic. Perhaps you could tell us
27 where that number derived from, and if you conducted a sensitivity analysis to see
28 whether the size requirements would be altered if the growth rate were 1%, 2% or 3%.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 JOHN EBERLE: In 2009, when we first began looking at this, we looked back at
37 our data back to I believe 2006, and we were looking at our growth patterns. The
38 patterns were varied, we had some big years and some small years, and so the 4% was
39 selected as a reasonable amount based on that previous data. Since that time, for
40 instance last year, I think we had a growth rate of approximately 10%, the year before I
41 believe it was about 7%, so we've been seeing the growth rate actually exceed what we
42 have anticipated, so we believe that our 4% rate that we selected is a good number.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. I just have a few more questions.
2
3 With regard to the design of the gate, I know we provided feedback to you at the last
4
5 meeting. Subsequently have you also consulted any local architects to help come up
6
7 with additional creative designs and options for us to look at?
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: I think we have had some informal discussions, but we haven't
10
11 really gotten into any specifics with any local architects yet at this time.
12

13 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: And the last question that I have right now is
14
15 with respect to the width of the gangway at 16 feet. Is there possibility to reduce that
16
17 width and mass?
18

19 JOHN EBERLE: No. As I showed in the presentation, the number of passengers
20
21 that we're looking at and the flow from the vessels with the two 8-foot gangplanks
22
23 coming from the 8-foot, which is 16 feet wide. So then we want to continue translating
24
25 that 16 feet up, continue it through the gangway itself, because if not it would create
26
27 another constriction point and would affect our operations.
28

29
30 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you.
31

32 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: One further question. With regard to the plan for
33
34 having loading and unloading from a single level, would that also require any
35
36 modifications of other facilities besides this one, like the San Francisco facility?
37

38 JOHN EBERLE: Yes. As I briefly mentioned at the beginning, we are going to be
39
40 making improvements to all three of our facilities: Sausalito, San Francisco, and
41
42 Larkspur. San Francisco, we are designing a gangway and float to match exactly like
43
44 this one, so we will have uniformity at all of our facilities and we'll have main deck
45
46 loading at all of our facilities, so there will be improvements necessary at the other
47
48 facilities.
49
50

1 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Were there any other alternatives
2
3 considered to improve operational efficiencies besides standardizing operations, taking
4
5 into account the nature of the size of the Sausalito waterfront, such as additional ferry
6
7 runs or additional runs on the weekend when there is increased bike traffic?
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: Currently we do have to operate additional ferry service on the
10
11 busy commute days, and we do that on weekends now, and this is not even the peak
12
13 season of the year, but we are having to bring additional ferries on.
14

15 The reason we want to improve our operating efficiencies is because we have a
16
17 boat with a capacity for 700-plus passengers, but in the time it takes to load and then
18
19 make our other destination point in San Francisco, we are not able to get people on the
20
21 facility, because the facility is so small. So what we're trying to do is we have capacity,
22
23 and we want to be able to take advantage of that capacity. We want to make this facility
24
25 efficient so that we can get the people out of Sausalito as quickly as possible, so that
26
27 we'll have a full boat, and again, we will not have to bring additional vessels, which we
28
29 would then only be able to utilize partially full again, so that's a losing operation doing
30
31 that.
32

33 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you.
34

35 CHAIR McCOY: Anybody else on the HLB? I don't have any.
36

37 CHAIR COX: Questions from Planning Commissioners?
38

39 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes, thank you, Chair Cox, and thank you for the
40
41 presentation. I had a couple questions.
42
43

44 One was the length of the access pier. Is that predicated on the distance that you
45
46 have to have the gangway and the float away from shore to provide adequate depth, or
47
48 is that based on stacking up pedestrians and bicycles while they wait?
49
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: The location of the float is what is governing, and I think you
2 had a question previously about the draft of float. The float is 12-foot deep, and so we
3 need to locate that in water that's approximately 15 feet deep, so that determines where
4 the end of float is. Then from that point we need to have our gangway at the... We're
5 trying to minimize that length, but 90-foot is the minimum length that we could get and
6 still meet our 1:12 slope requirement, and then that determines where the end of the
7 access pier is located.
8

9 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Great, thank you. In addition to that, relative to
10 BCDC's terminology, is the word "recommend," as in recommending the belvederes,
11 synonymous with recommend, or is that synonymous with require?
12

13 JOHN EBERLE: BCDC looks at this project as it's making an improvement to
14 the ferry facilities, but with those improvements, with the ADA improvements, and with
15 our operational improvements, it's increasing the size over the water. BCDC states that
16 that's fine, however, you need to provide some sort of public access component to this
17 project. So without adding additional width to the access pier, which would allow more
18 people to come out onto the water and provide more public access, but it would also
19 create more shadows. They're stating that you need to come up with something else, so
20 the something else we came up with was the belvederes, which allows for additional
21 public access, which is what BCDC is requesting.
22

23 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Presently the access pier is 5 feet wider than the
24 gangway. Wouldn't that suggest that there is already 5 feet of public access space on
25 that pier?
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: It would suggest that, but there is also the desire to create even
28 more public access than that.
29

1 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.

2
3 CHAIR COX: Other Commissioners?

4
5 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Thank you for the presentation.

6
7 Just to follow up, and push a little bit more on Board Member Richardson's question and
8
9 on questions that I think a lot of us had last week about the width of the gangway, which
10
11 really then leads to the width of the supports and the kind of massing of it as seen from
12
13 the shore.

14
15 As you've described it, if I understand it correctly, it's an operational efficiency
16
17 issue that is based on loading or unloading 700 passengers in a ten-minute period of
18
19 time. But the other factor that we haven't really discussed much is that you're also
20
21 assuming a level of service I think that you said is either C or D.

22
23 Currently the width of the gangplank is only 5 feet, 4 feet of walking. It is, I agree,
24
25 just inadequate. But there's a big difference between 5 feet and 16 feet, and I think
26
27 that's what is very hard to understand why it needs to go from 5 feet to 16 feet. Have
28
29 you looked at options that were 14 feet, or 12 feet? I think this level of service issue; I
30
31 just haven't quite seen it articulated in the documents to a level that convinces me that
32
33 that's absolutely necessary to achieve 700 people in ten or even 12 minutes. So could
34
35 you elaborate on the level of service issue, please?

36
37
38 JOHN EBERLE: Let me frame it this way: A level of service C/D is just that. It's
39
40 not a level of service where you have plenty of room all around you, but it's also not a
41
42 level of service where you are so crammed together that you feel like you're in New
43
44 York or Japan and going onto one of their subways. But it is still a crowded condition,
45
46 and it's not a flow that can... Well, you will have to restrict your flow in order to walk with
47
48 that level of service. I don't think that we looked at a level of service that is so great to
49
50

1 allow this big freedom of movement. It will still be crowded out there. Even with the 16-
2
3 foot wide pier, it's still going to be crowded.
4

5 Right now we cannot take all the passengers and make these turnaround times,
6
7 so by doing so, people are left behind and our vessels aren't full. Operationally that's
8
9 very inefficient to run a boat that's not full. Then those people who are left behind then
10
11 queue up with more people who are coming in and waiting, so what that creates is an
12
13 end of the day situation where we will have to bring another vessel, which again if
14
15 inefficient, and that vessel itself will not be full either.
16

17 The 16-foot width is based on our growth projections and our historic numbers;
18
19 we have determined that that is the minimum width that we need for these operations.
20

21 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Are there other materials that you
22
23 could use, or other design solutions, that would reduce the overall massing?
24

25 JOHN EBERLE: After the last meeting there were suggestions to, for instance,
26
27 put a third truss down the middle to try to lower the width. We looked at that, and
28
29 structurally that is just not feasible to do. We looked at taking two gangways of smaller
30
31 size and just putting them side-by-side. That creates some of its own problems in how it
32
33 connects on both ends at (inaudible) on the float. How do you connect those together?
34
35 How do you operationally now have this barrier down the middle? It also created
36
37 additional maintenance problems associated with that. So we did look at other options.
38
39

40 We looked at, like I said, steel beams previously. Steel beams have a lot of
41
42 horizontal surfaces, and they're in the splash zone, so it would create another steel
43
44 environment that could potentially create a larger maintenance issue out there. It
45
46 wouldn't be open either. The truss at least is an open system and you can see through
47
48 when you look at it sideways from shore.
49
50

1 So we did investigate these other areas and we have not determined that they
2 meet our operational needs, are structurally functional, or meet the desires of our long-
3 term maintenance at the facility.
4

5
6
7 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, so you can just do a yes or a
8 no answer to this question? In your professional opinion, it's not possible to reduce the
9 width of the gangway from 16 feet and still have 700 people loading or unloading in your
10 ten-minute window?
11
12

13
14
15 JOHN EBERLE: That's correct.
16

17 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, thank you. Just one last
18 issue. There were a lot of public comments at our last hearing, and since then I've been
19 paying more attention to the state of the existing landing when I take the ferry, and it is
20 in a remarkable state of disrepair for something built not very long ago. Could you just
21 summarize your maintenance plan and your commitment to maintaining this structure if
22 it is built?
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 JOHN EBERLE: Yes, when we build the new facility, first of all, the concrete pier
31 will be an extension of the existing concrete pier, very similar materials. If you look at
32 the existing pier today, it's in fairly good condition; the concrete and the railings are in
33 fairly good condition, so I think the condition of the float is the major concern right now.
34
35
36
37

38 The existing float is a steel structure and it's in water, and steel floats typically
39 have to be dry docked about every 20 years, sometimes more, sometimes less, just
40 because they're in that corrosive environment all the time.
41
42

43
44 That's why we selected a concrete float. The concrete float you do not have to
45 dry dock. You don't have that same problem with the rusting that you do with steel, so
46 the maintenance of that will not be as intensive as the maintenance of a steel float.
47
48
49
50

1 The tubular structure of the truss. Again, the tubular element will not collect dust
2 and debris as easily as flat, horizontal surfaces. But we will have a maintenance regime
3 in place for maintenance of that, to maintain painting or the galvanization, and also the
4 greasing of the bearings and the resting plate on the float itself.
5
6
7

8
9 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Thank you.
10

11 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I want to thank you for your updates and your
12 information that you brought back to us in answers to our questions.
13
14

15 The slide that you presented us about the history of the project, I'm curious, it
16 looked like in May 2011 you pretty much got a nod from our Council saying this was
17 okay. Is that what your understanding was?
18
19
20

21 JOHN EBERLE: That's correct.
22

23 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: And was the project similar to the one that you
24 presented to us in March, our first meeting?
25
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: That's correct.
28

29 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Thank you. I was just curious.
30

31 CHAIR COX: One of the Historic Landmarks Board members asked you about
32 whether you had consulted with a local architect, and you said your consultant had. Do
33 you plan at this point to make any further revisions to the plans that you have presented
34 to us?
35
36
37
38

39 JOHN EBERLE: The plans that we presented are what we are proposing at this
40 time. If the Commission has some recommendations that we could both agree on and
41 concur with, we are willing to look at some elements. We also have stated that
42 obviously the color, we haven't finalized. But if there are some recommendations that
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 we could both agree on, we'd like to listen to those and we could take those into
2 consideration.
3

4
5 CHAIR COX: I don't know if you can answer this question tonight, but would your
6 analysis regarding load time and level of service remain the same if the tourist bikes
7 were transported back to the City in a different manner than on the ferryboats? I'm not
8 expecting an answer to that tonight, but I would like...
9
10
11

12 (Audience applause.)
13

14
15 CHAIR COX: Okay. Listen, I would really appreciate it if you all would hold your
16 applause until the end of the meeting. Folks can all chat with one another at the end.
17 Seriously, just to maintain professional decorum, if you would just hold your boos, hold
18 your applause.
19
20
21

22
23 And my next question, again that you may not be able to answer tonight, is you
24 have talked about a load time of three minutes with the new pier. I would be interested
25 to know what the load time would be if we had a 10-foot pier instead of a 21-foot pier, or
26 a 12-foot pier instead of 21-foot pier, so that we can do an informed analysis of the cost
27 and benefit of operational efficiencies for the District.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 JOHN EBERLE: With respect to your first question, I just want to say that we are
35 a public transportation facility and we are there to provide public transit to people who
36 want to take public transit, so if people with bicycles want to take public transit, we are
37 there to support them and to take them on our transit.
38
39
40

41
42 CHAIR COX: I do recognize that, but I have been down there on the weekends
43 and I actually know that lots of the tourists don't want to ride the ferry back. They want
44 to drop off their bikes and enjoy this... They don't want to take the bikes back, so that's
45 the reason for my question. I don't know whether any surveys have been done, but
46
47
48
49
50

1 that's my personal experience from riding the ferry and speaking with others who do on
2
3 the weekends.
4

5 Did you want to address the second question regarding the timing for loading and
6
7 offloading if it was a 10-foot pier, or is that something I can ask you later?
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: I don't have that information tonight, so we could take that as a
10
11 comment.
12

13 CHAIR COX: And at our last meeting we had asked you about life cycle costs
14
15 and a maintenance plan, and you said that you're working on that. Is that something
16
17 you're going to be able to present to us at our next meeting?
18

19 JOHN EBERLE: The maintenance and operation plan is typically completed
20
21 when the design is completed, so when the design is completed I'd be more than happy
22
23 to present the maintenance and operations plan, because that will have all the different
24
25 elements of the facility. So if that's acceptable, I will submit that at that time.
26

27 CHAIR COX: All right, I hear someone else has another question.
28

29 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'm just responding to your responses that we
30
31 received tonight on the dais, but on Question 18, that was a question at our last meeting
32
33 about the low tide data, how often it occurs, and if not, why do you need a design like
34
35 this? And your answer was that you were doing further research, that you would bring
36
37 back the question to the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board. That was
38
39 number 18, so I'm just wondering if you have that tonight or you could bring that to us
40
41 next time as well?
42

43 JOHN EBERLE: I think there's a follow up response...
44

45 CHAIR COX: There's a follow up.
46
47

48 JOHN EBERLE: ...on that question right below it, it states on Question 18.
49
50

1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yeah, (inaudible). Thank you.

2
3 CHAIR COX: Then again, we did not have the benefit of seeing this prior to our
4
5 meeting.

6
7 As a follow up to that, we did receive a letter in our packet, one of over 80 letters,
8
9 from Sam Chase, who came up with decidedly different statistics from those that the
10 District came up with. This is on page 155 of our packet, and his analysis regarding the
11 number of times per year starts at page 157. My question is can the District please
12 distinguish between the analysis that Mr. Chase has provided for us and the District's
13 analysis to explain why they vary so greatly, if you could take a look and see if you can
14 answer that question.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 JOHN EBERLE: I don't have that particular document.

22
23 CHAIR COX: It's in our packet that was online. Again, it's pages 155 to 162,
24 Exhibit M as in Mary. It was from the public comment, from the various letters, all the
25 letters that were in the last packet.
26
27
28

29
30 Okay, I don't have any further questions, so at this time I'd like to start asking
31 members of the public to come up and present their questions or comments. I have
32 some speaker cards. I'm going to call in the order that I have the speaker cards. If
33 anybody else would like to ask questions and hasn't yet provided speaker cards, please
34 do.
35
36
37
38

39
40 Please know that the Golden Gate Bridge District and staff will not be answering
41 every question from the members of the public as posed. Instead, we're going to use
42 the same approach that we did last time, which is to make a list of all the questions, and
43 then if the Commissioners or the Historic Landmarks Board or staff believes it is
44 productive to answer some of those questions in time permitting, we may towards the
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 end of the meeting; but rest assured we will record the questions, we will ask for
2
3 responses to the questions from the Golden Gate Bridge District similar to what was
4
5 provided this evening in this 15-page document, only hopefully perhaps a little sooner
6
7 for the next meeting.
8

9 With that, I will ask Adam Krivatsy to lead us off.
10

11 COUNSEL WAGNER: He had to leave, Chair Cox.
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay, then I'm going to go to Bill Versaci.
14

15 BILL VERSACI: I'm Bill Versaci; I live on Currey Lane and I've most recently
16
17 been the principal architect for the San Jose Redevelopment Agency. I've managed,
18
19 designed and negotiated development agreements between public agencies and private
20
21 developers for 40 years, and also in deference to the Historic Landmarks Board, I wrote
22
23 the original draft of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation of historic
24
25 buildings.
26

27
28 The District objectives for this project are more efficient operations, and benefits
29
30 the community is seeking are more attractive facilities and easier waterfront access. I
31
32 strongly support the District's intention. I think the basic planning of the facility, the
33
34 engineering of the facility is sound, but the design is fundamentally flawed in terms of
35
36 both operations and public benefit.
37

38 The community has been outspoken about the gangway design, and certainly
39
40 more acceptable solutions are possible. Even with the changes, it's really over-scaled
41
42 and over-designed. It's clumsy and redundant. The handrails are a completely separate
43
44 structure from the trusses, which is very unusual and makes it very complicated and
45
46 reduces the transparency.
47
48
49
50

1 What I think is needed is a different design that integrates technical requirements
2
3 and the aesthetics into a simple, functional design that isn't just a rehash of the existing
4
5 failed design.
6

7 The gateways should be as close to shore as possible, and perpendicular to the
8
9 shoreline if possible, and perhaps right at the curb.
10

11 The District's other facilities security and boarding controls are separate, which
12
13 gets the passengers inside the terminal holding area before the ferry, and that facilitates
14
15 boarding of the ferry, rather than it being determined by the last straggler from the
16
17 longest point away. We'll return to that.
18

19 The simple gate is obviously the most acceptable, but I think it should be shorn of
20
21 the Big Brother element on top. If we need lighting and security cameras, I don't think it
22
23 requires a huge structure like that, and it's the same problem that we all have with the
24
25 gangway.
26

27 Well, proposed lighting you just saw, and I'm not sure that some may consider
28
29 drilling platform lighting 200 yards offshore to have a place in Sausalito.
30

31 The ferry trips are based on capacity of the vessels, not the number of trips.
32
33 Can't go into it here, but the landside design should be based on normal daily loads
34
35 rather than seasonal peaks, and that changes what the problem is in managing them on
36
37 shore.
38

39 The accommodation must be planned for overflow crowds, but as an exception. If
40
41 we look at the passenger loading side alone, basically they're just dumping the
42
43 passengers onto the plaza, which makes this the City's problem rather than the...
44
45

46 (Timer sounds.)
47

48 BILL VERSACI: Oh, well.
49
50

1 AUDIENCE: Let him speak.

2
3 AUDIENCE: Yeah.

4
5 AUDIENCE: Three more minutes.

6
7 CHAIR COX: How much more do you have, sir?

8
9 BILL VERSACI: I am on page four of six. I'll finish page four of six.

10
11 CHAIR COX: I'm going to let Mr. Versaci finish, but I'm going to hold everybody
12 else to three minutes. If you don't finish and you want to stay and comment at the end,
13 that's fine, but I want to make sure we hear from everybody.
14

15
16
17 BILL VERSACI: That's what I was planning on, speaking later.

18
19 CHAIR COX: Okay.

20
21 BILL VERSACI: But at any rate, the peak tourist load should really be an
22 exception; it shouldn't be the base load. Tourists expect crowding; it makes a festive
23 atmosphere, and anyone going downtown expects that.
24

25
26
27 If we look at the passengers loading site alone I think it's imperative to get those
28 people off of the plaza and into some kind of facility that is off the public property, onto
29 the District's property, and if that requires broadening the landside pier, which you can
30 barely see, and narrowing the access pier, which you can see and it interferes with the
31 view, I think it's necessary to do that.
32
33

34
35
36 What I was just showing and has gotten really screwed up here is that there is an
37 assumption that the Council, the City, has no authority over this project, because it is
38 exempt from local land use ordinances. However, I think that the landside
39 improvements are using public space dedicated to a private use, and that certainly is a
40 place for control over what is designed and what the capacity of the facility is.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 Somehow they're going to have to get a land lease from us to use that triangle of
2
3 land for the temporary facility. In addition, the access (inaudible) temporary facility,
4
5 which is on BCDC property. The temporary facility is on City property. None of them has
6
7 been presented and reviewed by anyone.
8

9 At any rate, I think that's it.
10

11 CHAIR COX: Thank you.
12

13 BILL VERSACI: I support the proposal. I think there are design deficiencies that
14
15 can be addressed.
16

17 CHAIR COX: And Mr. Versaci, it would be helpful to us if you would transmit
18
19 your materials to City staff so that the members of the various boards can review them
20
21 before our next meeting.
22

23 BILL VERSACI: Yes.
24

25 CHAIR COX: Great. So Terry Gilbert is next, and after Terry is Adrianna
26
27 Dinihanian, and then Marie Simmons.
28

29 TERRY GILBERT: I'm not quite as qualified as our last speaker, and I've not
30
31 been a very active person politically in Sausalito. The last City Council meeting I went
32
33 to, Sally Stanford was the mayor and Robin Sweeny and Earl Dunphy were on the
34
35 Council, so it's been a while.
36

37 So what would get me out here? To me, this is a transcendent thing that is being
38
39 proposed, and I understand that from an engineering point of view, and we seem to
40
41 have mostly engineers here that are just looking at the ferry, that it probably makes a lot
42
43 of sense and they did a great job. But in terms of something that's going to sit in the City
44
45 of Sausalito, that's a different story.
46
47
48
49
50

1 The City of Sausalito, up until this point, since I came here 40 years ago the only
2
3 changes I've noticed are more tour buses and bikes. Everything else has been pretty
4
5 much the same for 40 years, and now we have this, which to me reminds me of the
6
7 proposal done a while ago that didn't last very long, to put a space needle on Alcatraz.
8

9 I am completely against this project, and I understand some of the concerns they
10
11 have, but it seems like the tail is wagging the dog here and that we're missing the big
12
13 issue of what is this city about?
14

15 I rode the ferry to work for a number of years, and I never heard anybody
16
17 complain about anything about the ferry. I think that at this point in time what we need is
18
19 to have the City stand up and oppose this plan, and to insist that a new plan be
20
21 designed that is pretty much in the footprint of the existing ferry landing area, perhaps
22
23 wider, but not extending so far out into the water.
24

25 I know that they said the depth and all that. You can dredge. There are all kinds
26
27 of things. If they had the requirements to do something that makes sense for the City of
28
29 Sausalito, they'd be able to find a way. Thank you.
30

31 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, guys. Please hold your applause to the end.
32
33 Next is Adrianna Dinihanian, and after her is Marie Simmons, and then Vincent
34
35 Maggiora. If you guys can queue up, it will help our process go a little faster.
36
37

38 ADRIANNA DINIHANIAN: I'm Adrianna Dinihanian and live on Woodward
39
40 Avenue.
41

42 I'd like to ask the Bridge District, do you have a figure on how long this particular
43
44 pier landing thing is going to last?
45

46 CHAIR COX: As I told you, we're going to record your questions. We're not
47
48 going to have an answer as we go.
49
50

1 ADRIANNA DINIHANIAN: All right. In the little packet that we were handed out,
2
3 on number 22 you can see that they are planning this particular length, the 90-foot
4
5 gangway length, on the possible lowest tide in the potential life of this particular project,
6
7 so maybe 30-40 years. It's for the very lowest possible thing that could happen in 30-40
8
9 years, so I think that 90-foot length and the 1:12 figure could be looked at again,
10
11 because it seems rather extreme, like I think everything in this project is based on the
12
13 rather extreme.
14

15 I think design-wise we're looking at the same design, slightly smaller, and that's
16
17 what people always do. They always give something that's big and gargantuan and
18
19 horrible, and then they take something off of it, and you think oh at least I didn't have
20
21 that big, terrible thing. But really, what we need to do here is totally redesign this so that
22
23 it fits into Sausalito.
24

25 Take a look at that railing that's on the north end of town where you enter
26
27 Sausalito from the Sausalito/Marin City exit. It's black, it's nice looking, it looks like
28
29 Sausalito. Do you know what I'm talking about? It goes underneath the freeway there,
30
31 right? It's a nice, clean looking railing, and black is a traditional railing color. Not bright
32
33 blue, not gray, black. It's not sitting on the water, but it stands... Even the navy blue, if
34
35 you noticed in the pictures, I think the navy blue actually recedes.
36
37

38 And then, as a graphic designer I'm hoping there will be some sort of review by
39
40 the public on the eventual graphic design elements in this sort of thing, because that
41
42 really does impact the overall design greatly. Thank you.
43

44 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Vincent Maggiora, then James Gabbert. Again, if folks
45
46 could line up, it would speed us up a bit.
47

48 VINCENT MAGGIORA: I'm Vincent Maggiora, resident of Sausalito.
49
50

1 I'm against what is being proposed right now for a few reasons. I have slides.

2
3 CHAIR COX: All right, if you have a slide show I'm going to ask someone else to
4
5 come up while they get that set up for you.

6
7 VINCENT MAGGIORA: Okay.

8
9 CHAIR COX: Okay, Jim Gabbert, and then Patty Bacon.

10
11 JIM GABBERT: Okay, Jim Gabbert. I've lived in Sausalito since 1960, and like
12
13 the previous speaker said, it hasn't changed much except for tourists and all. There are
14
15 three things here tonight that I notice could be very bothersome.

16
17 Like move the gate down on the pier so people will have public access. It was my
18
19 understanding it was being widened so they could handle more people getting off and
20
21 on the boats. Now, if it's going to be full of people, it's not going to work, so why did we
22
23 put the gate here? To make everybody happy.

24
25 Number two, it's obvious that this is designed for two boats simultaneously, so
26
27 let's take 700 people here, 700 people here, 1,400 people get off. They walk down the
28
29 park, they go by the Sausalito Hotel, and they all get an ice cream cone, and 1,400 of
30
31 them cross Bridgeway. You're going to need to control traffic. I mean right now when a
32
33 ferry comes in with tourists.

34
35 I live down where the sea lion is on Bridgeway. I drive down, and when a tourist
36
37 boat arrives, traffic is a mess. So you're going to need pedestrian cops and you have to
38
39 handle the traffic, and I don't think anybody has thought of that. Can we handle that
40
41 much more? The problem is if this goes ahead I would require that the City mandate
42
43 there would never be two simultaneous boats there, because that's what it was
44
45 designed for. It was designed to handle tourists.

46
47
48 (Audience applause.)
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Guys, seriously.

2
3 JAMES GABBERT: Thank you. That's all I've got to say.

4
5 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Is this slide presentation ready? Okay, Vince, you're
6
7 up. After Vince is Patty Bacon, then Doug Martin.

8
9 VINCENT MAGGIORA: A week ago they put up the story poles, and the floats
10
11 kept on moving around; it was very difficult to see. But this shot here, you can see how
12
13 far it will come out, but you can't see the height on it. So it was sort of a disaster.

14
15 This is going in the wrong direction, but just trying to show here are the gates.
16
17 They can be 5 feet high. It's electronic security that they can have. They have
18
19 somebody at the Bridge District that does their security 24 hours a day, and probably
20
21 people (inaudible).

22
23 This is what's showing the dogleg now that's a very poor design that they came
24
25 up with in the first place.

26
27 This is a rough idea that I had, that expanding the landside pier to come out with
28
29 the green part, and then this is the size of their gangway that they have proposed now,
30
31 and the size of their float. It's moved in a little bit from the original, and instead of doing
32
33 a temporary pier and relocating the float, they can come off the shore to the access pier.
34
35 So they can do all the construction from landside on a pier and it would fit in a lot better
36
37 than sticking way out in the bay.

38
39 I'm really against what they're proposing. The float needs to be repaired; it's in
40
41 horrible condition. Thank you.

42
43 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Patty Bacon, then Doug Martin, and then Stafford
44
45 Keegin.
46
47
48
49
50

1 PATTY BACON: Yes, my comments relate to the lack of integration between the
2
3 land and the waterside planning.
4

5 Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles, thank you for asking City staff about the land
6
7 plans. The City Attorney replied that there are no plans. For the number of years that a
8
9 project of this size has been underway with the Bridge District, it's quite remarkable that
10
11 we don't have any plans.
12

13 There are some things we know: That the ferries will be modified to disembark
14
15 four times the number of people, and that will be 16-foot doors that will go on to the way
16
17 it is designed today, a 20-foot gangway and two approximately 20-foot concrete piers.
18
19 So if that gets reduced, all the better.
20

21 But where are these people going? I'd like to ask you to look at Item 10 on page
22
23 17 in the staff report later. It states emphatically that there will be no changes to the
24
25 parking lot, the exits, or the vehicle traffic pattern. Now, any of us who take the ferry in
26
27 commute hours know that getting off the ferry we are climbing over bicycle wheels, and
28
29 in the winter walking into headlights by star struck tourists, and we can barely get out of
30
31 the parking lot.
32

33 Now we have four times the number of people coming off. We need to know at
34
35 this point, after all this time, what is going to happen. Do we need the details? No. Do
36
37 we need to slow this project down? Probably not.
38

39 And we also know, just go back a minute, \$2 million is sitting in a pot for these
40
41 land improvements, so we're talking no car changes, no parking changes, we're talking
42
43 people and bicycles. Could you ask perhaps, or consider asking City staff, at least for
44
45 some general concepts of what the options are? Walking onto Bridgeway, going down
46
47
48
49
50

1 by the parking, there may be a variety of options. That would help us understand that.

2
3 Thank you.

4
5 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Doug Martin, then Stafford Keegin, and then Clayton
6
7 Smith.

8
9 DOUG MARTIN: Douglas Martin. I've been riding the ferry twice a day since
10
11 1970, and what I want to offer to you today is my experience of where the choke points
12
13 are in embarking and disembarking on the ferry, and to what extent I think that the
14
15 proposal will help clear those choke points, and to what extent I think they may not, and
16
17 where I think we should focus our attention.

18
19 The main choke point is not in Sausalito. The main choke point is in San
20
21 Francisco, and it's the tourists carrying their bicycles up the stairs and getting out of the
22
23 ferry. It takes a tourist much longer than a commuter who bicycles in. The commuters
24
25 on bicycles in the morning, they come up pretty much as fast as people without bicycles
26
27 and they're out with no spacing between them, so they get out very quickly. The
28
29 tourists, on the other hand, have no experience carrying bicycles up stairways, and so if
30
31 you watch them get off you'll see there are 20-30 feet of space between each one of
32
33 them as they dribble off the boat. That is the main reason why the ferries are late, and
34
35 until that is addressed we can get improvements in Sausalito, but we will not solve the
36
37 problem.

38
39 The problem in Sausalito and the choke points are at the gangway, because only
40
41 two people can walk side-by-side there, and they generally do, so it's difficult to pass
42
43 anyone. People who walk faster than others are constrained to be behind the slower
44
45 walkers, so an expansion of the gangway would permit people to get off the ferry faster.
46
47
48
49
50

1 Getting on the ferry, it depends on whether or not these new doors on the boats
2
3 will permit them to get on faster. If it doesn't, then when they come down the gangway
4
5 they'll simply bunch up in front of the doors instead of bunching up in the gangway or
6
7 further on. It's like a funnel. If you've got a funnel that's this shape, it won't get the water
8
9 through faster than one in this shape, simply because the spout is the same size. The
10
11 critical thing is when the people get down to the float, are they going to be able to get
12
13 into the ferry faster, or are they going to clump up? That will depend upon not just the
14
15 size of the openings, whether it's 8 feet, it will depend on the size of the gangway. The
16
17 gangway immediately makes it smaller than the door itself, and that's also true
18
19 incidentally in one of the choke points up in the gates.
20

21 CHAIR COX: I'm going to ask you to wrap it up, Mr. Martin. That was your time.

22 DOUG MARTIN: Okay, well, I'll write something to you.

23 CHAIR COX: I appreciate that. Anybody who would write, we appreciate being
24
25 able to read and consider your opinions. Stafford Keegin, then Clayton Smith, then
26
27 Janeane Moody. Good evening.
28
29

30 STAFFORD KEEGIN: Good evening. Nice to see you all. I'm Stafford Keegin, a
31
32 longtime resident of Sausalito, and I'm just going to make a few micro comments. I think
33
34 the comments that have been made heretofore are smack on and done by some very
35
36 smart people and are worthy of your serious consideration. I'm going to look at much
37
38 smaller points.
39
40

41 One is the use of the story poles. From experience I discovered that they rarely
42
43 show the mass of a project that is being planned, and that is certainly true in spades
44
45 here where we have buoys floating on the water, not necessarily in the right location.
46
47 That is no way to get a sense for how massive this particular project would be. I don't
48
49
50

1 have any particular solutions for you, but I do know that story poles are fine for showing
2 the outline, but give you no sense of what the mass is.
3

4
5 Secondly, for ADA purposes I would suspect that handicapped individuals would
6 not be able to enjoy the view that BCDC is trying to provide them with the design of the
7 gangway that has been presented. I also think that's true of people who are perhaps
8 shorter than 6 feet, because those round beams are going to be in everybody's view
9 and they're not going to be able to enjoy a view out as well blocking the views of those
10 on shore looking across. I think a redesign of that entire ramp area needs to be done in
11 order to allow people to actually enjoy the view that they are approaching.
12
13

14 Those are my comments, and thank you very much.
15

16 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Clayton Smith, then Janeane Moody, and then
17 Sandra White.
18

19 CLAYTON SMITH: What I wanted to comment on is, again, following up on the
20 concern of massiveness of this project. I think it's inexcusable that for something that's
21 been in the development phase since 2008, there is not a three-dimensional model here
22 to look at. I think anything of this substance we should demand a three-dimensional
23 model, so you can see the massiveness. I think the reason there is not a three-
24 dimensional model is because they do not want you to see how massive this project
25 really is, and its effect on the views and the effect on the whole way the City is going to
26 look. Sausalito is very small. It's only two blocks long. I mean this is really like Tiny
27 Town; it's like one of those little places you see in Italy.
28

29 The second thing, I want to go back to the 700 people in ten minutes. I mean this
30 is like Sausalito as Omaha Beach. Think about it. Seven hundred people are a battalion
31 of infantry, and when the person was talking about two boats, 1,400, we're getting to
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 regimental size here. Now, this has an impact on the quality of life in this town. I know
2
3 it's kind of funny to think about it, but actually it's turning southern Marin into Coney
4
5 Island. We are dealing with this at Muir Woods. Three million people. I mean how many
6
7 millions of people? Not everybody on this planet can visit Muir Woods in their lifetime;
8
9 it's just not possible, and that goes the same thing for Sausalito, no matter what the
10
11 Bridge District might have in its fantasy as its obligation to transport people about the
12
13 bay.

14
15 As to the objections that they have presented concerning the fact that they could
16
17 half load their boat, let's change the schedule. Just the change the schedule. I worked
18
19 at Space Technology Laboratories when I first came to California. We did the
20
21 trajectories for the Apollo mission, and I'm certain there must be some old, retired space
22
23 engineers in this community that could help them with their schedule, and they would
24
25 probably do it for free. Thank you.
26

27
28 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Janeane Moody, then Sandra White, and then Bruce
29
30 Corcoran.

31
32 JANEANE MOODY: A difficult act to follow. I'm Janeane Moody, Sausalito
33
34 resident for over 30 years at 6 Alexander Avenue.

35
36 Do citizens have the right to determine what is allowed in their communities? A
37
38 lack of transparency and behind the scenes decision making by the few has effectively
39
40 precluded Sausalito citizens' rights.

41
42 In this project it also appears that a concerted effort has been made to
43
44 disempower the citizens of Sausalito. First we were told that the Golden Gate Bridge
45
46 and Ferry District could do this and there was nothing we could do about it. Then our
47
48 City Attorney indicated that the City could do nothing about property that was rented by
49
50

1 the City. That was retracted. Behind the scenes it was agreed that it would not be a
2
3 good idea to have the District go through the City's design review process voluntarily. A
4
5 previous City Council gave consent to the overall design of this project. Further, it was
6
7 presented that a handful of community members think that we are bypassing the public
8
9 process and destroying the waterfront. Well, here we are, the handful. So now, what is
10
11 the scope of the input these citizens are allowed?
12

13 Design. The citizen input asked for is for limited to waterside only, predetermined
14
15 design features, and we are allowed to choose which design features and which color
16
17 we would prefer. Other design choices are not to be considered, nor is it the stated
18
19 purpose of the meetings to decide whether or not we want Sausalito to become a
20
21 transportation hub in the first place. Other designs are not being considered.
22

23 A giant transportation hub would destroy the quality of life for residents and
24
25 perhaps fatally spoil the very essence of the heritage and beauty of our town. Do we
26
27 want to look back years from now and say that we, the citizens of Sausalito, allowed this
28
29 to happen?
30

31 Does the project solve the bicycle problem? No. Where I live, 6 Alexander, south
32
33 end of town, it would increase by a staggering number of the bikes that enter the south
34
35 end already. It is already a foreseeable tragedy waiting to happen. It's just a matter of
36
37 when.
38

39 A few years ago City Council member Amy Belser and Sausalito citizens
40
41 challenged a large project at Point Cavallo that would have adversely affected Sausalito
42
43 traffic and quality of life, a project of far smaller impact than the proposed ferry terminal.
44
45 It was successfully challenged, and it was not even on Sausalito property.
46
47
48
49
50

1 I urge the citizens of Sausalito not to give up their government to a few City
2 politicians and City staff members, or to outside agencies. We need to take back
3 ownership of our right to determine what is allowed in our community.
4
5

6
7 CHAIR COX: Okay, thank you. Okay, guys, again, I'm going to ask you to refrain
8 from clapping. I know it's difficult. There are a lot of us who have a lot of strong feelings.
9

10
11 Okay, Sandra White, then Bruce Corcoran, and then Chris Skelton.
12

13 SANDRA MacCLEOD WHITE: Good evening, my name is Sandra MacCleod
14 White; I'm a 40-year resident of Sausalito.
15

16
17 I commuted for 28 years, and I'm here on behalf of the commuters. Had to stand
18 outside waiting for the ferry in extreme conditions; storms, rainstorms, fog, and there
19 was no shelter for any of us. I would like to know, or plant the seed, that maybe for the
20 commuters who have to stand out there for a long time in the elements, and we all live
21 with them here in Sausalito, that maybe there could be some kind of wall or shelter for
22 those who need it, and also for the disabled and the elderly. Thank you.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Bruce Corcoran, then Chris Skelton, and then Neil
31 Whitelaw.
32

33
34 BRUCE CORCORAN: Good evening, I'm Bruce Corcoran, a 38-year resident of
35 Strawberry.
36

37
38 I've had many years of experience analyzing development plans in the
39 unincorporated areas of Marin. In general, I favor local control. I'm very wary of
40 proposals by regional bodies and appointed officials who are not accountable to us in
41 the election booth, don't live in or understand our communities, but have been vested by
42 law with the extraordinary powers to govern our lives. Such proposals demand public
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 scrutiny, because they often contain errors and don't serve our best interests. That's
2
3 why I'm so pleased to see the large turnout tonight.
4

5 You are fortunate to have your own Town Council, which is accountable to you
6
7 by election. In contrast, Strawberry is a community governed by five county supervisors,
8
9 but we can only vote for one of them. What Strawberry wants to do can easily be
10
11 overturned with impunity by the three or four other supervisors who are not accountable
12
13 to us.
14

15 The pivotal issue for this project, which was in dispute at the December BCDC
16
17 hearing, is who has development rights at the Sausalito ferry landing? The Bridge
18
19 District asserted that it could do whatever it wanted without Sausalito's approval, but
20
21 BCDC and some members of your Council disagreed. The subsequent rediscovery of
22
23 the 1995 lease agreement shed new light on the matter. In January, your City Attorney
24
25 proffered that the proposed project entailed major improvements, which required the
26
27 Bridge District to obtain Sausalito's prior written consent. The opinion is logical.
28
29 Because Sausalito owns the land, the property owner should have the right to
30
31 determine how that land is developed. So now the key question is: What do you want to
32
33 do?
34

35
36 Kate Sears is in a unique position to offer strong leadership, because she is a
37
38 resident of Sausalito, a county supervisor, a member of BCDC, and a member of the
39
40 Bridge District, but her testimony has been equivocal. She did not say I object to this
41
42 proposal until we get more input from the citizens of Sausalito. Instead, she said that
43
44 she favors approving, with slight modifications, the waterside project now and feels
45
46 okay, with some reservations, about approving the landside project later.
47
48
49
50

1 But is this the way you feel? Wouldn't it make more sense to coordinate the
2 development of both projects simultaneously, rather than developing each one
3 separately? Otherwise, won't you have a platform that would encourage more
4 commuters, tourists, and bicyclists on the waterside without having the infrastructure to
5 accommodate them on the landside? Remember, a SMART train will not serve southern
6 Marin, so any additional traffic from new development will impact your surface streets.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Also bear in mind that any decision by one community along the 101 corridor will
14 impact every other community. For example, Strawberry is seeing a remarkable
15 increase in bicycle tourists. Although we consider ourselves to be a bike-friendly
16 community, some sections of our roadways are dangerous for bikes, and the sheer
17 numbers of additional bike tourists who are distracted by sightseeing and trying to read
18 roadmaps attached to handlebars are presenting new hazards for themselves and all of
19 us.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 These are questions for you to answer. God speed on your decisions.

29 CHAIR COX: Thank you, and if you could submit your letter, we would greatly
30 appreciate it. Chris Skelton. Chris, if you don't mind, Neil is up. Let's just let him speak,
31 and then you can speak after him.
32
33
34

35 NEIL WHITELAW: I may need a chair for this.

36 CHAIR COX: You've got one right behind you. Chris, could you hand him that?
37
38 Thank you.
39
40

41 NEIL WHITELAW: As one of the two founders of the No on B issue when a
42 monstrosity building was going to be built for public safety, I have to say again that this
43 reminds me, it's like déjà vu again. Too big. Too ugly. Too expensive.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 I'm starting to get mad. No one is asking Sausalito do you even want this? The
2
3 two boards are talking about should it be blue, or should we make it purple, as if it's
4
5 already been decided.
6

7 There's an old story, build it and they will come. If you build a big pier out there
8
9 and have space for two boats, that's going to be it, there's going to be more. You're
10
11 going to like quadruple the number of tourists coming. If there are a million tourists a
12
13 year coming now, do you want to live in a town with 3 million tourists?
14

15 I came through on the bus at 5:00 o'clock today, and I was amazed. In April the
16
17 whole downtown was filled with tourists. I wouldn't go down there. Yeah, I go down if I
18
19 have to make a bank deposit, then get out of there, or a quick drink, but the downtown
20
21 has been lost to me.
22

23 I didn't start out identifying myself. I'm Neil Whitelaw. Today is my 48th
24
25 anniversary of coming to California and Sausalito. April 1, 1967. It's been wonderful. I
26
27 hope the next ten or 20 years are wonderful. It won't be if we have 3 million tourists
28
29 here. This whole philosophy, built it and they will come, that's what will happen if you
30
31 expand this.
32

33 I really think we're going to have to dump the whole project. Repair what needs
34
35 fixing and go on. This town is already too much run by the commercial interests in
36
37 downtown Sausalito. What about the people that live here? I'm scared to go downtown
38
39 now. What's it going to be like with triple the population of tourists? They're talking
40
41 about they can't unload the boats fast enough. Unload them faster and we've got built it,
42
43 they will come.
44

45 We had the same thing happen before with the public safety buildings, the
46
47 monstrosity they were going to build. We had a couple committees that thought they
48
49
50

1 knew what people wanted. They went ahead, they didn't listen to people, and they didn't
2
3 get the input. These two boards have a little more input. The last meeting they had, they
4
5 had 80% non-input with the public, now they're up to maybe 40% input of what they've
6
7 talked to the public about. I don't think they know what we want.
8

9 I don't want anything. I want this project dumped. I'll get out the road wrench and
10
11 help you fix the thing, if that's what needs fixing. Fix it. Thank you.
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay, Chris Skelton, then Joan Proctor, and then Willie McDevitt.

14 CHRIS SKELTON: Good evening, Commissioners and Board Members.
15

16
17 The ferry landing is in terrible condition. We can all philosophically agree that
18
19 alternate transportation is good. That's not what these meetings are about.
20

21
22 What these meetings are about is a dramatic increase in intensity of
23
24 infrastructure and an unimaginable impact on a historic downtown waterfront. It's going
25
26 to last at least for the next 30 to 50 years.
27

28 At the study session on March 11th the Planning Commission, the Historic
29
30 Landmarks Board, and residents all asked for information for presenting questions to
31
32 the District. Staff report acknowledged that as of the deadline, I think March 26th, the
33
34 District did not provide that information. Hours before this evening's hearing, check the
35
36 website, the information wasn't provided. It was only after walking through the door that
37
38 we received, as Chair Cox identified, a 15-page packet responding to this. This is not an
39
40 opportunity for meaningful review and input. It sort of represents a waste of either the
41
42 study session, or this evening, or both.
43

44 My reason for highlighting this lack of information is to demonstrate that this
45
46 project is simply not ready for prime time. The findings required by the City's code
47
48 cannot be made, and any attempts to manipulate the facts to squeeze them into those
49
50

1 findings represents and demonstrates a disingenuous process. We deserve better, and
2
3 the District is accountable for providing you the information necessary to make an
4
5 informed decision.
6

7 An earlier speaker identified what I have coined, “the planning game.” It appears
8
9 to be going on here. This project, over the past eight to ten months, epitomizes the
10
11 planning game. It came in way too big, and we’ve seen incremental changes. The
12
13 access pier went from 25-foot to 21-foot. The truss structure went from about 11-foot-
14
15 plus to 8-foot. The color changed from white to something else. Access gates went from
16
17 roller gates to now swing doors. These minor changes are not the significant changes
18
19 that you are asking for.
20

21 I understand I’m running low on time, so I’ll try some highlights quickly.

22
23 If you’re looking to see what the truss structure will look like, go no further than
24
25 Sir Francis Drake over by Larkspur Landing. They just put it up. It does not belong in
26
27 Sausalito. That truss structure I’m talking about is for the pedestrian bikeway over Sir
28
29 Francis Drake leading to Larkspur Landing.
30

31 Second, the March 11th hearing really epitomized this, but it’s worth reiterating.
32
33 There is an imprecise and an even suspect methodology for justifying the proposed
34
35 ferry landing. I would point you to look no further than Mr. Versaci and his comments
36
37 earlier.
38

39 One other important point that I just want to highlight is safety. Safety was raised
40
41 at the last hearing for why this project is necessary. I agree improvements are
42
43 necessary, but safety in this context entails what is the use? Multi-use? Are there going
44
45 to be fishermen? Are you inviting unnecessary impacts at the expense of the benefits? I
46
47
48
49
50

1 think that this can be addressed by demanding that the gates be relocated, not only to
2
3 be parallel or oriented as the gates are now, but also to lower those gates.
4

5 CHAIR COX: Chris, I'm going to...

6
7 CHRIS SKELTON: I understand. In conclusion, we all philosophically agree
8
9 about the project; it's just not ready for prime time. Thank you.
10

11 CHAIR COX: Okay, Joan Proctor, then Willie McDevitt, and then Rich Conley.
12

13 JOAN PROCTOR: Hi, I'm Joan Proctor; I'm a resident.
14

15 I think we're finally getting down to something real here. I think for a while we
16
17 were all distracted by how unattractive this thing was and what to do about this and that,
18
19 but it has become apparent to me during this meeting that we have a basic
20
21 philosophical difference going on here.
22

23 The Bridge District, or whoever the higher-ups are that are looking at this, are
24
25 looking at maximizing tourism. They're looking at more people, more efficiency. They're
26
27 saying "operational efficiency." They're saying "passenger convenience." On the other
28
29 hand, we who live here, we're looking at this as, "What is happening to our town, and do
30
31 we want this happening in our town?"
32

33 Our focus is more towards having something attractive, small scale and simple,
34
35 and with nautical aesthetics. I think that our present one is wearing out maybe
36
37 prematurely. It could perhaps need fixing, but I don't think that this project is the right
38
39 one.
40

41 I'm also wondering about something I have both heard and read about, an
42
43 underlying reason why this massive project came here, that somebody up there has
44
45 some concept about making Sausalito a transportation hub for the bay. I don't have the
46
47 facts on that, but what I've heard about and seen in diagrams is this big link between
48
49
50

1 San Francisco and Muir Woods. If that's what this is all about, I think they've got the
2
3 wrong place. This is private property. There must be state park property where this
4
5 could be developed. I don't know where, maybe Angel Island, maybe Fort Baker, maybe
6
7 many other places that the state already owns, but I don't think it belongs here.
8

9 I do have a lot of specific ideas I was going to write and send in, rather than
10
11 mention them here, about the design, but I really think that that's all fluff. I think we need
12
13 to be looking at the real issue. Thank you.
14

15 CHAIR COX: Okay, Willie McDevitt, Rich Conley, and then Marv Hovatter.

16
17 Can we just take a pause? We're blocking an aisle way, so I want to help
18
19 resituate Mr. Whitelaw, if we can.
20

21 WILLIE McDEVITT: Good evening. My name is Willie McDevitt; I'm one of the
22
23 owners of the Inn Above Tide. We're, as most of you know, right next to the ferry
24
25 landing and quite concerned. I'm here with my brother and sister, who are the other
26
27 owners, and our general manager, Mark Flaharty.
28

29 I'm going to change the subject a little bit. Our concerns are more about the
30
31 project and what will happen during construction to us, and the entire downtown area.
32
33 We have five concerns, pretty much in this order. The first two are pretty serious for us.
34
35

36 The temporary pier location, and the duration that that pier will be in place 90 feet
37
38 closer to the hotel, so it will go from 190 feet to about 100 feet. I said the location of the
39
40 pier, but when the boat comes in it will be that much closer, which will disrupt the
41
42 privacy and serenity of the rooms, which is why the people rent them in the first place.
43

44 We think it's really important to the entire downtown not to have the construction
45
46 occur during the crowded summer season. It would also be extremely important to the
47
48 hotel that hopefully construction can start within the window that piles may be driven
49
50

1 sometime in October and can be taken through the winter and be done in the spring.
2
3 We think that there will be a huge loss of revenue to us and the (inaudible) if it were a
4
5 summertime project. It's hard to estimate, but somewhere between \$500,000 and \$1
6
7 million loss in revenue for the Inn Above Tide. Probably in the neighborhood of
8
9 \$100,000 to \$200,000 for the City when you include TOT revenue from the various
10
11 hotels that are on El Portal, and parking revenue, from disruptions due to construction,
12
13 as well as disruption to other merchants.
14

15 We would like to be included with the City to come up with some mutually
16
17 agreeable rules for the way the construction takes place and how it is scheduled so that
18
19 it has minimal impact on the inn and the rest of the downtown area.
20

21 We were happy to see that the ticket vending machine has been relocated to a
22
23 much less congested area. We were very concerned about automobile and pedestrian
24
25 traffic at the entrance to the inn as well as just the general sort of chaos that occurs
26
27 there, so getting the ticket machine moved is a big plus.
28

29 We're suggesting that if the gate is not moved, as other people have suggested,
30
31 that a secondary gate be put at the end of the pier to avoid late night revelry that may
32
33 occur out there, which would be real obnoxious to the entire downtown, the inn, and the
34
35 Yacht Club.
36

37 So our plan is, and the reason we want to be on the record, we'd like to work with
38
39 the City and the Bridge District to collaboratively develop some work rules and a
40
41 schedule that are the least impactful to the City. Thank you.
42
43

44 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Rich Conley, then Marv Hovatter, and then Russ Irwin.

45 I got a message. Apparently the streaming is not working for Macs, so I don't
46
47 know if that's something we can address while the meeting is going on.
48
49
50

1 MALE: (Inaudible).

2
3 CHAIR COX: Okay, but it is okay for PCs, I guess? Okay. All right.

4
5 RICH CONLEY: Hi, I'm Rich Conley. My wife and I both were born here in the
6
7 Bay Area, residents of Sausalito.

8
9 I'd like to correct something that hasn't been brought up yet about history, and
10 that is that the first instance we've been able to find in researching this whole project
11 that is that the first instance we've been able to find in researching this whole project
12 was the horrible depression we had in 2006-2008. There was a \$1 trillion stimulus
13 package that was passed, and in that stimulus bill the Bridge District got \$3.2 million to
14 retrofit and repair the Sausalito ferry landing. This was a project that was going to
15 employ 100 people and be done by 2010, and that somehow has been left out of this
16 legacy.
17

18
19 This has been turned into a major scheme to make Sausalito, San Francisco and
20 Larkspur the same for logistic purposes of handling ferryboats. It looks like San
21 Francisco and Larkspur will get the benefit of a smaller profile and we'll get the larger
22 one. It makes no sense to have these three facilities be in common.
23

24
25 The next thing that's been shown, and hasn't been addressed, is this city has a
26 problem with bicycles. The whole logistics problem of loading people on the ferryboat is
27 a bike problem that has grown far more than 4% a year. Give me a break. If you asked
28 the Blazing Saddles folks, they've had a lot more than 4% growth per year since 2006.
29 And the throttle, the big bottleneck, is right here in Sausalito. We've all felt it; we've all
30 seen it. The Spaulding class boat, or ferry, is the one that handles the most bicycles; so
31 don't show us the other two ferryboats. The Spaulding class that we have now is the
32 one that primarily ought to be accommodated.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 The other thing is moving the ramp from 4 feet to 16 feet, and in fact this is much
2 more than 16 feet. The mass of this thing is huge. I believe we could do something in
3 much less width than what is being proposed.
4

5
6
7 The other thing is if you follow the government's money trail, you won't believe
8 how convoluted these things get. If you want to know why the balustrades are there and
9 why the pier is there, it's money. All of the money that comes down from the fed gets
10 tied to these little things, like if you improve view shed, and if you look at the justification
11 of the balustrades, it is that it improves the view shed for people accessing the pier.
12 Read what's there. There's money tied to it, and that's why the balustrades are there,
13 because certain monies come from different pockets, and that's why they're there.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 I suggest we put the landside development and this terminal project in a much
22 smaller scale, coordinate it so that it handles the bike problem that we currently have,
23 and get this thing back to \$3.2 million, get it done in a couple of years, and leave us out
24 of the Larkspur and San Francisco model.
25
26
27
28

29
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Folks, I just got a message from this police officer that
31 there are two cars blocking a police car. It is a red Honda Element, and a gray Toyota
32 Highlander. This is around the corner on B Street. They're asking if you folks can move
33 the cars, so they don't have to move them. Someone here is trying to leave, and they
34 can't get out because these two cars are blocking them. So it's a red Honda Element
35 and a gray Toyota Highlander. If you own one of those cars, if you could help one of
36 your colleagues depart, they would appreciate it.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Okay, Russ Irwin. Oh, did I skip one? Marv. Sorry about that. Then Russ Irwin,
45 and then David Keller.
46
47
48
49
50

1 MARV HOVATTER: If this were during the day, there would probably be two
2
3 bicycles blocking those cars out there. I'm Marv Hovatter; I've lived here over 20 years.
4

5 I'm not going to say anything new here. I rode the ferry for many years and it
6
7 wasn't a problem. The issue I see here is Blazing Saddles. The only people making
8
9 money are Blazing Saddles and a few downtown residents. I think when I was with the
10
11 Chamber of Commerce they said most people that came here buy an ice cream cone
12
13 and a tee shirt. If you've got a bicycle in hand, you're even buying less. I think I would
14
15 agree with what Sally Stanford's associate said earlier: We have the tail wagging the
16
17 dog here.
18

19 You all want to carry more people obviously to make more money. If you can't
20
21 get these people on the boat, then the backlog will happen and the feedback will go
22
23 back to Blazing Saddles and to all the tourist industries, and people will stop coming
24
25 here with their bicycles, as many, and this will improve the quality of life of the local
26
27 residents here.
28

29
30 Governor Brown passed a law that we have to maintain a 3-foot distance
31
32 between the car and the bicycle, but right now it's getting bad, and it's getting worse and
33
34 worse to where we can't even drive downtown anymore. During the weekends I will not
35
36 even go downtown. It's too much of a liability for the local residents to get close to those
37
38 bicycles. I think we need to get behind Council Member Pfeifer and decide how many
39
40 bicycles we want to let in here. Now, I don't know how you control that, but there has to
41
42 be a decision of how many bikes can we actually allow and have here. Then after we
43
44 figure that out, you all will have something to work with.
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 We've got global warming going on; the oceans are coming up. Why on earth are
2 you planning for the water to go down? Let's rethink this. I don't believe you all have our
3 best interest in mind. Thank you.
4

5
6
7 CHAIR COX: Russ Irwin, then David Keller, and then Leslie Hail.
8

9
10 RUSS IRWIN: The goal of this whole ferry expansion is obviously to increase the
11 amount of throughput. There are a lot of people who have talked about all the other
12 problems that is going to cause, but there is \$2 million in bait that has been thrown out
13 there in front of us to try to get us to buy on this thing, and \$2 million is not going to turn
14 Bridgeway into a four lane boulevard all the way to 101, and \$2 million is not going to
15 widen South Street, and \$2 million is not going to widen the road all the way down from
16 the bridge, for Alexander and all into town, so that we can have even more bikes come
17 in here. Two million bucks won't do it. Ten million dollars won't do it, because we have a
18 geographically constrained city. We've got the hill; we've got the water. Everything else
19 has got to fit in between it, so no amount of money is going to make this system work
20 for anybody.
21

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 But let's suppose that this is all really well intended and we're going to be a
33 gateway for the rest of Marin to reduce the traffic on the Golden Gate Bridge. Well, \$2
34 million won't buy you a bigger parking lot in Sausalito. Two million dollars won't even
35 probably keep the onramp from being under water during the next big high tide, like the
36 frontage road is today. And the State of California, by the way, has no plan for that,
37 because I've been exchanging emails with the transportation planners there.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45 This is a transportation group. This is not a transportation solution. These guys
46 freely admit their planning stops at the water's edge. Nothing goes beyond there. The
47 transportation problem does not stop at the water's edge. It goes all the way to the
48
49
50

1 traffic jam on 101 north. Where are these cars going to go? Where would the people
2 go? Where would the bikes go? That's what a transportation plan addresses. This is not
3 a transportation plan. This is like inviting 50 people for dinner, and then stopping once
4 you've got 50 water glasses. Okay, we're done. It's not going to work. So even if it's well
5 intended, even if it is well engineered, even if they make it the right color, it's not a
6 transportation solution.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 And while we're talking about transportation, 26 years ago the Embarcadero
14 Freeway was considered a vital link in and out of San Francisco. I drove that for ten
15 year, I sat stuck in traffic; it was critical. Twenty-six years ago it all fell down. Now
16 there's not a politician or a transportation planner that would ever propose putting the
17 Embarcadero Freeway back up. Somehow San Francisco survived 26 years of growth
18 and a huge amount of expansion with no Embarcadero Freeway. It's amazing.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 So I'm pretty comfortable that despite the growth projections, we'll get by fixing
26 the pier that we have now. Thank you.
27
28

29 CHAIR COX: David Keller, then Leslie Hail, and then Shah Ibrahim.
30

31 DAVID KELLER: I want to thank the Commission and the Board for meeting and
32 the presentation, and I'm going to ask some questions.
33
34
35

36 As I understand it, we are the lessor and they're the lessee, by the 1995 lease.
37 I'd like that confirmed. I'd like our attorney to explain what the powers are as the lessor.
38
39

40 Basically, I agree with a lot of the prior speakers. This is an act in haste, repent at
41 leisure, as my father, an engineer, used to say, and this sounds like great, bring your
42 proposal and let's mull it over for about a year, because we got all those retired
43 engineers that want to stand up and help us look at this. I think they could probably
44 come up with a better deal for the citizens and residents. I'm a resident of Sausalito.
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 Earlier the presenter talked about how they're going to make a provision for other
2
3 ferry providers. What does that mean, and how many? What are the limits put on this?
4
5 How many ferries do they want to land on that dock every day? Are we going to have
6
7 them stacked up like SFO airplanes? What are the limits? Are there limits being set on
8
9 this proposal?

10
11 I would like to know how much money the District made with their ferry business
12
13 in the last ten years? And if they get this, and their increased capacity, and increased
14
15 speed and turnaround time, what is there projected revenue over the next ten years?
16

17 As I understood Questions 33 and 26, we get \$600 a year; they get \$30,000 a
18
19 year for subleasing to other ferry users, like Blue & Gold. How about reversing that
20
21 around? We're the lessor, they're the lessee. It sounds like they're getting a good deal
22
23 on our lease.
24

25
26 Maximum number of landings, I'm interested in. What are the extremes of the
27
28 start and finish times? What's the earliest they're allowed to arrive? What's the latest
29
30 they're allowed to arrive?

31
32 I think I'll stop there. Thank you for your time.

33
34 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Leslie Hail, then Shah Ibrahim, and then Wendy
35
36 Richards.
37

38
39 LESLIE HAIL: I'm Leslie Hail and my family has been here since 1959. I'm a
40
41 property owner and a resident.

42
43 I think it's disingenuous of the Bridge District to suggest that their presentation
44
45 has left us informed. They seemed to imply at various times that they could do little
46
47 things, but not other things. Other things had been decided.
48
49
50

1 I think it's a money issue. It's all about making money for the Bridge District. We
2
3 don't have to accept this at all. We are not Coney Island or New York or Tokyo; we are
4
5 a small 7,000 some-odd people town with a very tiny downtown.
6

7 I still have not heard any discussion really about the environmental impact on the
8
9 water, the view, the noise that this will bring, the accidents that might happen, fuel, what
10
11 the concrete will do to the water on this massive scale, a larger landing, litter in town,
12
13 more people. It's like cramming 50 people onto a tiny little deck and thinking that the
14
15 deck is going to support them. Sausalito cannot support the thousands of people that
16
17 you plan to bring in for your dollar. That has to be discussed. Thank you.
18

19 CHAIR COX: All right. Shah Ibrahim, Wendy Richards, Sam Chase.
20

21 SHAH IBRAHIM: Hello, Commission. Thank you.
22

23 I'm a resident of Sausalito, and one of the things I really love about the City is its
24
25 size and the community. I'm a frequent user and commuter on the ferry and I have
26
27 some comments on some of the assumptions.
28

29
30 Before I go there, one of the things I enjoy every day when I go down the
31
32 gangplank is actually looking left and right. I get to see the City, I get to see the water, I
33
34 get to see the pelicans, and with something so high, 5-6 feet, I think that whole
35
36 experience will be dampened; you're walking down a tunnel basically. Furthermore, I
37
38 think children and shorter people will not be able to enjoy the view.
39

40 I believe the current landing is okay. It needs to be maintained and fixed, but I
41
42 feel the size is adequate.
43

44 The area that really needs to be developed is the landside area. It needs to be
45
46 better organized for the tourists and commuters, but I believe the gangway and the size
47
48 it is actually okay. I believe actually the assumption of 700 people for ten minutes
49
50

1 somehow does not seem correct. I'm an engineer by training. Seven hundred people in
2
3 ten minutes are 70 per minute. This row was 70 per minute. That means approximately
4
5 one person has to sit per second. Really? That means one guy with a bike has to sit per
6
7 second. Really? I don't think that's possible, so I think 700 people in ten minutes, 70 in
8
9 one minute, one person per second, amazing.

10
11 In fact, I don't think one whole section here can sit 70 people in one minute. You
12
13 have to seek your seat, you have to push people, and you have to lock our bike or put
14
15 your bike in. Not possible; it's a fallacy.

16
17 Finally, I don't think the constraint is the loading and unloading; it's the design of
18
19 the boats. The boats themselves are a maze, and that's fine, that's the way it is. You
20
21 don't need it to be so fast.

22
23 I think the idea also is that better scheduling can help. Better intelligence of
24
25 existing infrastructure instead of trying to build bigger infrastructure.

26
27
28 Finally, in closing I think the design of the project, as one of the earlier speakers
29
30 said, should be designed for average use, not peak load use. In fact, I counted about
31
32 198 people boarding the ferry this morning, commuters. There was no problem.

33
34 Remember, slow food; eat better. Slow growth; better quality of life. We need
35
36 slower tourist traffic, tourism calming, to make a better quality of life and experience for
37
38 both citizens and tourists. Thank you.

39
40 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Wendy Richards, Sam Chase, Ken Horiszny.

41
42 WENDY RICHARDS: Thank you. Wendy Richards.

43
44 I think we deserve the data. A couple of the last speakers have spoken about
45
46 other boats. I'd like to know, what is the actual data on the Golden Gate Bridge District
47
48 today? What is the historical data? How many commuters? We know that there are two
49
50

1 different kinds of tickets: commuter ticket and tourist tickets. Show us the numbers.

2
3 After 2008, the town was empty; there were no riders. How many bikes? What's a 4%
4
5 growth? What are we talking about?
6

7 We have two issues here. One is the commute traffic and the standard load. The
8
9 second issue is a peak load issue. It's been said before; I think we need to see the
10
11 numbers and see the data.
12

13 We have other industrial piers that are available if there were other ways to solve
14
15 the bike issue. There's Fort Baker, and there's the Bay Model. Those are existing piers.
16
17 Now, they have other problems and other issues, but there are ways to solve it. We
18
19 could go to the PUC and make a request of the PUC to allow the Bridge District to solve
20
21 this problem in another way. We can't just say oh the PUC requires us; let's go there.
22
23 They're people. They're elected, or our elected officials appoint them. They work for us.
24
25 The last time I looked, I was working late tonight as a taxpayer. These are people that
26
27 work for us. We are here. You are volunteering your time.
28

29
30 We need a solution that is a holistic solution that looks at the whole picture, that
31
32 finds out what is this so called Muir Woods traffic question? Let's find out. Let's go back
33
34 to the Park District and see. If we have to go to the BCDC and propose an alternative
35
36 way to meet BCDC's request for public access, let's come up with some alternatives.
37
38 That's why we're here. This is a democracy last time I looked, and I'd like to have the
39
40 whole picture for all the people, and all the objectives, not just have this run by some
41
42 sort of vision of efficiency. Thank you.
43

44 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Sam Chase, Ken Horiszny, Susan Shea.

45
46 SAM CHASE: Sam Chase. I've been a resident of Sausalito since 1976, and I
47
48 did ride the ferry about 15 years during the 70s and 80s.
49
50

1 I have a hard time understanding the justification for this project; I consider it
2 quite scant. There's been some arm waving about how poor the existing landing is with
3 regard to its condition. I'm sure there is some room for a refurbishment of that landing.
4
5 But the biggest problem I've got is the fundamental justification that's trying to be
6 charaded here with these slides about some fundamental issues.
7
8

9
10
11 First of all, let's talk about capacity. I'm using the Golden Gate Bridge District's
12 own numbers here. Seven hundred and forty people on these boats, per boat. There
13 are nine round trips during the weekdays; there are six round trips on the weekend.
14 They're running at 16% of capacity during the weekday, and 26% of capacity on the
15 weekends, okay? That's 26% on the weekends, and 16% on the weekdays. Now, if the
16 airlines had this problem, the last thing they would do is double the width of the jet way.
17 They would run fewer round trips. More time between boats, more time to load. We've
18 got all kinds of excess capacity, and what's the solution? A wider ramp. Warren Buffett
19 would not go for that solution.
20
21

22
23 Now let's talk about ADA compliance. I did a little research on this ADA charade
24 that we hear about. Now, it's cursory evaluation from some tidal data off the web. It
25 could probably use more of a professional review, but if you do a cursory evaluation,
26 there are 16 days in 2015 where the tide goes below -1.1 feet, which I understand is the
27 magic number for 12:1. Out of those 16 days, only ten of those days does this tide occur
28 during operational hours. Ten. And that's out of 365. And then if you go a little bit
29 further, on three of those ten days the slope of the landing actually went in the uphill
30 direction, being steeper.
31
32

33
34 I'm out of time, but I would urge you to read my commentary. I'm very
35 disappointed in the dissemination of information, in general. A lot more people have got
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 to be heard on this, and there's a lot more written information that hasn't obviously fallen
2
3 into the hands or been read by everybody. Thank you.
4

5 CHAIR COX: Thank you. We have read your letter, and if you have more, we
6
7 would welcome it. Ken Horiszny, then Susan Shea, and then Sonya Hanson. All right,
8
9 so Susan, I think you're it. All right, and after Susan is Sonya, then Tammy Blanchard.
10

11 SUSAN SHEA: Good evening, my name is Susan Shea and I live on Spring
12
13 Street.
14

15 I'd like to backup about a hundred miles and talk less about the particulars of this
16
17 plan and more about the process of small government. What I've learned through this
18
19 process, and through the Housing Element process, is that Sausalito has lost the idea
20
21 that we live in a democracy. For some reason, City Council and City Hall and City staff
22
23 has decided that there are certain people that should have information, certain people
24
25 that shouldn't have information, and information should be funneled different ways for
26
27 different people. And we have to actually get lawyers in order for us to get information
28
29 that should be offered to us willingly.
30

31 I won't go into the details about how some of us in Sausalito have to get
32
33 information in order to get this process to where it is today, but I would just say that we
34
35 should say no to this project. Not no to looking at the ferry landing and bicycles, etc., but
36
37 we have been so misinformed and there has been such colluding among different
38
39 agencies to keep the average person in this town from finding out what's going on
40
41 behind the scenes on this project, that I say that rotten cheese and this is Denmark.
42
43

44 CHAIR COX: Okay. Sonya Hanson, then Tammy Blanchard, and then Pat Zuch,
45
46 and that's all the cards I have.
47

48 SONYA HANSON: Sonya Hanson, Sausalito resident.
49
50

1 I think most of the things I ever thought about saying about this project have
2 already been said, so I'm going to leave it at one thing, which my neighbor did for me. If
3 it doesn't fit, don't built it. Thank you.
4

5
6
7 CHAIR COX: Tammy Blanchard, and then Pat Zuch.
8

9 TAMMY BLANCHARD: Hi, I'm Tammy Blanchard; I'm a resident of Sausalito.
10 I'm really disappointed in the fact that we haven't received this information until
11 walking in the door. It's pretty disturbing to get it at such late notice that we don't have
12 time to read it. I still haven't had time to read it, because I wanted to listen to
13 everybody's comments.
14
15
16
17
18

19 I would like to know if the District has done a cost analysis of whether or not it
20 would be more cost effective to fix the current landing, maybe expand it in a much less
21 dramatic way, less expensive, and then add ferry service in order to accommodate the
22 people. If that report exists, I'd like to see it.
23
24
25
26
27

28 I don't see how widening the ramp is going to change the way that we live here in
29 Sausalito. It's going to take the traffic jam and move it down, maybe off the sidewalk a
30 little bit, but it will be in the place that's supposed to be public access to the bay.
31
32

33 I haven't had a chance to see all of the findings that didn't come forth, but
34 Number 4 regarding the view and privacy, that dramatically affects the Yacht Club, and
35 although it is a City building, private people from this community use it. There are 520
36 members with their significant others, probably 1,000 people, and many of the people in
37 this room are members and guest members of the club, and it's important. The club
38 does a lot of stuff for this community, we're very active here, and we would like to be
39 considered. They're moving the dock probably about 25 feet off, and that's where all the
40 crowded people will be standing, basically looking into the deck area of the Yacht Club.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 Everything else that I would have thought to say, I agree with Sonya, it's been
2 said. We're relying on you guys to protect this town and to use your best judgment to
3 preserve it. We can't trust them, and I think that we're losing confidence. They've
4 listened to us and come back with just chopping a piece off and moving a foot forward.
5 They're not hearing us. They're using our \$14 million in federal funding to make this
6 project that we don't want at this size on our shores, blocking our views, and changing
7 our waterfront. We just don't want it. It's our money and we want to spend it differently.
8

9 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Pat Zuch, and then Katherine Whipple.
10

11 PAT ZUCH: I thought I'd be last. Last name Z; I should go last.
12

13 Anyway, when this review process was announced I had hopes that it would
14 evolve to a substantive review of all the elements of the project, and unfortunately that
15 somehow doesn't seem to be the way things are working out.
16

17 At your last meeting you were specifically steered by staff to talk about the Bridge
18 District's design proposals. Configuration, functionality, size, scale, materials,
19 integration with landside elements, none of those were on the table at that last hearing.
20

21 Many people said many of the same things that were said tonight, and at the end
22 of your last hearing you did in fact comply with staff's direction and talk about the color
23 of the railings and the shape of the gate. I hope that you will not limit your comments
24 and deliberations to the design review findings.
25

26 Let's be real. What you are in this project is a stalking horse, an advance scout,
27 for the City Council. Your "design review findings" won't have any legal weight; they will
28 not be binding. They will simply be forwarded on to the City Council so the City Council
29 can determine whether or not to grant consent to this project, which consent shouldn't
30 be unreasonably withheld. Is it unreasonable to require that a project of this size and
31

1 magnitude have community support? I don't think that's unreasonable. Is it
2
3 unreasonable that something like this shouldn't impact a structure like the Sausalito
4
5 Yacht Club, which it will? I don't think that's unreasonable.
6

7 If you are going to focus on the specific design review findings, I think the most
8
9 unsupportable of them would be Numbers 3, 4, 9, 10 and 13.
10

11 This configuration simply pushes ferry users farther out in the bay, and it will in
12
13 fact create another major choke point, which the District seems so concerned with, at
14
15 the security gate when exiting passengers try to squeeze into an 8-foot space to get by
16
17 people who are waiting to load. It would seem far more effective to widen the current
18
19 platform and keep a side entry to it, rather than extend it, and to reduce the width of the
20
21 gangway to, say, 10 feet, so that you have a column, and a column, and not a
22
23 confrontation. And the narrower gangway would eliminate the offensive out of scale and
24
25 unhistoric truss.
26

27 Finally, separating the landside and the waterside improvements has cleverly
28
29 advanced this project, and the landside improvements will be needed to support this.
30
31 Even Bridge District personnel express surprise that we've let this get by like that, and I
32
33 hope you don't. Thanks.
34

35
36 CHAIR COX: And Katherine Whipple.
37

38 KATHERINE WHIPPLE: Hello, good evening. I came to this event with nothing
39
40 prepared and with an open mind. I saw this on the ferryboat this morning (holds up
41
42 flyer). I'm a Sausalito resident. I'm a regular commuter. I've been the owner of a
43
44 property here since 1990; it means a lot to me.
45

46 I came with an open mind, and now after hearing everyone I know more and I'm
47
48 able to ask one question, and maybe David Keller can tell us. How do we just say no?
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, that's all the public comment I have, so I'm going to close
2
3 the public comment period. We're going to take a five-minute break for matters of
4
5 personal convenience, and then we will resume.
6

7 (INTERMISSION)
8

9 CHAIR COX: Okay, we are live and we are back on. Okay, technical difficulties.
10
11 We're good? Okay, we're good.
12

13 I'm going to ask us to use the same process we did at the study session. I'm
14
15 going to ask the HLB and then the Planning Commissioners to each make up to three
16
17 minutes of comments regarding these various findings, and that will give all of us an
18
19 opportunity to speak, and then we'll go back and catch up any further comments folks
20
21 may have.
22

23 So John, you want to start with the HLB?
24

25 CHAIR McCOY: Sure. We have any takers? I'll go first.
26

27 CHAIR COX: And I'll remind us that obviously we have all these findings, but
28
29 you know the ones that staff asked for feedback.
30

31 CHAIR McCOY: Right. I'll just open it up. We've heard from a lot of people
32
33 tonight, but we haven't heard a lot. We've heard the same thing over and over; so it's
34
35 pretty clear the sentiment in the room.
36

37 As far as addressing these findings, basically there's a lot to take in and digest
38
39 between the presentation and the speakers, and I don't think three minutes would... I
40
41 could probably get through one of these findings, so I'm going to opt not to speak to
42
43 them directly tonight and spend more time reviewing them.
44

45 We heard a lot of things about a lot of different traffic problems, and bicycle
46
47 problems, and tourism problems, and none of those things is before us tonight with this
48
49
50

1 application. Specifically from my point of view as a member of the Historic Landmarks
2 Board, what I'm tasked with doing is assessing the site and the project as it relates to
3 the Historic District of Sausalito. I understand that all those other concerns significantly
4 impact our Historic District. I've lived here for over 15 years and I get it, but when I look
5 at this, I'm assessing the site.
6
7
8
9
10

11 But even having said that, from the very beginning my biggest issue with this
12 project has been that it's not a holistic approach with the landside development, and
13 unfortunately I don't have a remedy for that at the moment, but in my opinion that's one
14 of, if not the biggest, issue with the project.
15
16
17
18

19 Looking back, when we look at the ferry landing that's there now, it is not a
20 historic structure, but the ferry service from San Francisco and Sausalito is a strong
21 historic element to our city, and it has been since 1875, so continued ferry service is
22 important to the City and it's important to the character of the City.
23
24
25
26
27

28 Looking at the design before us, it's one design that's adequate, I guess. I do
29 appreciate the fact that the Ferry District did go back and make the revisions that they
30 did. I did have concerns, and I mentioned them last time, about there are a lot of people
31 who asked for those rails to be lowered, and they did listen. I was in favor of the arch
32 trusses, because they were taller and you could see through them better, and we have
33 lowered them and I think created the tunnel and cut off our nose to spite our face.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 I think the ferry landing and its increase in size is not inappropriate for the historic
41 area. If you look back through the historic materials, over the years we've had ferry
42 terminals five or six times as large as this, and that added to the waterfront character of
43 the town.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1 However, obviously there's a lot that's been said here tonight that I really need to
2
3 go back and review the comments and see exactly where the issues are. I know the
4
5 broad strokes, we get that, I get that, but I would like to ask of staff, even if we don't
6
7 have the answers, if you could provide us a copy of the comments and the questions
8
9 that were asked by the public in a timely manner, within a week at least, so that we
10
11 could review those. I would feel more comfortable speaking to them when I've had a
12
13 chance to actually review them. Sitting up here, there's a lot coming at you all in one
14
15 evening, and I'm just going to leave it at that for now.
16

17 CHAIR COX: Thanks, John. Mary, I'm going to ask us to run the three minutes
18
19 just for the first round to make sure we all get an opportunity to speak. Okay, who's
20
21 next?
22

23 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I'll jump in. I don't think I'll need the whole three
24
25 minutes. Again, I think there was a consensus of what was said tonight. I will try to stick
26
27 to the findings in light of the request that was made by staff and how I've been looking
28
29 at everything.
30

31 I think in particular, to Item 1, there was some history presented tonight that we
32
33 hadn't seen before, which I think was helpful. We do know there's a strong history of the
34
35 use of the ferry, but we don't have a connection between the history of the use and this
36
37 project that's being presented, so we have the two side-by-side, but not really an
38
39 explanation as to how the project connects to that historical use, and that's what I'm
40
41 really struggling with. Because yeah, I agree, the history of this town is associated with
42
43 the ferry, there's a lot to that, but it ends there and then says and now we're looking at
44
45 this project.
46
47
48
49
50

1 I know the last time we were here you were looking for direction from us in terms
2
3 of what does that mean, how do we orient or adjust this project to it? I don't know if we
4
5 can really do that within our charge, but I think it's a dialogue that clearly the town wants
6
7 to have more. So I don't know if I have an answer for it, but I think that's really what I'm
8
9 struggling with, which is in Item 1, how is it compatible? I haven't seen it.
10

11 One idea I thought would be maybe to break down the proposed project in each
12
13 item and try to show how that fits in line with the history of the ferry use, or you guys
14
15 were talking about the nautical colors, things like that. But instead of presenting the
16
17 collective, we were looking at this massive project and trying to make these conclusions
18
19 as to how it aligns with historical use of the town, and the District maybe would take
20
21 each part by part, if that makes sense, but that would maybe make it a little easier. John
22
23 was saying there's much information coming at us. That may make it a little more
24
25 palpable to understand. So for Item 1, that would be my response for tonight.
26
27

28 For Item 8, it's tough, because we're hearing so much about the impact of this
29
30 new project and how it will affect the District, and our charge is to really consider the
31
32 District as whole, and I do think we're missing something on that. There's data that I
33
34 would like to know about what will happen in the District with these proposed plans in
35
36 terms of this new amount of people coming in, and that I think for the dialogue would be
37
38 really helpful. And I know, again, that's all been said, but from my end up here as a
39
40 Board member, that would really help me to start making that connection, which I think
41
42 we're still missing.
43

44 CHAIR COX: Thank you.

46 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I'd like to start by saying also that I appreciated a
47
48 lot of the comments from members of the public today. They provide a lot of food for
49
50

1 thought, and I'll probably have to think over a lot of things that were said before deciding
2
3 upon responding to each of these individual findings. I think it's a little premature, having
4
5 just seen these, to respond to them individually.
6

7 A couple of specific comments come to mind, one that was made by a member
8
9 of the Planning Commission. Could we see a design without the belvederes? That's one
10
11 concern.
12

13 Another is could we have an attempt to provide an integrated plan with the
14
15 landside as well as the ferry side portion of the proposal? That's an important
16
17 consideration here. And even from a standpoint of the Historic Landmarks Board, how
18
19 would that affect the historic landside of the City?
20

21 I think the questions about the increased volume of bicycle tourist traffic, which
22
23 were raised by members of the public, are important considerations here. I don't know if
24
25 it's directly related to our charge, but it could relate to Item 8 of Table 1.
26

27 I don't think that I have much else to add at this point, so I'll just stop here.
28

29
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you.

31
32 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you all for the presentation.
33

34 Looking at the charter and the charge that we're given as members of the
35
36 Historic Landmarks Board, looking at Items 1 and 2, I think instead of giving specific
37
38 feedback about the trusses, the gate, the elements that you brought before us, I think
39
40 that it's important to keep in mind the balance between the operational efficiencies and
41
42 the aesthetic of the historic downtown. The design that has been presented, in my
43
44 opinion the mass and the scale and the design elements, that has not taken into
45
46 account the historic aesthetic of the downtown and recognizing that it was a railroad
47
48 terminus and that there was a lot of traffic at the time. That was important history to see
49
50

1 and take a look at if you look at the progression and how we have grown as a town and
2
3 decided how we want to keep our nod to the historic elements, but still create a town
4
5 that functions for the residents. The railroad terminus is not there anymore, we have
6
7 Vina del Mar Park, we have Gabrielson Park, and it shows that we are able to adapt
8
9 and maintain a transit operation and still have a town that functions for our residents.
10

11 And I do think that it's very important that we maintain a safe ferry passage; it's
12
13 very critical. I commuted for two years on it, my husband takes it now, and he rides the
14
15 bike. I think it's critical to the people who live here and go to work in the City, as well as
16
17 tourism contributes the joie de vivre of the community, and we want to keep that, but at
18
19 this point I think that the mass and the design is not in keeping with Items 1 or 8.
20

21 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Who would like to lead off for the Planning
22
23 Commission?
24

25 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I will start by saying that I am going to agree with
26
27 John McCoy, and that is that I can make some high-level findings tonight, and I'll go
28
29 through those, but I do want more time to review this.
30

31 I'll start with Finding 1 on Table 1, and this is asking about the new construction
32
33 being compatible with the architectural and historical features. This is not a historic
34
35 structure. This was built in 1970. We've seen pictures of the historic structure, which as
36
37 one of the HLB member mentioned, it was huge because of the capacity that was
38
39 needed to run those ferries. We don't want to see something of that size again, so if we
40
41 were asking for historic credibility, it certainly wouldn't be to that size.
42
43

44 As I mentioned in the last meeting, what I want to see here is the best functioning
45
46 facility that Sausalito can have. I think it's great that we don't have people commuting in
47
48 cars constantly, that people can take their bikes; that's what we need to be working
49
50

1 towards. So we need a great functioning facility, but I do want it with the least impact to
2 views, and certainly I've heard from the community that there is a lot of concern about
3 the size.
4

5
6
7 In terms of this first finding about the construction, I have no problem with
8 fundamentally this design. It looks more modern, but this is often done in a historic
9 setting. When you do something different, you don't replicate it, you do something in a
10 different style to distinguish it. The design of this is more industrial or public
11 infrastructure, so I can make that finding quite easily.
12
13
14
15
16

17 The next thing is compatible with the purposes of the Overlay District. Again, I
18 think that's kind of an overlapping situation in that our Historic District, we have
19 buildings down there that are over 150 years old, some of them, so we have very old
20 buildings down there. These, again, are not historic, old features, so I can also say that
21 this design, again, fundamentally I can go with Finding 8 on Table 1.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 These, by the way, that we're calling out, the staff had asked for both the HLB
29 and the Planning Commission to comment on these, because we both have kind of
30 different perspectives; we're coming from slightly different places.
31
32
33

34 When I look at Table 3, Finding 1, this one is talking about the General Plan.
35 When we look at our General Plan, this is related to Historic Design Guidelines and that
36 is a document that the City did.
37
38
39

40 Anyway, I can come back. I'll go for round two.

41
42 CHAIR COX: Okay. Who wants to go next?

43
44 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I think I commented pretty
45 extensively last week on the fact that I definitely see the need for this project. The
46 project and the ferry serve a lot of our residents. I use the ferry regularly, as does my
47
48
49
50

1 husband. It's a really important part of our town, and I'm surprised again tonight that
2
3 there aren't more ferry riders here.
4

5 But in any case, I think that the question is about scale and whether the extent
6
7 and the scope of the project are necessary or at all appropriate for what we need at this
8
9 point, and I think that really links in my mind to the findings.
10

11 There were several speakers tonight that said they didn't even think this was a
12
13 starting point for a project, and I disagree with that. I think the overall design is
14
15 something that can be worked with and that can be adjusted to something that I think
16
17 could fit the findings that we've been requested to make. But there do need to be some
18
19 modifications, and I was actually slightly disappointed that the District didn't get a little
20
21 more creative with the fantastic engineering team that you have to come back with
22
23 something more creative, more modern, that makes better use of more modern
24
25 materials or schemes to bring in something that's a little smaller and a little visually
26
27 lighter, and those are the two issues that really are my two main issues.
28

29 I'm not really concerned with the footprint. I think that the slope is necessary to
30
31 get the ADA requirements, but I think that that truss is too dense and high, and that
32
33 seems to me to be driven by some calculations on a level of service and a need for
34
35 loading and unloading that I'm not satisfied are necessary at this point.
36
37

38 In terms of specific findings, as has already been said by many members and
39
40 Commissioners, the ferry is just an integral part of the history of Sausalito, and retaining
41
42 it and keeping it vital here in the town is very important. I think I can definitely make
43
44 Finding 8 on the historic findings, and if the scale was reduced and the truss lightened, I
45
46 can make Finding 1.
47
48
49
50

1 I'm struggling more with the design review findings, and I'll just make one
2
3 comment, which is I think these design review findings are usually implemented in a
4
5 residential setting, and this is a commercial industrial project, so I think we need to have
6
7 some flexibility with them in this setting. I can comment again on the design review
8
9 findings after others have commented.
10

11 CHAIR COX: Thank you.
12

13 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you all, and I certainly echo the sentiments of
14
15 my fellow Commissioners and Board members.
16

17 As a daily ferry rider with bicycle I'm intimately familiar with the struggles and
18
19 nuances of the existing facilities, and while I can tell you definitely that some wider
20
21 ramps and some better logistical arrangements there would be very welcomed by me
22
23 and my fellow commuters, I guess the biggest concern with me as pertains to these
24
25 findings is scale, and I find that both applicable to the historic context as well as to the
26
27 design review findings in general.
28

29
30 At our last meeting I had questions of the Bridge District on—and I'm not using
31
32 this term correctly—the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force of our town, whether their
33
34 findings or studies had been implemented into this, and there was no definitive answer
35
36 whether those had been. I think in the absence of that, it's really premature to come to
37
38 some conclusions on what size of facility we need in this location. Obviously a little
39
40 larger would be better, but how large is absolutely necessary, given we factor in the
41
42 scale of our community and what our ultimate goals are from a tourism and community
43
44 standpoint? So from that perspective I need to research some of the comments tonight,
45
46 and some of the late arriving information, before I can really start to commit to some of
47
48 these findings.
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I will echo the comments of several of my fellow
2
3 commissioners, and I'm sad to say many of my comments from our study session
4
5 remain, because there wasn't a lot of real movement in the project between then and
6
7 now in terms of scale and design aesthetic, as we had hoped. At the last meeting it was
8
9 already an option to reduce it from 25 feet to 21 feet. The District has not presented any
10
11 plans or interest in further reducing that.
12

13 It's difficult to make some of the historic findings and some of the design review
14
15 findings because we don't have a holistic project to look at, so we don't have landside
16
17 improvements. Even in a design build project, which this doesn't qualify for design build
18
19 since its infrastructure, but eve a design build can have concept drawings and
20
21 performance criteria. Even something not even at the schematic design level would still
22
23 give us something to look at and to understand what the vision is for how the waterside
24
25 improvements would impact and be integrated into our existing landside. I think you
26
27 heard some really thoughtful comments this evening regarding concerns for if the
28
29 numbers that the District is projecting could ultimately be realized, the landside impacts
30
31 would be significant and overwhelm the facilities we now have in place. So I think it's
32
33 really important to consider what those impacts would be and how we would address
34
35 them before we can feasibly understand and evaluate the seaside designs.
36
37

38 And we have used these design review findings for public projects in the past.
39
40 We did it for Vina del Mar, we did it for the Bicycle Pedestrian Plan when we were using
41
42 grant money for the downtown loop, so we definitely have used these design review
43
44 findings for a public project. I think the reason they seem not to fit this project is
45
46 because we don't know what the landside improvements would be.
47
48
49
50

1 I'm also surprised at the CEQA finding. I'll just wrap it up and say I'm surprised at
2
3 the CEQA finding, that there was an NOD of no impact, and I wonder if that's because
4
5 the project was characterized as a rehab and repair rather than the truly tremendous
6
7 expansion that it appears to be.
8

9 All right, with that we'll go back to the HLB for any further comments.
10

11 CHAIR McCOY: Does anyone have anything they want to add to the
12
13 discussion? I think we'll take a little more time to review the materials we received
14
15 tonight. As a matter of process, Lilly, am I correct that it's the next meeting when we're
16
17 going to be asked to give a direction to the Town Council?
18

19 LILLY SCHINSING: Yes.
20

21 CHAIR McCOY: Again, I'll repeat my request to get the comments and questions
22
23 from the public, whether or not we have answers, in a timely manner so we can digest
24
25 them and take them in and reply to them if needed, or just include them in our
26
27 discussion. If we can get the answers to those questions from the Ferry District in a
28
29 timely manner for the same reasons, that would be very helpful.
30
31

32 I know these meetings go long, but if we can be given more than three minutes to
33
34 discuss our viewpoints and reasoning behind any decision that we may or not make, I
35
36 think that's a valid request at that third meeting. Thank you.
37

38 CHAIR COX: Any Planning Commissioners have further comments? Please.
39
40 Yes, absolutely. And I'm not confining you to three minutes. I'm asking for initial three so
41
42 everybody gets a chance, and then we'll circle back around.
43

44 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: This was somewhat related to our staff report. I
45
46 heard a couple of comments from the public about concerns about the applicant's
47
48 project and their neighbor, the Sausalito Yacht Club, and we were provided with some
49
50

1 photographs by staff. I don't know if it was just me, but I had some difficulty looking at
2
3 where the story poles and the lines were, because you were looking through glass
4
5 partitions on the lower deck and it was distorted and hard to see, at least for me. So is
6
7 there a way for us to go in and do a site visit there? I sort of feel it incumbent that I
8
9 should get in there and take a look, like I do on every other project, to really be able to
10
11 see the impact, if there is any. Do we have a plan for that?
12

13 LILLY SCHINSING: We can put all of the Board and the Commission members
14
15 in touch with some representatives from the Sausalito Yacht Club and you can make
16
17 individual site visits, and I will do that.
18

19 CHAIR COX: I had a couple of follow on questions.
20

21 I was curious to know, I listened with great interest to the comments from Inn
22
23 Above Tide. I was curious to know what outreach had been made regarding the
24
25 temporary facility? What community outreach where people within 300 feet are notified.
26
27

28 Also, how long the temporary facility will be in place. I think that was in our initial
29
30 staff report, but I've forgotten.
31

32 Let's see, a couple other questions.
33

34 I heard an interesting comment. I think John, or somebody, said the reason for
35
36 the belvederes being required is the length of the gangway, that if the gangway wasn't
37
38 so long, that it was that expansion in size that prompted BCDC to seek the belvederes,
39
40 so I would like some clarification on that.
41

42 I'm trying to quickly look at my notes. I think that's it. Who else has anything
43
44 else?
45

46 Oh, I would like to know the answer to the commuter tickets versus the tourist
47
48 tickets, just so that we have some perspective on that.
49
50

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: As this relates to Finding 4 under
2
3 the design review findings about public views and primary views from private property,
4
5 I'm still struggling with treating views from a private club as public views. I understand
6
7 that the Yacht Club is on public property, but I'm wondering if Finding 13 is really the
8
9 more appropriate finding to address the Yacht Club's issues, and that's the one about
10
11 neighboring properties. In any case, if staff has any further thoughts on treating views
12
13 from a place that is not publicly accessible as public views, I'd be interested in hearing
14
15 them, and I'll try to articulate my thoughts on that in more detail for the next meeting.
16

17 CHAIR COX: John.

18
19 CHAIR McCOY: I have just one more quick question/direction for the Ferry
20
21 District. It came up a few times tonight, and I think it came up last time as well. If for no
22
23 other reason than just to answer the question, it would be helpful if you could prepare a
24
25 true maintenance plan with scheduled maintenance and how you intend to have
26
27 whatever ferry landing gets approved last longer than the 20 years of the previous ferry
28
29 landing; that came up a number of times. So if we would get that, just a maintenance
30
31 schedule.
32

33
34 And also I heard requested a number of times an operating schedule. Would it be
35
36 the same? Would it be different as far as with the new? We heard questions of how
37
38 many boats, and how often, and when that would happen? If it was just a quick slide or
39
40 handout, again, if for no other reason than to just to give some clarification to the people
41
42 who are requesting that information, that would be helpful.
43

44 With that, I'm done.

45
46 CHAIR COX: Okay.
47
48
49
50

1 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I would also add a request for a construction plan
2
3 and how that's going to impact the immediate area, such as staging areas. I imagine a
4
5 lot of the construction staging will take place there, so it would be nice to know where
6
7 materials are going to be stored as well as equipment, etc., and how that's going to
8
9 impact daily.
10

11 CHAIR COX: I would defer to staff on that. A lot of times we on the Commission
12
13 require the construction staging plan as a condition of the building permit. We don't
14
15 always review or analyze that as part of design review, but let's interface with staff
16
17 about that. It may be, since where else are they going to be other than in the parking lot,
18
19 that this might be important to make that exception.
20

21 Okay, seeing no further comments, we will thank you all again for coming, and
22
23 for the long evening, and for hearing all of the members of the public, hearing out the
24
25 concerns, and we hope that we can continue a productive dialogue at our next meeting.
26
27

28 I also want to thank the members of the public for coming. These evenings are
29
30 long. We really appreciate the great turnout. Obviously this is a matter of great
31
32 community interest, so we appreciate all of you coming and letting us hear your views
33
34 and hear your concerns.
35

36 And we want to thank staff and members of the community for finding a location
37
38 where we could all convene and be heard in one room.
39

40 With that, we're just going to wrap up a few things. The next item on our agenda
41
42 is New Business, and there is none. Old Business, none. Any staff communications?
43

44 DANNY CASTRO: Just that you know your next meeting is April 15th, if that
45
46 hasn't been announced, and that's again, here at IDESST Hall at 6:30pm.
47
48
49
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Any communications from Planning Commissioners?
2
3 Any communications from Historic Landmarks Board members?
4

5 CHAIR McCOY: None.
6

7 CHAIR COX: All right, then did you want to adjourn your meeting, John? Then
8
9 we'll adjourn ours.
10

11 CHAIR McCOY: Sure. Could I get a motion to adjourn the meeting?
12

13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So moved.
14

15 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.
16

17 CHAIR McCOY: All in favor?
18

19 CHAIR COX: And may I have a motion?
20

21 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: So moved.
22

23 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.
24

25 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 4-0, and we are adjourned. Thanks,
26
27 everybody, very much.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 _____
39 Submitted by
40 Danny Castro
41 Community Development Director

38 _____
39 Approved by
40 Joan Cox
41 Chair

42 \\ASTROBOY\data\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2015\04-01-Approved.doc
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50