

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday, March 11, 2015**  
**Approved Verbatim Minutes<sup>1</sup>**

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**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 joint study session on the Ferry Landing Project by accepting a presentation from the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District, taking public comment, providing direction as appropriate. The Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board will hold a public hearing on the proposal on Wednesday April 1, 2015.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

**Planning Commission**

PC Chair Joan Cox

PC Vice-Chair Bill Werner

Commissioner Susan Cleveland-Knowles

Commissioner Vicki Nichols

Commissioner Morgan Pierce

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

**Historic Landmarks Board**

HLB Chair John McCoy

HLB Secretary Natascha Fraser

HLB Board Member Aldo Mercado

HLB Board Member Shasha Richardson

HLB Board Member Ben Brown

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

---

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

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, we're going to get started. Thank you for your patience.  
2  
3 We're going to go ahead and get started. I want to let you know we are bringing more  
4  
5 chairs over to the overflow room, so those of you who are standing, you may want to  
6  
7 check that out one more time. We've confirmed that our sound is working back there,  
8  
9 just as it is in here. Folks who are sitting back there, if you fill out a speaker card, I will  
10  
11 call your name and you can just walk next door to provide us with your comments.  
12

13 Okay, I'm going to call the meeting to order. I'll call the Planning Commission  
14  
15 meeting to order. This is our regular meeting for Wednesday, March 11, 2015. This is a  
16  
17 joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board.  
18  
19 Lilly, would you call the roll for the Planning Commission? Or Danny.  
20

21 DANNY CASTRO: I will. For the Planning Commission, Commissioner Pierce.  
22

23 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Present.  
24

25 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.  
26

27 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Here.  
28

29 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.  
30

31 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Here.  
32

33 DANNY CASTRO: Vice-Chair Werner.  
34

35 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Here.  
36

37 DANNY CASTRO: And Chair Cox.  
38

39 CHAIR COX: Here. And I'll turn it over to John McCoy to call the Historic  
40  
41 Landmarks Board meeting to order.  
42

43 CHAIR McCOY: Danny, can you call the order for the HLB?  
44

45 DANNY CASTRO: Yes. Board Member Brown.  
46

47 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Here.  
48  
49  
50

1 DANNY CASTRO: Richardson?

2  
3 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Here.

4  
5 DANNY CASTRO: Fraser.

6  
7 SECRETARY FRASER: Present.

8  
9 DANNY CASTRO: Mercado.

10  
11 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Here.

12  
13 DANNY CASTRO: And Chair McCoy.

14  
15 CHAIR McCOY: Here.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: Okay. First item on our agenda is Approval of the Agenda.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Move to approve.

20  
21 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Second.

22  
23 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 5-0.

24  
25 CHAIR McCOY: Our first order is the same, to approve the agenda as written.

26  
27  
28 Can we get a motion?

29  
30 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to approve.

31  
32 CHAIR McCOY: Second?

33  
34 SECRETARY FRASER: Second.

35  
36 CHAIR McCOY: All in favor? Motion approves 5-0.

37  
38 CHAIR COX: Next on our agenda are public comments on items not on this  
39  
40 agenda. This is the opportunity for any member of the public who is here to address us  
41  
42 regarding an item not on our agenda this evening. We only have one business item on  
43  
44 our agenda, and that's the Ferry Landing Project. So if there is anyone who would like  
45  
46 to speak to us about a different item, please step forward. You would have three  
47  
48 minutes. Okay, seeing none, we'll move on.  
49  
50

1 The next item on our agenda is discussion regarding public contacts. This is the  
2  
3 opportunity for members of the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board  
4  
5 to reveal any discussions with members of the public they may have had regarding  
6  
7 items on our agenda this evening.  
8

9 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you. I met with two members of the public to  
10  
11 hear their questions about the ferry landing. I offered no opinion, but I was happy to  
12  
13 listen to their questions.  
14

15 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I have none.  
16

17 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I've met with so many people, I don't know where to  
18  
19 start. I would just say that I have had conversations with a lot of the members of the  
20  
21 public.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: I, too, have had conversations with numerous members of the  
24  
25 public, not regarding the merits of the Ferry Landing Project, more about process and  
26  
27 about the upcoming hearing and when folks would have an opportunity to provide  
28  
29 feedback.  
30

31 FEMALE (audience): Excuse me one second. In the room we can't hear you.  
32  
33 Thank you.  
34

35 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox, if I may? Please, all the Commissioners and  
36  
37 Board Members, speak right into the mic. Kiss the mic and speak clearly, and you'll be  
38  
39 heard. Chair Cox, I can hear you well, but I want to make sure of everyone else.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: So we're going to continue on for a couple of minutes, but we'll get  
42  
43 the sound issues resolved before we go into substantive issues. They're working on  
44  
45 that.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Okay. Are there any declarations from members of the Historic Landmarks Board  
2  
3 regarding public contacts?  
4

5 SECRETARY FRASER: I've spoken with a couple members of the public.  
6

7 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have spoken with several members of the public  
8  
9 to solicit their opinions about the ferry landing proposal, and I've offered none of my  
10  
11 opinions.  
12

13 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Being relatively new to the HLB, I've not had  
14  
15 any comments with the public.  
16

17 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I have none.  
18

19 CHAIR McCOY: I've met with a handful of members of the public to discuss this.  
20  
21 Additionally, I've met with the Ferry District, with the reapplication meeting to the City, to  
22  
23 see their design ideas and their concepts, and that's it.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Okay, I'm going to turn it over first to Lilly for a little bit of  
26  
27 discussion about our process, and then we'll turn it over to the applicant for a  
28  
29 presentation.  
30

31 LILLY SCHINSING: Thank you, Chair Cox, and welcome Planning Commission  
32  
33 members and Historic Landmarks Board members, as well as the members of the  
34  
35 public that are here this evening and watching at home and will watch at home later  
36  
37 after this meeting is over.  
38

39  
40 This is the first in a series of four public meetings on the Ferry Landing Project,  
41  
42 and the purpose of the meeting this evening is to hold an informal study session to  
43  
44 receive a presentation from the Golden Gate Highway and Transportation District on  
45  
46 their proposed project, including several alternative designs, and to ask questions and  
47  
48 to provide feedback. There will be no decision made tonight.  
49  
50

1 During public comment period we will be recording all of your questions that you  
2 ask. We will take a short break after the public comment period, and when we return  
3 we'll do our best to answer all the questions that you asked. Those questions that we're  
4 not able to answer tonight, we will return at the next meeting and answer your questions  
5 for you.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 The District will then take the Commission, Board, and public's feedback into  
12 consideration, revise their plans, and submit a formal application for the April 1<sup>st</sup> joint  
13 meeting of the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board. That application  
14 will be heard at 6:30 on April 1<sup>st</sup>.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Very briefly, in terms of how we got to this meeting her tonight, the District has  
20 been planning to remove the existing ferry landing and replace it with a new ferry  
21 landing for many years now. During their presentation this evening, the District will  
22 describe how they arrived on their preferred design and the alternatives that the  
23 community, the Board, and the Commission may consider.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Per state law, the District is not required to comply with the City's zoning or  
31 building ordinances, and is exempt from Sausalito Planning Commission and Historic  
32 Landmarks Board permitting for a Design Review Permit. However, the site that the  
33 ferry landing sits on is located on a City of Sausalito property, and as the landlord, the  
34 City Council has directed a public review process. Again, this is the first meeting in a  
35 series of four meetings that we'll be having.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The first meeting tonight is informal, and it's a joint study session with these two  
43 bodies to receive a detailed description of the project from the District, to ask questions,  
44 and to provide feedback as well as comment. The public is invited and welcome at this  
45 meeting, and you're welcome to say your questions and provide your feedback. We will  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 be asking the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board to provide  
2  
3 specific direction to the District at the conclusion of tonight's meeting regarding the  
4  
5 project.  
6

7         The District will then submit a formal application after considering feedback from  
8  
9 these bodies and the community, and then the second and third meetings will be formal  
10  
11 joint meetings with the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board, and  
12  
13 they'll be on April 1<sup>st</sup> and April 15<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of those meetings will be to determine  
14  
15 whether or not the design review findings can be made for the District's proposed  
16  
17 project. Again, the public is invited and welcome at those meetings.  
18

19         The last in the series of four meetings will be a City Council hearing. It will be  
20  
21 held after the Historic Landmarks Board and Planning Commission hearings, and the  
22  
23 date has not been determined at this time, but please put your email address on the  
24  
25 signup sheet at the front, and you'll be informed of those meetings.  
26

27         At the meeting of the City Council the Council will consider the Historic  
28  
29 Landmarks Board and Planning Commission's determination and decide if consent will  
30  
31 be granted for the project in accordance with the terms of the lease that the District has  
32  
33 with the City. Again, the public is invited and welcome at that meeting as well.  
34  
35

36         If the Council grants consent the District is planning on requesting a hearing in  
37  
38 front of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, or BCDC, for May 21<sup>st</sup>.  
39

40         With that, I'm going to hand it off to the District. I think John Eberle with the  
41  
42 District will be beginning the presentation. We have a detailed presentation for you this  
43  
44 evening.  
45

46         CHAIR COX: And Lilly, if I might, I just want to describe for the public how we're  
47  
48 going to proceed this evening. We're going to hear roughly a 30-minute presentation  
49  
50

1 from the District. Then Planning Commission and HLB members will be able to ask  
2 questions. Then we'll turn it over to the public to hear your comments and to hear your  
3 questions. As Lilly said, we will write down your questions. We're not going to answer  
4 questions. As Lilly said, we will write down your questions. We're not going to answer  
5 them on a person-by-person basis, because we want to be sure everybody has an  
6 opportunity to speak. After all the questions and comments are in, the staff will tally up,  
7 make a list of the questions, and address some of those questions this evening, time  
8 permitting, and then provide other responses later.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 And before the presentation, I can barely read the nametags from here. I wonder  
16 if the District members could introduce themselves, so we know whom we're dealing  
17 with. Or John, if you can just tell us who everybody is.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 MALE (audience): I have a point of order.

23  
24 CHAIR COX: Sir, if you're going to speak, you have to come up to the mic,  
25 because we're recording this meeting and I don't think the mic is portable.  
26

27  
28 MALE (audience): You'll hear me. The point of order is you initially said that if  
29 somebody is speaking, they have to go in the other room?  
30

31  
32 CHAIR COX: No, I did not say that, so let me repeat. And again, anybody who  
33 wants to speak has to come up to the microphone. This is an open meeting and we  
34 want to make sure the people in the next room and at home can hear everything this is  
35 said.  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 Anybody who speaks will speak in here. Anybody who wants to speak should fill  
41 out a speaker card. I will call the next two or three speaker cards so that folks know  
42 when their turn is coming. If someone is sitting next door, they will hear in advance that  
43 they're about to be given an opportunity to speak and they can walk over here and  
44 speak. So those of you who are sitting next door, I invite you to fill out speaker cards if  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 you'd like to speak, and to have somebody bring those cars over here so that everybody  
2  
3 is included.  
4

5         Okay, with that, John, if you could introduce the members of your District and  
6  
7 your counsel.  
8

9         JOHN EBERLE: Certainly. First, good evening, and thank you for having us here  
10  
11 tonight.  
12

13         CHAIR COX: His mic is not very loud. Okay.  
14

15         JOHN EBERLE: I'll try to yell into this. My name is John Eberle; I'm the Deputy  
16  
17 District Engineer at the Golden Gate Bridge District. With me tonight, Ewa Bauer; she is  
18  
19 the Chief Engineer at the Golden Gate Bridge District. Sitting next to Ava is Bo Jensen;  
20  
21 he's the project manager with our consultant, Moffatt & Nichol. Next to Bo is Michael  
22  
23 Conneran, legal counsel with the District. Behind the table there is Robert Jansen; he's  
24  
25 with our architect on the project team. Carolina Wallin; she's a Senior Engineer at the  
26  
27 Golden Gate Bridge District. Jonathan Carey; he works with ESA, a sub-consultant to  
28  
29 Moffatt & Nichol during the environmental portion of the project. Gary Oates; he's also  
30  
31 with ESA. And Priya Clemens; she's with the District Public Information.  
32

33         CHAIR COX: Thank you. Although this is an informal study session, I'm  
34  
35 conducting it somewhat like a formal meeting to make sure that everybody has an  
36  
37 opportunity to be heard and everything proceeds orderly. So if you can maybe between  
38  
39 now and 7:30 let us know your (inaudible).  
40

41         JOHN EBERLE: Sure. I'll try and keep it to a half an hour.  
42  
43

44         CHAIR COX: Great.  
45

46         JOHN EBERLE: There's a lot of info to go over, and I'd like to give as much  
47  
48 information as possible, but I'll try to keep it within the 30 minutes.  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Sounds great.

2  
3 JOHN EBERLE: So first a little background on the Golden Gate Bridge District  
4  
5 and our ferry operations. We've been in the ferry passenger business since 1970,  
6  
7 operating between San Francisco and Sausalito, and San Francisco and Larkspur.  
8  
9 We're the largest operator on the bay. Last year we had over 2.3 million passengers we  
10  
11 served. We had approximately 790,000 passengers between San Francisco and  
12  
13 Sausalito.

14  
15 The purpose of the project is to replace our aged ferry landing structures to keep  
16  
17 them structurally sound. We've been operating since 1970; some of our facilities are  
18  
19 over 40 years old. You'll see some photos of the Sausalito facility and see the condition  
20  
21 that they're in. Also, while we're doing this we want to bring those new facilities into  
22  
23 compliance with current ADA requirements. Currently the facilities have steep slopes,  
24  
25 they're not in compliance with U.S. Access Board Guidelines, and this project will bring  
26  
27 them into compliance.

28  
29  
30 There are also some secondary benefits to the project. We want to improve our  
31  
32 operational efficiencies, improve operations, be able to maintain our service, also keep  
33  
34 our operating costs low. We plan to do that by standardizing our main deck loading.  
35  
36 Currently we load on the main deck in Sausalito, but we do not load on the main deck at  
37  
38 San Francisco and Larkspur; that creates operational inefficiencies when people load  
39  
40 on one deck and have to unload on another deck, particularly people with bicycles,  
41  
42 people with disabilities, people with strollers, etc. Right now currently we are retrofitting  
43  
44 our vessels for main deck loading, two doors on each of our vessels.

45  
46 Better management of passenger and bicycle loading and unloading. Again, if  
47  
48 you eliminate having to move from one level to another, it makes the passenger and  
49  
50

1 customer experience better. It also reduces our operating procedures, having to train  
2  
3 personnel for different loading and unloading situations.  
4

5 Upgrade emergency preparedness. The float will be designed so that not just  
6  
7 Golden Gate Ferry vessels, but other vessels, will be able to use the float in case of an  
8  
9 emergency.  
10

11 Here's a vicinity map. You can see the project site is located to the east of  
12  
13 Bridgeway, right down here, out on the water, and you can see the location of the  
14  
15 Commercial District, Public Institutional area, Open Space, and Public Parks.  
16

17 Here is a copy of the City of Sausalito's Historic District. You can see the location  
18  
19 of the facility with respect to the Historic District, and also the historic buildings listed on  
20  
21 this map.  
22

23 I want to do a little background on ferry service in Sausalito. As many of you  
24  
25 know, it's been operating ferries here since the late 1800s. The ferries originally carried  
26  
27 both passengers and vessels. We just carry passengers. This was a ferry service that  
28  
29 was in the same location as our ferry facility. Here you can see, in the 1970s you could  
30  
31 still see the old berths of that old berthing, and you can see where the Golden Gate  
32  
33 Ferry service constructed facilities just to the south of that existing timber piling  
34  
35 structure. The ferry service, I believe, stopped in about the 1940s, 1941, and we  
36  
37 commenced operations in 1970.  
38

39 So the District constructed a float structure, a gangway, and a temporary pier  
40  
41 adjacent to the old timber piling berth. It was functional, but not very durable. Also,  
42  
43 again, it was a pretty small scale, and you can see in the background the steep  
44  
45 gangway leading from the pier down to the float.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Here's a view from what would be the parking lot adjacent to the Yacht Club. You  
2  
3 can see the view is obstructed pretty severely by these timber pilings.  
4

5 That operated from 1970 to about 1996. In 1996 the District came and  
6  
7 constructed the current float, gangway, and one portion of the access pier, which you  
8  
9 can see in the shaded area on the screen, down here. And here you can see the outline  
10  
11 of those piling structures. Those were removed as a part of this project in 1996.  
12

13 In 1997 the City of Sausalito constructed the remainder of the facility, and that  
14  
15 consisted of the landside pier and the other portion of the access pier that extends from  
16  
17 the landside pier.  
18

19 So that's a brief history of ferry service and how we are in the situation that we're  
20  
21 in today. Here's an aerial view of our existing facility. You can see the existing float; it's  
22  
23 about 42 feet by 110 feet. The gangway is 70 feet long by about 5 feet, 7 inches wide.  
24  
25 The pier is in totality about 96.5 feet by 8.5 feet long. The existing landside pier is about  
26  
27 20 feet wide, and the access control point is located at the end of the landside pier. You  
28  
29 can see people queuing on the other side of the landside pier.  
30

31 So again, the existing facilities are aging, they're nearing the end of their life, and  
32  
33 they're in need of replacement. You can see on the left slide, this is a picture of the  
34  
35 ramp that goes from the float to the vessel, that it is not able to reach compliance with  
36  
37 1:12 slopes. It's also manually operated. We'd like to put in a hydraulic system, which  
38  
39 will eliminate the need for people to move this back and forth, eliminate injuries, etc.  
40  
41

42 You can also see the existing gangway, which is this structure right here. It's very  
43  
44 narrow, it's aluminum, and it also does not comply with ADA on low tides, which I'll  
45  
46 show a little later on in the presentation.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Here's the existing float. The existing float is a steel structure. It's susceptible to  
2 corrosion, especially in a marine environment. It's very difficult to maintain this type of  
3 structure, especially trying to maintain operations, take this out of service repair it. We  
4 are going to be replacing this float with a concrete float, which is much more durable  
5 and would eliminate a lot of the maintenance issues that we have with steel floats.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 You can see here the conditions in stormy weather. Waves can come up over the  
12 top of the float. If you're standing on the gangway, it is very narrow; it's not very stable.  
13 It's very challenging to be walking on that, especially if you're walking with a stroller or if  
14 you're those who have mobility impairments, in these types of conditions.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Then you can see here that the facility is fairly well used, especially in the  
20 summer months. As you all know, it can get quite crowded. But as you can see, the  
21 narrowness of the gangway and the platform on the float only provides for about two  
22 people across; you can't get more people in that narrow width. Also, you can see that  
23 there's only one boarding platform on the float to the vessel. We're trying to improve  
24 that, to improve our operations, to improve turnaround time, to maintain schedule.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 So that gets into our design. Here's a plan view schematic of the float, boarding  
31 platform, boarding apron, gangway. Also the hydraulic gangplanks and the concrete  
32 float.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 What is going on is, as I stated, all our vessels are being retrofitted to include two  
39 8-foot doors. Currently we have one 5-foot door on our vessels. It restricts access on  
40 and off the vessels. In addition, the existing ramp from the float is only 4 feet wide,  
41 which further restricts it, and you can only get, like I said, two people across, so it really  
42 hampers our operations getting on and off the vessel. The new doors will be 8 feet wide.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 They'll be uniformly spaced on the vessels; spacing is 48 feet center-to-center on those  
2  
3 gangplanks that you see there. Everything will be compliant of 1:12 or flatter.  
4

5 Since we have different types of vessels, it made it a challenge to conform to the  
6  
7 boarding platform, hydraulic planks, boarding apron and gangway to make all of those  
8  
9 things operate within the 1:12, which I'll show you later on with some slides.  
10

11 First the ADA requirements for the slope of a ramp. This is from an ADA  
12  
13 guideline. It states that a ramp shall have a running slope of not steeper than 1:12. Also,  
14  
15 at the end of a ramp there has to be a level platform, minimum width and length. You  
16  
17 can see there, on a corner it's 5 feet and a running width, 5 feet at the end of the  
18  
19 landing.  
20

21 Here's our float. Here are our two different vessels. We have a Spaulding class  
22  
23 vessel on the bottom, and a high-speed catamaran ferry vessel on the top. They differ in  
24  
25 elevations for where you board on the main deck, so that becomes a challenge of  
26  
27 having a hydraulic gangplank that is able to load at both of those elevations and comply  
28  
29 with the 1:12 gangplank back to the boarding platform. So what we developed is the  
30  
31 float itself will have a boarding platform which hydraulically may be lifted and lowered,  
32  
33 depending upon which vessel comes in, and that will allow for maintaining that 1:12 to  
34  
35 the vessel. You can see here, 4.5 to 3.0, so there's a 1.5-foot differential that needs to  
36  
37 be accounted for. It's about 16 feet from that platform to the edge of the float. The  
38  
39 hydraulics allows it to extend to 18 feet to land properly on the vessel. So that's the float  
40  
41 and the gangplanks.  
42

43  
44 Then we talk about the gangway. The gangway connects from the float to the  
45  
46 pier, and again, you need to have a 1:12 slope, no steeper than. Our existing facility,  
47  
48 when there's a tide of -1.1 or lower, it exceeds the 1:12 slope, so that length is just not  
49  
50

1 sufficient currently to comply with the requirements. In order to comply, we've evaluated  
2  
3 the conditions and we determined that we need a 90-foot long gangway, as you can see  
4  
5 here. A 90-foot long gangway will connect to the float and the access pier. At the lowest  
6  
7 low tide we will not exceed the 1:12; that's at a -2.5, and as I stated before, the existing  
8  
9 exceeds 1:12 when you get -1.1 or greater.  
10

11 I also want to talk about when the gangway connects to the float, what's  
12  
13 happening there. At the end of a ramp, as I stated, you need to have a flat, level  
14  
15 platform. So that's what is called this "fixed landing," since there are flaps on the  
16  
17 gangway itself; that's about 8 feet wide, and then that connects to a boarding apron,  
18  
19 which is in itself a ramp. That is required because depending upon what vessel is at the  
20  
21 float, that boarding platform will raise and lower.  
22

23 You have tides, you have vessels with different pre-board and loading locations,  
24  
25 you have ramps, and you have fixed landings. All of these things had to be considered  
26  
27 and all of these things are what drove the length of both the float and the gangway.  
28  
29

30 Here's a schematic or rendering of the existing conditions showing that at the  
31  
32 lowest tide, the -2.5, we're at about a 1:9.5 horizontal, and the proposed will be 1:12 at  
33  
34 the lowest low tide. That's a controlling condition.  
35

36 In addition to ADA, I spoke about operational needs. What is the District trying to  
37  
38 do? We are not just updating our Sausalito ferry terminal, we updating all three of our  
39  
40 facilities, San Francisco and Larkspur. We're looking at our operational conditions now  
41  
42 and what we want to do in the future. Currently, we board and disembark through one  
43  
44 door. We want to have multiple doors. Currently the ramp-to-float width at this location  
45  
46 is 4 feet wide. We want to increase that. Ridership has been increasing. Last year,  
47  
48 793,000, and it's been picking up this year also. Weekday average, last year about 944,  
49  
50

1 and weekend average, 2,758. So this is taking approximately 900-1,300 cars off the  
2 road if you figure two people per car with those services. And currently our vessel  
3 turnaround is about 30 minutes; we're trying to improve that to about ten minutes.  
4

5  
6  
7 So what are we doing? We're retrofitting the vessels to put in two 8-foot wide  
8 doors, and I'll talk about that in a little bit. We're providing two 8-foot wide ramps from  
9 those doors, so there won't be a choke point. Then those two doors will connect to a 16-  
10 foot wide boarding platform, again to eliminate a chock point, and this will reduce our  
11 turnaround time to approximately ten minutes.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Here's a drawing showing our three different types of vessels, showing that we're  
18 making uniform modifications so that we have uniform door locations on all the vessels.  
19  
20

21 Here you can see the existing float with different vessels on either side. Similar to  
22 the existing conditions, a vessel will be able to berth on either side, but they will not be  
23 able to simultaneously berth on both the north and south side of the float. It also shows  
24 that depending upon what vessel you have, one is forward on the float and one is to the  
25 back, and we need some room for tie-ups for these two different types of vessels on the  
26 float.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In order to determine our ten-minute turnaround we had to determine how many  
34 passengers we had, what their level of growth was going to be, and then determine how  
35 long it takes passengers to disembark and to load onto a vessel, so we had to look at  
36 level of service. What we did is in 2006-2009 we looked at our passenger counts, per  
37 trip, and we summed all those up, and there are peaks and valleys, depending upon the  
38 day, and there are peaks and valleys depending upon the season. So we looked at the  
39 season from June through November, and we looked at how many passengers were on  
40 each trip, and we threw out the first top 15% of all of those, and we took that next  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 number and we said this is what we're going to use as our baseline, and we used that  
2  
3 baseline and increased it by 4% per year for 20 years, and that's our design basis for  
4  
5 how many passengers we're going to be taking at an 85% percentile on our vessels.  
6

7         With that number we then looked at level of service, how do people move in  
8  
9 airports, in transportation facilities? There's a book on this that talks about these  
10  
11 different levels of service, which is what we used. So we're using for passengers  
12  
13 walking, a level of service corresponding to a Level D-E, and you can see on the bottom  
14  
15 photo what that represents. It's taken as approximately ten square feet around your  
16  
17 person while you're walking. It's an average flow of 20 passengers per foot, per width,  
18  
19 per minute. Normal walking (inaudible) is restricted with this, and this is consistent with  
20  
21 the observed conditions at the facility.  
22

23         Then we looked at what are people going to be doing when they're waiting in  
24  
25 line? And again, we took it as a level of service C-D. You can see in the photo how  
26  
27 close people are; it represents about 3-7 square feet per person. Space is provided, so  
28  
29 there is no contact with others. This is also consistent with the observed conditions at  
30  
31 the facility.  
32

33         Again, I said we looked at the passenger counts back in 2006-2009 and we came  
34  
35 up with a number of passengers we would need 20 years in the future, and you can see  
36  
37 down on the bottom of this slide we show a total of 512 passengers waiting to board,  
38  
39 408 offloading. We wanted to allow for these people to offload and then load within  
40  
41 about ten minutes.  
42

43         So using the level C-D for people walking, if you know how many people can  
44  
45 walk per foot of width per minute, and you know the length, that's how we determined  
46  
47 that 8-foot doors were appropriate on the vessels, 8-foot width was necessary on the  
48  
49  
50

1 gangplanks, and the 16-foot width was necessary on the boarding platform. That 16-foot  
2 width was then carried through to land.  
3

4  
5 So you can see here, disembarking 408 passengers takes about three minutes to  
6 disembark with this width. And then boarding, we're estimating about six minutes. Now  
7 the boarding, we're showing a 25-foot wide pier on this particular slide, and the access  
8 gate is located adjacent to the gangway out on the water. What this allows is for about a  
9 4-foot wide area where people can actually queue up on the access pier out into the  
10 water. What that does, in addition to taking them off the landside, it allows them to  
11 board quicker than if they're waiting on the landside, because they'd have to traverse  
12 that extra distance.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 So you can see in a cross section—I know it's kind of small, but it's in the packet  
22 also—we have a 4-foot where people are queuing, a 16-foot where people are walking,  
23 and then there's an area for public access. If people who are not using the facility for  
24 getting on or off the vessel just happen to be out there, we wanted to have some room  
25 for them to be there without getting caught in the crowd, and that's what the belvederes  
26 are also shown for. If people wanted to really get out of the flow, they could find refuge  
27 in those belvederes, which are on either side of the 25 foot access pier.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 What this width also allows us to do is as was shown previously, we can only  
37 have about two people shoulder-to-shoulder walking on the existing gangway, but with  
38 this here we could have three people, plus bikes, so we can simultaneously load bikes  
39 and passengers. Currently we have to load one, and then the other, so that really slows  
40 things down. This will allow us to speed things up. Two different doors will allow bikes to  
41 go in one door, passengers to go in another door. It will improve operations at the site.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 After our last meeting we heard that the 25-foot wide pier looked to be too large  
2  
3 in scale, so we looked at reducing that. We looked at a 21-foot pier, and we looked to  
4  
5 see what would that do for our operations, and we determined that other than reducing  
6  
7 the amount of space for people who are not passengers, who are not wanting to board  
8  
9 and disembark from the vessels, operationally 21-foot was still sufficient. It does impact  
10  
11 the original gate that we looked at, but there's not a big concern. So operationally,  
12  
13 reducing it is acceptable. This just shows, again, we could still maintain loading bikes  
14  
15 and passengers from both doors simultaneously.  
16

17 Then I want to talk a little bit about the location of the facility itself. The float, as I  
18  
19 stated, is concrete. You saw the steel float in the waves and how it rocks pretty good  
20  
21 out there. This is going to be a concrete float. It reduces maintenance, it's much more  
22  
23 durable. However, it's a little deeper and it must be located in water that is sufficient to  
24  
25 allow it not to land on the bottom during low tide, so we've determined there has to be  
26  
27 15 feet of water or greater to locate this float, which is why it's located where it's at. So  
28  
29 from the float location you then have the 90-foot gangway, and the remainder is what is  
30  
31 left for the pier. This is a rendering showing the existing and how it's located with  
32  
33 respect to the bay, and how the new float must be located in water deep enough so it  
34  
35 will not sit on the bottom.  
36

37  
38 Gangway alternatives. Before I show some renderings of the gangways I wanted  
39  
40 to talk a little bit about the design associated with it. As noted, the clear gangway width  
41  
42 is 16 feet and the length is 90 feet. With that the gangway then has to be designed for  
43  
44 its own dead load and a live load of 100 pounds per square foot. A hundred pounds per  
45  
46 square foot is from California, and the Uniform Building Code specifies this for public  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 assembly area, gangways, any place where there's a common assembly. So that's  
2  
3 where the 100 pounds per square foot comes from.  
4

5         With this size for the structural elements we elected to use a truss system with  
6  
7 circular tubes consisting of the members of the truss. Those were selected because a  
8  
9 truss, first of all, is very light, so its dead load is lighter than if you had a pre-cast  
10  
11 concrete structure, some sort of H-beam, or some sort of large tubular steel structure;  
12  
13 any of those structures are very heavy. This is much lighter, plus we felt that it allowed  
14  
15 people to see through the truss better than these solid other structures. In addition, a  
16  
17 tube structure is economically very good. From an engineering standpoint, it's very  
18  
19 efficient. It doesn't allow debris to accumulate on it as easily as other structural  
20  
21 elements, it doesn't allow birds to get on it, and so that's why we selected this truss.  
22

23         So this was the original gangway. As is shown in the handout, it's 12 feet tall at  
24  
25 the center with 12-inch diameter tubes, and we were asked if we could make this  
26  
27 smaller, so we looked at it and we are able to reduce the overall height. We originally  
28  
29 elected for a taller truss, because we were thinking of people passing on the gangway  
30  
31 itself, they could see through, but the concern is really how it looks from land, so we are  
32  
33 able to lower this by about 1.5 feet at the center and a similar distance at the ends.  
34

35         We also looked at a rectangular truss. This is reduced further from the 12 feet to  
36  
37 about 9 feet. There are still about 12-inch diameter cord elements. The other thing  
38  
39 about this one is when you look at it from the side, you can't see through it as easily as  
40  
41 the others.  
42

43         Here are all three lined up side-by-side. The top was the original 12-inch pipes;  
44  
45 overall height is 12 feet. The second one is about 10.5 to 10.75 inches at the center.  
46  
47 The lower one about 9 feet. I also want to note that the walkway itself is about 3 feet  
48  
49  
50

1 from the bottom of this truss, so as you're walking on that walkway, you're about 3 feet  
2  
3 up from the bottom.  
4

5 Gate alternatives. We need to have access control between the float and  
6  
7 gangway and the pier. So here's the existing condition. You can see it's not very  
8  
9 elaborate, not very attractive, and it's located fairly close to land. It restricts access at  
10  
11 that point, so people are not allowed to go out further onto the bay.  
12

13 This was our original gate that we presented. It consists of a roll-up gate and two  
14  
15 3-foot emergency exits on the side. It's in a structure canopy, because the gate itself  
16  
17 actually rolls up into it and the motor and controls are in the structure. The structure also  
18  
19 provides a space for lighting and for security cameras.  
20

21 But we also looked at a simple swing gate. Swing gates are fine; they function  
22  
23 fine. When they swing you just have to be careful that they don't open into where people  
24  
25 are standing. Roll-up gate eliminated that, which is why we originally selected the roll-  
26  
27 up.  
28

29 We also looked at instead of just a plain gate with no top possibly putting a  
30  
31 curved top on it. This way here the lights and security cameras could be mounted to the  
32  
33 structure framing itself rather than an independent pole, which is required for a simple  
34  
35 swing gate.  
36

37 If we go to the 20-foot wide pier the roll-up gate option goes away, because you  
38  
39 need emergency access on either side. You cannot put emergency access in a roll-up  
40  
41 gate structure, but the swing gates, you could put panic hardware on the (inaudible).  
42  
43 Reducing it to 21 feet still maintains our 16-foot opening. It also though provides for  
44  
45 emergency egress through these doors.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 So here is the one with the covered structure. In case this is selected, this again  
2  
3 allows lighting and security to be hidden in that covering. Here's with just a simple  
4  
5 curved top with the lights and security on top. And here would be an 8-foot simple gate  
6  
7 with a pole incorporating the camera and the lighting.  
8

9 Lighting is going to be incorporated in the project. On the left it shows current  
10  
11 lighting. These are just attached to the railing and they have a kind of semi-circle look to  
12  
13 them when they shadow down onto the walkway. We'll be putting linear lights  
14  
15 underneath the handrail all the way on the pier and the gangway. Out on the float itself  
16  
17 we will have poles with these LED lights attached.  
18

19 Another item that needs to be incorporated in the project is due to the hydraulics  
20  
21 and other components on the float. The existing power source is insufficient to run all of  
22  
23 these operations, so we need to get a new PG&E service. The new PG&E service will  
24  
25 require a meter where the existing ticket vending machines are located, so we're  
26  
27 proposing to relocate those ticket vending machines to the south end of the plaza.  
28

29 Here are our two renderings of two potential locations. Location 1 is looking  
30  
31 toward the parking lot and directly behind the Timber Commerce kiosk, and the other  
32  
33 one is where there are currently trashcans and other type of things in the plaza. The  
34  
35 new transformer will be located at the corner of Anchor and the entrance to the parking  
36  
37 lot adjacent to the transformer for the pump station.  
38

39 Now, I want to show some renderings of the existing facility and some of the  
40  
41 proposals for consideration. Here is from the south looking north. It's scaled to show the  
42  
43 new facility, how the new float will extend further into the bay, and this has the larger  
44  
45 truss on it.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Here is that same view, and what we're trying to show here are different potential  
2 color schemes. The first one we selected was white. We selected white because that's  
3 a nautical type color, the existing facilities are white and blue, so we just selected white,  
4 but we don't have to have any of these colors, but there's white. The second one is  
5 supposed to represent galvanized zinc, because a lot of these members could be  
6 galvanized for corrosion protection and not painted at all. And the lower one is blue.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 Here's north looking south, and you can see how the new facility will extend a  
14 little further into the bay.  
15  
16

17 And here we have the view from the parking lot adjacent to the Yacht Club and  
18 the landside pier.  
19  
20

21 Here's the existing facility, and here would be the facility with the 25-foot width,  
22 the large truss, and the gate with the white color. Here's the same view with a different  
23 color, and the blue.  
24  
25  
26

27 There was also a question about moving the gate closer to land. We would like to  
28 maintain the gate out further. Part of BCDC's mission is to provide public access to the  
29 bay. Moving the gate closer to land will restrict public access out to the bay, which is  
30 why we prefer allowing people to come out as far as possible. However, if the gate was  
31 moved, you can see here, this is what it would look like. It's much more visible from this  
32 view. Here's just a different color, and again, a different color. And here's a side-by-side  
33 comparison.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Then a view from the plaza. This is probably where most people will view the  
42 facility from. The existing condition. The large truss with white. This is with the lowered  
43 truss, and here's with the rectangular truss; you can see the difference. And then again,  
44 different colors. Here's the gray color, and the blue color, a side-by-side comparison.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           So again, different considerations and options we looked at. Twenty-five foot  
2  
3 wide pier we initially looked at, but from an operational perspective 21 feet wide is  
4  
5 sufficient. Different gangway alternatives. We originally liked the higher truss, but the  
6  
7 reduced height truss or the rectangular truss is also acceptable. Different gates. If the  
8  
9 21 foot wide pier is selected, the roll-up gate is not acceptable. It cannot be used; it  
10  
11 won't function. But these others will function with that width. Covered roof, a simple  
12  
13 cover, and a simple swing gate. And then again, the colors. We just showed white,  
14  
15 galvanized gray, and blue, but any colors may be considered.  
16

17           And with that I think I made my half an hour.  
18

19           CHAIR COX: Thank you. John, if you'll stay where you are, I'm going to see if  
20  
21 folks up here have questions. So any questions from members of the HLB?  
22

23           SECRETARY FRASER: Hi. I don't have any kind of engineering background. My  
24  
25 first question is what is the purpose of the truss system? That seems to have elicited a  
26  
27 lot of reaction from what I've read in letters so far, the design of it.  
28

29           JOHN EBERLE: The truss is to hold up that gangway. You have a 16-foot wide  
30  
31 by 90-foot long gangway structure, walking platform. If you have a structure that wide  
32  
33 and that long, and then you impose its own dead load and then a load of 100 pounds  
34  
35 per square foot on that structure, you need to have some sort of system to hold that up  
36  
37 as it spans between the pier and the float, and a truss is just one way of doing that.  
38  
39

40           SECRETARY FRASER: Is there a reason that the top level of it can't be brought  
41  
42 down to the same height as the railing?  
43

44           JOHN EBERLE: If I could maybe go back, if you'll indulge me here a second, if I  
45  
46 can find it.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 If you look at this slide right here, and if you look at this location up here, you see  
2  
3 how the walking surface is up here and then the truss actually seats down lower? If we  
4  
5 make it any lower than that, during high tides the truss is going to be in water. So that  
6  
7 bottom portion, in order to make it lower when you have a high tide, those steel  
8  
9 elements will be under water.

10  
11 SECRETARY FRASER: I mean but the top portion, the part that's going to be  
12  
13 above people's heads, why that can't be (inaudible).

14  
15 JOHN EBERLE: You need that depth. You need that depth, either the 12-foot or  
16  
17 the 10.5-foot or the 9-foot, structurally to make the truss work.

18  
19 SECRETARY FRASER: Okay, thank you.

20  
21 CHAIR COX: Other members of the HLB?

22  
23 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I do, thank you. Do you have any renderings  
24  
25 of the gate viewing it from the plaza?

26  
27 JOHN EBERLE: The gate viewing from the plaza. Here would be a rendering of  
28  
29 the gate with the curved structure on top. You can see right here, here would be the  
30  
31 gate.

32  
33 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I think I was more interested in seeing it from  
34  
35 the center of the plaza rather than from the far south end.

36  
37 JOHN EBERLE: The only renderings we have for that are the ones adjacent to  
38  
39 the Yacht Club. Do you want me to skip back to that?

40  
41 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No, I saw those. Thank you.

42  
43 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Some of the improvements which you're proposing  
44  
45 in the loading and unloading process due to wider doors, (inaudible) will certainly help  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 with congestion. It will also reduce the turnaround time for ferry loading and unloading.

2  
3 Does BCDC have any plans to increase the frequency of boat landings?

4  
5 JOHN EBERLE: That's out of BCDC's purview, first of all, so no, BCDC does not  
6  
7 have anything to do with increasing or decreasing loadings.

8  
9 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I feel awkward talking into the mic to talk to you,  
10  
11 but just generally, not having an engineering background, following up on the truss, why  
12  
13 is that the way it is in existence now in the proposed plans? Is that just something that's  
14  
15 used in most ferry landings? Is it sort of an industry standard? Generally within the  
16  
17 gateway and the truss system, why is that the only option, I guess?

18  
19 JOHN EBERLE: Well, as I said, it's not the only option; it's the one we selected.  
20  
21 But to answer your first question, if you go to AT&T Park and if you look at the truss at  
22  
23 the ferry facility at AT&T Park, they have a truss system there that they use. And I  
24  
25 believe in San Francisco, at some of those ferry facilities, there are also truss elements.  
26  
27 We, again, selected this because of the loads that we needed to carry. We were looking  
28  
29 for the lightest and most open element to carry those loads, which is why we selected  
30  
31 the truss.

32  
33 CHAIR McCOY: Just a couple more quick questions that haven't already been  
34  
35 touched upon. You and I have spoken about the belvederes and how they increase the  
36  
37 mass of this, I don't know if it's the gangway or the walkway or however it's labeled.  
38  
39 Have you gone back and revisited that with BCDC at this point? It was my  
40  
41 understanding that that was a BCDC requirement.

42  
43 JOHN EBERLE: BCDC has two missions, as you may or may not know. One of  
44  
45 them is to look at fill going into the bay, and the other one is to maximize public access  
46  
47 to the bay to the extent possible. So when we had our initial discussions with BCDC  
48  
49  
50

1 they did not believe that there was sufficient access to the bay with the width of the  
2 facility, and so they requested that we look at the belvederes, so that's why we are still  
3 looking at them. BCDC Commission will make the final call on that, but we're still  
4  
5 looking at them. BCDC Commission will make the final call on that, but we're still  
6  
7 incorporating them in.  
8

9 CHAIR McCOY: Okay, thanks. The second question I have is we're looking at  
10 replacing a ferry landing that was built in 1996. If this was to be approved for  
11 construction, do you have an estimated lifespan of this ferry landing?  
12  
13

14 JOHN EBERLE: Yes. Its design life will be approximately 30 or 40 years. The  
15 concrete float will really help to make this a very durable structure, and with the  
16 concrete pier and the more stable gangway, it will be, again, a much more durable  
17 structure.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 CHAIR McCOY: Thanks.

24 CHAIR COX: Questions from Planning Commissioners? Morgan.

25 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll start it, thank you. I only have eight or nine  
26 questions, so I'll try to keep them brief.  
27  
28  
29

30 CHAIR COX: Well, I guess what we're going to do is we're going to take it then  
31 one at a time, so that everybody has an opportunity.  
32  
33

34 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Okay.

35 CHAIR COX: Okay.

36 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Great. Thank you very much for the presentation.  
37  
38 As a commuter on the ferry with my bicycle daily, I understand the shortcomings of it  
39 presently, so I look at this with an intimate perspective of what the conditions are.  
40  
41

42 My first question is were Sausalito's General Plan and the Bike Task Force  
43 findings incorporated at all into the design of this facility?  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: I'm sorry?  
2

3 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Were Sausalito's General Plan and Sausalito's  
4  
5 Bicycle Task Force findings incorporated at all into the design of these facilities?  
6

7 JOHN EBERLE: We did not look at those documents when we were doing the  
8  
9 design.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I also have several questions, but  
14  
15 this will be my first. I do think that the truss is a pretty critical issue. A lot of people have  
16  
17 commented on it, and so I want to understand. You said there are other options. In your  
18  
19 professional opinion, what are other feasible options that exist to the truss, and are  
20  
21 there ways to reduce the volume, the 12-inch diameter, or the height other than the  
22  
23 three options that you've given us?  
24

25 JOHN EBERLE: As I stated earlier, we're looking at the loads that need to be  
26  
27 carried on this width and length spanning over the water. It's really a bridge structure, so  
28  
29 there's a truss. When you have long spans you can't just have a simple beam type  
30  
31 structure, so a truss is the most efficient structure, because it's light. As I stated,  
32  
33 especially with tubes, those are very efficient sections, so you don't have a strong and a  
34  
35 weak axis.  
36

37  
38 You can have a steel box of some sort, but if you look at that truss, basically it  
39  
40 would be a large steel member about probably 4.5 to 5 feet deep at least, maybe longer  
41  
42 or maybe deeper, 6 feet deep, and it would be all enclosed; you wouldn't be able to see  
43  
44 through it. If you built that box, it would also be heavier than this particular structure, so  
45  
46 how it is framed into the pier itself and into the float would have some structural  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 implications that we'd have to look at. That may increase something on the float, and it  
2  
3 may increase something on the pier.  
4

5 A pre-cast concrete structure technically is feasible, but the weight itself would  
6  
7 just be too great, especially where it lands on the float itself. I don't think that that would  
8  
9 feasibly work.  
10

11 Those are about the only options that I think would work here.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: And there's no possibility of  
14  
15 supporting it midway with some other structure?  
16

17 CHAIR COX: John, people are having a hard time hearing you. If you can just,  
18  
19 again, make an effort to speak more loudly into the mic, that would be helpful.  
20

21 JOHN EBERLE: Certainly.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: Thanks.  
24

25 JOHN EBERLE: No, you could not put a support in the middle of that, no.  
26

27 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, great. Thank you very much.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: Okay, Bill.  
30

31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: You mentioned that your turnaround time is now 30  
32  
33 minutes?  
34

35 JOHN EBERLE: Approximately.  
36

37 VICE CHAIR WERNER: How often does that happen?  
38

39 JOHN EBERLE: Our schedule is set at 30 minutes.  
40

41 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Well, I don't understand that, because I looked at the  
42  
43 schedule and your 10:40 out of San Francisco arrives here at 11:10 and turns around  
44  
45 and goes out at 11:20; that's a ten-minute turnaround. The next one arrives at 12:30  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 and goes back out at 12:45; that's a 15-minute turnaround. So you're never on  
2  
3 schedule, I understand?  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: It's my understanding that we had a 30-minute turnaround.  
6

7 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So you answered by question. You're never on  
8  
9 schedule.  
10

11 JOHN EBERLE: Well, we're on schedule obviously when we have less people  
12  
13 on the boats. The morning trips have fewer passengers up until about probably noon,  
14  
15 and then the heavy commutes are at 3:00 to 5:00 o'clock, 5:30, and then it tapers down  
16  
17 again.  
18

19 VICE CHAIR WERNER: The one that arrives from San Francisco at 4:30 turns  
20  
21 around and goes back at 4:45; that's 15 minutes.  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: I mean I could get the actual information for you on our  
24  
25 turnaround time.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Yeah, I think that's something we'd like to see at our next meeting  
28  
29 is that data to validate the need for a larger sized pier in order to accommodate more  
30  
31 passengers and reduce the turnaround time.  
32

33  
34 And I'm going to follow up on that question from Mr. Brown, along those same  
35  
36 lines. As I understand it, the main reason to increase the size of the pier is to increase  
37  
38 the load, and that is in order to increase the numerosity of passengers in a smaller span  
39  
40 of time. Do you intend to increase the number of trips? He asked you did the BCDC,  
41  
42 and you didn't answer. Does whatever authority is in charge of determining the number  
43  
44 of trips intend to increase the number of trips?  
45

46 JOHN EBERLE: At this time, we have no plans to increase the number of trips.  
47  
48 However, in the future will be increase them? That depends on what the demand is. It  
49  
50

1 also depends on the resources that we have. We only have so many vessels, we only  
2 have so many crew, we have a service between Larkspur and San Francisco also. It's  
3 not like we have additional ferries and crews readily available to automatically increase  
4 trips, so there's not a plan at this time.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Can I just follow up with that? On  
10 your slide that had the comparison of the sloped (inaudible) about the ADA  
11 requirements, you had an illustration that had two vessels; one of them was high-speed.  
12 Just to go on the record, is high-speed proposed at all here in Sausalito?  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 JOHN EBERLE: We use all of our vessels, depending upon the availability of  
18 those. So for instance, we typically use Spaulding in Sausalito, however, if there are  
19 special events, if all of our Spauldings for some reason go out of service, we still need  
20 to maintain our operations, so we need to make the facility able to accommodate all of  
21 our vessels.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I'm speaking more about a regular  
29 schedule. There's (inaudible).  
30  
31

32 JOHN EBERLE: Currently we plan to maintain our Spaulding class vessels at  
33 this facility.  
34  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Morgan.  
37

38 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'm going to continue on that line of questioning.  
39 Again, regarding the potential for an additional trip or trips during the middle of the day  
40 when I believe the bicycle loads and pedestrian loads are greatest, if you had more  
41 trips, how would that affect the proposed design for this from a scale standpoint?  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 JOHN EBERLE: More trips should not...  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: And since you wouldn't have as much loading area  
2  
3 required for people waiting...  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: Oh, I see your question. If we increase our service.  
6

7 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Right.  
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: Yes. Increase of service, as I said, is a resource issue.  
10  
11 Currently, with the current resources that we have operating out of Larkspur, we don't  
12  
13 have additional capacity at this time to increase service to the extent to lower that  
14  
15 number of people per trip here. During the peak time in the summer we do pull a vessel  
16  
17 once in a while when people are being left behind, and on special events we will pull a  
18  
19 vessel. Those are mainly on weekends when we don't have our commute runs.  
20

21 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.  
22

23 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Many, or several at least, of the  
24  
25 commenters talked about bay fill associated with the project. Could you discuss any bay  
26  
27 fill related project?  
28

29 JOHN EBERLE: Bay fill from a BCDC standpoint is considered a shadow over  
30  
31 the water, and I'd like to differentiate between shadows over the water and what's  
32  
33 actually placed in the water. The placement in the water consists of the pilings, which  
34  
35 are the supports that hold up the pier and secure the float. From a piling placement in  
36  
37 the water perspective, we're increasing that by approximately 131 square feet. From a  
38  
39 shadow perspective, the facility, the float is larger, the gangway is larger, and the pier is  
40  
41 larger, so the shadowing over the bay is increased. I say it in the document; I forget the  
42  
43 exact numbers, but it's increased.  
44

45 FEMALE (audience): Could he speak louder, please?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 CHAIR COX: We will try. You kind of died off there. How many square feet does  
2  
3 the shadow increase as a result of this proposed structure?  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: I don't have that number right in front of me. If I could ask my  
6  
7 team, maybe if they have that number?  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Okay, we'll come back to that.  
10

11 JOHN EBERLE: Okay.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Vicki?  
14

15 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'm good.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Bill?  
18

19 VICE CHAIR WERNER: How many bicycles does the Spaulding class boat  
20  
21 handle, and how many bicycles does the catamaran handle?  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: I don't have those numbers. I'll have to get back to you.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: So that's additional data we'd like to have for next time.  
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: Okay.  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Can I follow up just on that?  
30

31 CHAIR COX: Yeah.  
32

33 VICE CHAIR WERNER: The lifespan of the facilities in Sausalito has been 16  
34  
35 years, or something like that. What's the lifespan of the Spauldings and the catamarans  
36  
37 that you are designing this whole float system for?  
38

39 JOHN EBERLE: The catamarans and the Spauldings are undergoing  
40  
41 renovations currently, so with renovations I believe the cycle is about a 15-year cycle  
42  
43 we're trying to get on our vessels. So about every 15 years they go through some sort  
44  
45 of renovation work, and with that frequency we're hoping that they last at least 40 years  
46  
47 or so. We have no plans to purchase any new vessels at this time.  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: You mentioned hydraulics for this new system. Will there be a  
2  
3 redundancy so that the system can be operated manually, or will it be completely  
4  
5 dependent on the hydraulics?  
6

7 JOHN EBERLE: There will be a redundant control system on the float itself, so  
8  
9 that if the one hydraulic system goes down, the redundant system will be available to go  
10  
11 in place.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: But it will be hydraulic?  
14

15 JOHN EBERLE: If both hydraulic systems happen to go out simultaneously,  
16  
17 there is a way to manually raise and lower the facility.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: One other question. You mentioned the 1:12 slope is sometimes  
20  
21 exceeded in times of low tide. How frequently per week is that slope exceeded for  
22  
23 passengers onloading or offloading?  
24

25 JOHN EBERLE: I'll have to go through the data. I don't know if we have that  
26  
27 tonight, but I know we have gone through that.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: We'd like that data. If it only happens twice a year, I mean that  
30  
31 seems like we're going through a lot.  
32

33 JOHN EBERLE: It's more frequent than twice a year.  
34

35 CHAIR COX: Okay. All right, Morgan.  
36

37 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'd like to go back to the ramp truss design one  
38  
39 more time. I understand the calculations for the load, etc., and some of the diagrams  
40  
41 proposed. Was a variation pursued at all where instead of a two-part truss it was a  
42  
43 three-part truss utilizing two 8-foot passageways on either side of that?  
44  
45

46 JOHN EBERLE: No, that was not contemplated.  
47

48 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Is that something you want him to consider?  
2

3 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I think that will be part of our comments?  
4

5 CHAIR COX: Okay, all right. Susan.  
6

7 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I was wondering, there are a  
8  
9 limited number of materials used in the proposed design. I think a number of members  
10  
11 of the public have commented that it's fairly industrial. I think we've exhausted the truss  
12  
13 discussion for the moment, but in terms of the other parts of the project, could you just  
14  
15 discuss like the gate and the railings, whether any wood components or other types of  
16  
17 materials could be introduced to kind of soften the overall feel or make it less industrial?  
18  
19 Obviously there are weather conditions here. But it seems like you're not wedded  
20  
21 necessarily to the design of the gate, for example.  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: Correct, we are not. I'll start with the railing. The railing, what  
24  
25 we're looking at is similar to the existing railing at the site, which consists of vertical  
26  
27 tubular pickets, and with an appropriate handrail on top. We are not contemplating  
28  
29 wood, because wood is not very durable; it's also prone to graffiti. There will be some  
30  
31 wood handrails at some other locations that get marred pretty quickly and they're then a  
32  
33 maintenance problem; they're not very durable.  
34

35  
36 The gate itself, we really don't have anything that we are married to, but it will be  
37  
38 some sort of durable steel that will hold up to the environment.  
39

40 We looked at glass for some of the railings also, but again, it's not very durable; it  
41  
42 gets dirty pretty quickly, it's prone to graffiti and maintenance issues.  
43

44 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, thank you.  
45

46 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I can help you out with that question about the shadow  
47  
48 coverage of the bay fill. The numbers you gave the BCDC, and which are included in  
49  
50

1 your summary, are that the existing is 6,057 square feet and the proposed is 13,000  
2 square feet. The pile area, according to you own information here, is currently 73  
3 square feet, and it's going to 204 square feet.  
4

5  
6  
7 JOHN EBERLE: That's a 131 square foot increase on the piles, and you're  
8 correct on the shadows.  
9

10  
11 CHAIR COX: We have a bunch of people here that I want to give opportunity to  
12 comment and ask questions, so I'm going to ask each of us to maybe pull out our one  
13 biggest question for now, and then I'm going to reserve other questions from Planning  
14 Commissioners until after we hear from the public. So I'll go all the way around the table  
15 for additional questions before we turn it over to the public.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 SECRETARY FRASER: I was wondering if there are any improvements  
22 contemplated on the landside to match the improvements on the waterside? Right now  
23 it seems it's pretty chaotic as it is, but with this larger structure it would be inviting, it  
24 seems, a lot more visitation to use the ferry.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 JOHN EBERLE: This project's scope is just for the waterside improvements.  
31 There is a project that is contemplated to be looking at the landside improvements that  
32 the City of Sausalito is taking the lead on.  
33  
34  
35

36 SECRETARY FRASER: Can I ask a second question?  
37

38 CHAIR COX: Go ahead.  
39

40 SECRETARY FRASER: For the area of the pier, it's I believe the access pier,  
41 this large area that would be extending into the water, that would be open to the public,  
42 including in the evenings and whatnot? There are no gates, and benches would be  
43 open?  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 JOHN EBERLE: That's correct.  
49  
50

1 SECRETARY FRASER: Who would be responsible for policing that if people  
2  
3 were sleeping on the benches or anything?  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: That would have to be an agreement worked out between the  
6  
7 District and the City of Sausalito.  
8

9 SECRETARY FRASER: Fishing, would that be allowed on the pier?  
10

11 JOHN EBERLE: Again, that would be something that we would work with the  
12  
13 City of Sausalito to come up with regulations for that.  
14

15 SECRETARY FRASER: Thank you.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Ben  
18

19 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: In your presentation there were a couple of  
20  
21 elements of this design where the size was reduced, for example, from 25 feet to 21  
22  
23 feet on the gangplank, and also on the access gate. Now, the overall design is going  
24  
25 from a current 7,000 square feet to a 1,200 square foot configuration. Do you envisage  
26  
27 any other areas in which there could be a size reduction and still maintain the level of  
28  
29 service and turnover that you envision?  
30

31 JOHN EBERLE: The only opportunities that we saw for reducing area would be  
32  
33 on that access pier itself where we reduced it from the 25 feet to the 21 feet. The  
34  
35 gangway, for our ADA, length cannot be reduced; the width for our operations cannot be  
36  
37 reduced; and the size of the float cannot be reduced.  
38

39 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I have two questions.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: I really need to limit us, because we have so many members of the  
42  
43 public here.  
44

45 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay, the one.  
46  
47

48 CHAIR COX: We can ask questions after the public comments.  
49  
50

1 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay, sounds good. The one question that I  
2  
3 do have is regarding the difference between the plans that were developed in 1996 or  
4  
5 1997, that were ADA compliant, and current plans. Did the ADA compliancy regulations  
6  
7 change? Why is there now a 90-foot gangway for the 1:12 ratio? What was it before,  
8  
9 and did it change?  
10

11 JOHN EBERLE: There were guidelines that were developed, and have been in  
12  
13 development for a number of years. The original design in 1996, I believe, contemplated  
14  
15 trying to accommodate the 1:12 on the gangway, but in fact it doesn't. On the planks  
16  
17 from the float to the vessel, that was never contemplated at that time to be compliant,  
18  
19 because there really were no guidelines on that particular aspect that I'm aware of.  
20  
21 Well, our operations are not compliant, so why it wasn't completely done in 1996, it just  
22  
23 wasn't. It's not compliant now though.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: John.

26 CHAIR McCOY: I'll wait.

27 CHAIR COX: Okay. Morgan.

28  
29  
30  
31 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you. Regarding the circulation for the greater  
32  
33 site and specifically the relocation of the vending machines—which I think is wise,  
34  
35 because they create a bottleneck presently—were any circulation diagrams studied  
36  
37 relative to how pedestrians and bicyclists currently use those spaces and how that  
38  
39 might influence the access to those machines?  
40

41 JOHN EBERLE: No, an evaluation or study was not done.

42 CHAIR COX: I'll wait. Vicki.

43  
44  
45 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: (Inaudible).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Really? Okay. Thank you, John. At this point we're going to open  
2  
3 this up to public comment. I right now only have 20 speaker cards. There are a lot of us  
4  
5 here. I have to think there are more people who want to speak.  
6

7 DANNY CASTRO: If I may, just a quick announcement, Chair Cox, that we will  
8  
9 collect any more speaker slips now; and if you would just give us a minute, we'll also go  
10  
11 to the other room and collect any more speaker slips that people may have, so that we  
12  
13 have them.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Yeah. I'm going to go ahead and let people start speaking though.  
16  
17 So what I'm going to do is I'm going to call out two or three names at a time so that you  
18  
19 all know when your turn is coming, and that way we can quickly come to and from the  
20  
21 microphone. So first we're going to have Martha Cavalho, then Adam Krivatsy, then  
22  
23 Adrianna Dinihanian. Is Martha here?  
24

25 MARTHA CAVALHO: Yes.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Oh, okay.  
28

29 MARTHA CAVALHO: Hello. Can you hear me?  
30

31 CHAIR COX: Yes. We have a three-minute timer behind me, so everybody has  
32  
33 got three minutes to speak.  
34

35 MARTHA CAVALHO: Okay. It shouldn't take this long. Thank you for the  
36  
37 presentation.  
38

39 Just one thing that in looking at the plans and imagery and what this is, this is a  
40  
41 gateway into town. This is the point of arrival to Sausalito, and it's just striking me that  
42  
43 one of the biggest factors we might have to work with is we have technical limitations to  
44  
45 accomplish the upgrade of the terminal.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 But I was wondering if we could give some more special attention to color? I saw  
2  
3 white, galvanized steel, blue. I'm just thinking that the color could be a great ally in how  
4  
5 this structure imposes itself on the water, and also how it disappears.  
6

7 One structure that came to mind, and I think it would be a good example to look  
8  
9 at, is the Lion's Gate Bridge in Vancouver. I'm sure there might be several structures we  
10  
11 can use as an example for the study, but there is something with that, the use of a steel  
12  
13 green color, and then also using some stone in the background. It seems to me like a  
14  
15 perfect example of how a color can have grace and also blend in with the surroundings,  
16  
17 because I think we're going to be fighting a little bit on how we make this not so  
18  
19 imposing on the view and not conflict with the surroundings, but we also don't want to  
20  
21 make it insignificant.  
22

23 I also was going to mention if there is any we can do—I think that was brought  
24  
25 up—to comments on the design of the gate and on the ticket terminals, because I think  
26  
27 that's an opportunity to start establishing the language of what we want to be in  
28  
29 Sausalito, since that's the gateway to the City.  
30

31 Those are my main comments.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Adam. And after Adam will be Adrianna, and  
34  
35 then Peter Van Meter.  
36

37 ADAM KRIVATSY: Good evening, Adam Krivatsy, 840 Olima Street.  
38

39 I'm a ferry rider and I appreciate the need for modernizing the system. I fully  
40  
41 understand why the Golden Gate Transportation District is interested in fixing their  
42  
43 landing and takeoff operation.  
44

45 What I would like to emphasize is that this facility is an engineering solution and it  
46  
47 has to satisfy certain engineering requirements. The span cannot be reduced, the size  
48  
49  
50



1 of the float cannot be reduced, and so I would like to urge the designers to reduce the  
2  
3 height and the bulk of this facility by, as somebody mentioned, instead of two trusses,  
4  
5 three trusses, a divided gangway, and a lower profile.  
6

7 I think two good architects have been named by the City to represent the City's  
8  
9 interests in working with the Bridge District, so they will be able to recommend solutions.  
10  
11 I would like to urge the Bridge District to listen to recommendations to make it a much  
12  
13 lighter structure to the degree possible. Thank you.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Next is Adrianna, then Peter Van Meter, then Tammy  
16  
17 Blanchard.  
18

19 ADRIANNA DINIHANIAN: Hello, I'm Adrianna Dinihanian and I live at 254  
20  
21 Woodward Avenue.  
22

23 First of all, I would like to comment on the width of the gangway and everything.  
24  
25 It's now 5 feet. They want 21 feet. There's a lot of difference between 5 feet and 21 feet.  
26  
27 Couldn't we think of something around the 10-foot range that might be a little more  
28  
29 reasonable?  
30

31 Also, this whole structure looks like it should belong to the Port of Oakland, or  
32  
33 even to Larkspur Landing, where everything is modern. But in Sausalito we have a  
34  
35 historical district facing it. The Historic District is what the tourists come to see Sausalito  
36  
37 for really, that and the view, so why doesn't this reflect some of the design elements of  
38  
39 what makes Sausalito special? That's really what I'm here to say.  
40

41 The last comment I have is how about a dark color? Dark might be very, very  
42  
43 nice, like deep bronze or even black or brown or something like that; it doesn't stick out  
44  
45 like a light, bright color does. Thank you.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. All right, folks. Again, in the interest of time I'm going to  
2  
3 ask folks to hold their applause until the end. I'm going to call up Peter Van Meter, then  
4  
5 Tammy Blanchard, then Pat Shea.  
6

7 PETER VAN METER: Yes, I'm Peter Van Meter, and I had occasion on  
8  
9 President's Day, which was a beautiful day, I happened to be down in the parking lot  
10  
11 and I stuck around to watch an offloading and onloading process, and it's a mess.  
12

13 I think the great thing about this plan—and again, thank you for a great  
14  
15 presentation—is to help solve our problem of congestion in downtown Sausalito. That's  
16  
17 what you're going to get with this. You've got a queuing up, you've got a very slow  
18  
19 process, and with this, as they described the way to move people on and off here, it's  
20  
21 going to address our bicycle issue, it's going to address our congestion issue, and I  
22  
23 think it's an absolutely essential improvement that's needed for our town to improve our  
24  
25 quality of life.  
26

27  
28 Now, including the details. If you're talking about, again, the alternatives, the flat  
29  
30 top truss seems to be better to me. The swing gate with pole is less obtrusive, but make  
31  
32 the color the galvanized gray; it's going to kind of fade out against the water and  
33  
34 background. The little kiosk ought to go over by the existing information booth.  
35

36 Also, regarding the truss for you non-engineers, I did happen to be one back in  
37  
38 the day, but it's like when your piece of wood is like this, it's going to bend. When you  
39  
40 put it up vertical like this, it's strong and it doesn't bend. That's why you need a truss; it's  
41  
42 going to be something that keeps it from bending.  
43

44 Now, they can maybe make those tubes thinner, and they might have a little bit  
45  
46 more members; instead of just a few zigzags, maybe you've got twice as many zigzags,  
47  
48 but each diameter is maybe 6 inches instead of 12 inches. So I think there is some  
49  
50

1 refinement in terms of the engineering that can take place to make that flat truss a little  
2  
3 bit more acceptable.  
4

5 But that's basically it. Great project. Move it ahead. Make these design  
6  
7 refinements. It will help solve our congestion problem downtown. Thank you.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next is Tammy Blanchard, then Pat Shea, and  
10  
11 then Tom Skunda.  
12

13 TAMMY BLANCHARD: Hi, I'm Tammy Blanchard. I think that you each received  
14  
15 a copy of the petition that's been signed by many of the concerned residents of  
16  
17 Sausalito. There are 700 signatures there and 300 wet signatures.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: No, we did not get that.  
20

21 TAMMY BLANCHARD: Lilly, I emailed it to you on the 5<sup>th</sup>.  
22

23 LILLY SCHINSING: I didn't receive an email.  
24

25 TAMMY BLANCHARD: I'll make sure you get a copy of it. There are many,  
26  
27 many comments from the residents of Sausalito; 700 signatures as of this afternoon,  
28  
29 and about 300 wet signatures that were gathered by citizens.  
30

31 CHAIR COX: And whom did you turn the wet signatures in to?  
32

33 TAMMY BLANCHARD: I photocopied them and sent them to Lilly, along with all  
34  
35 the comments. I have a couple of questions. I'm going to go quick.  
36  
37

38 CHAIR COX: Can you just touch base with Lilly after you finish speaking and  
39  
40 make sure you have her correct email address?  
41

42 TAMMY BLANCHARD: I cut and pasted from the website, so okay.  
43

44 How often do we actually have a minus 2.2 tide? That's a question that I have,  
45  
46 and I think you also asked that question.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Is the 12:1 the absolute minimum for a ferry unloading and loading? I know it is  
2  
3 for land, but is that actually the criteria that we need for this ferry?  
4

5 I guess I'm not going to repeat any of the questions that have already been  
6  
7 asked.  
8

9 How come you have not provided story poles for this town? I'm a little  
10  
11 disappointed. You know that you have a lot of opposition and very, very concerned  
12  
13 citizens, and it disturbs me that you haven't taken it seriously and that you're not coming  
14  
15 to us and saying here's what it's going to look like, how can we work together? I also  
16  
17 agree we need some upgrades here. The ferry landing that we have now has not been  
18  
19 maintained well over the last 20 years. I certainly don't want to see that on this huge  
20  
21 monstrosity that they're planning now, so we would like to see what it's going to look  
22  
23 like.  
24

25 I have a little more time. Right now the gate to the ferry landing is perpendicular  
26  
27 to the shore. It's pretty unobtrusive from almost any direction. It's in the parking lot of  
28  
29 the Yacht Club; they're not affected. When you're looking out from the landing area and  
30  
31 from the park, you almost can't see it. You have it turned now right out in front of the  
32  
33 Yacht Club. You jog over almost...  
34

35  
36 Actually, that's another question. What is the dimension, the closest point in the  
37  
38 jog to the Yacht Club, and why is it now parallel to the shore? Now we're talking 25-foot  
39  
40 wide gate that you can't see through. Maybe if we moved it in, put it a little bit closer to  
41  
42 where it is right now, that might be a nice idea.  
43

44 I would just urge you—you're all residents here and I know you love this town—  
45  
46 and the Golden Gate District, please work together to make something that we can all  
47  
48 live with that is modern and does accommodate the people, and maybe has an  
49  
50

1 expanded schedule during busy times so that people aren't waiting on the sidewalk.

2  
3 Thank you for your time.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: Thank you. And for those of you who haven't seen our staff report,  
6  
7 one of the items of feedback to the Golden Gate Bridge District this evening will be story  
8  
9 poles, or modeling or whatever it is, what we're going to ask of them in terms of being  
10  
11 transparent and giving residents an opportunity to see exactly what is planned.  
12

13 Okay, next we have Pat Shea, then Tom Skunda, then Jen Gennari.

14  
15 PAT SHEA: Hi, Pat Shea here, and in the interest of time I'm going to speak for  
16  
17 both Pat Shea and Tom Skunda.  
18

19  
20 I think what we all heard here tonight is a situation about scale and being  
21  
22 appropriate within the confines of Sausalito, expressing it for Sausalito. I think the  
23  
24 questions and the comments that were previous just to me were what I was going to  
25  
26 ask. It seems like what we're starting with is the ADA and the size that needs to be  
27  
28 taken into account for the ferry. Are those numbers carved in stone, or is there some  
29  
30 wiggle room there that would allow us to look at a smaller scale and that would also  
31  
32 allow the ferry to address the needs they have? And then I agree with everything that  
33  
34 was said prior to me. Thank you.  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next Jen Gennari, then Joan Proctor, then  
37  
38 Donna Bachle.  
39

40 JEN GENNARI: Hi, I'm Jen Gennari. I am a Sausalito resident. I commute daily  
41  
42 by bike and by ferry.  
43

44 Actually, I want to see a show of hands of many people in this room ride the ferry  
45  
46 daily. Okay, we've got like three of four of us, so I just want to let you know that there  
47  
48 are a lot of us out there who are super excited about this project. Yea! Really like it. And  
49  
50

1 in fact I really like the 25' wide width, because we have trouble getting on and off. When  
2  
3 I get off at the end of the day, we're all trying to jam through that one small 4-foot door,  
4  
5 and we're late once again. So no more pushing through the crowds because there is no  
6  
7 system to handle the paying customers.  
8

9         It's really about safety for me. It's really about safety. The current loading dock is  
10  
11 too low. We know sea levels are rising. We don't want to lose this major commute route,  
12  
13 and we don't want those 2,000 people in cars.  
14

15         Today's Chronicle reports the big one is coming. What if Highway 1 becomes  
16  
17 impassible? What if Bridgeway is under water, or landslides block Alexander? We really  
18  
19 need a way to get out, and obviously a fortified and upgraded ferry terminal would allow  
20  
21 for emergency personnel and resources.  
22

23         Another thing is a wider gangplank. It's important to move people on and off a  
24  
25 boat more quickly. I always fear for the safety of the Golden Gate Ferry staff, that their  
26  
27 fingers will be cut, and with a hydraulic system that will be so much safer for them. Last  
28  
29 week a woman fell while carrying her suitcase down those stairs, and women with  
30  
31 strollers, it's always a problem. I also fear that I will lose my footing coming up and down  
32  
33 on the staircase there. And when you get off you have nowhere to go. An improved  
34  
35 system will really help all of that. New signs, better movement, so that it's safer as we all  
36  
37 move, whether or not we bike or walk or drive home. It's really a safety issue, and an  
38  
39 economic one. I know people will come to Sausalito. We can't remove it from the tour  
40  
41 guides and the guidebooks, and we need to have an efficient way to move people in  
42  
43 and around our city. I know that there is some federal funding tied to this. Please don't  
44  
45 kill this project and lose that federal funding. It's really important for us, and it's going to  
46  
47 be a safety issue for all of us. So thank you.  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next I have Joan Proctor, then Donna Bachle,  
2  
3 then Millie Amis. And if I could ask folks, if you want to chat with each other, if you could  
4  
5 step outside to chat so that we up here can hear what folks are saying and they're not  
6  
7 interrupted. Thanks.  
8

9 JOAN PROCTOR: I'm Joan Proctor; I live at 414 Bee Street.  
10

11 I came here actually to say something quite different, but when I heard this  
12  
13 presentation I was just struck by how all the comments are about the convenience for  
14  
15 this ferry company, for the operation's ease, for matching what San Francisco has, or  
16  
17 having all the same kind of doors, and there was nothing about the fact that this  
18  
19 happens to be in Sausalito and we're a small town. I really agree with the woman who  
20  
21 said something about this would be great for the Port of Oakland, New York City, even  
22  
23 Larkspur, but I think it's really inappropriate for us.  
24

25 I think there has got to be some way to accommodate fixing what we already  
26  
27 have, which obviously needs help, and also taking some design ideas from one of the  
28  
29 ferry pictures that somebody mentioned. Seattle, I think, had a really good one. There  
30  
31 must be other cities that have done this successfully, and get some ideas of what can  
32  
33 have a modest, unobtrusive, sort of nautical look to it. I don't see any reason to have  
34  
35 these giant white tubes going overhead. I don't see any reason to have 25 feet of width;  
36  
37 we're not going to be driving a car down there. It just seems so totally excessive for  
38  
39 what we need, and I'm sure the job could be done in some other way. I'm not an  
40  
41 engineer, so I don't know precisely what those things are.  
42  
43

44 I watched the Tiburon Ferry Landing fix itself and it turned out very attractively,  
45  
46 and they have ferries landing in a lot. They don't have the volume we have, but they  
47  
48 certainly had a different vision, and I think that's what we need. I don't know where this  
49  
50

1 vision came from that the company came up with, but I think it really doesn't work here  
2  
3 and I'd like to see a whole different vision. Maybe that means using some local  
4  
5 architects who have some experience around here as consultants. I don't know what it  
6  
7 takes, but I think we've got a long way to go on this and I'm really glad it's being  
8  
9 discussed. Thank you.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Donna Bachle, and Millie Amis, the Leslie Hale.

12  
13 DONNA BACHLE: Hello, I'm Donna Bachle; I live at 25 Edwards Avenue, and  
14  
15 the woman who just spoke before me pretty much said almost everything I wanted to  
16  
17 say.

18  
19 I'm not opposed to a new ferry structure, but the massive industrial size of this is  
20  
21 just too overwhelming for our beautiful little town. I feel that the focus seems to be on  
22  
23 just moving more tourists and bikes in and out of this town, and we are just overrun as it  
24  
25 is. I would feel like we should start focusing on how to make the citizens of our town  
26  
27 happier and more comfortable.

28  
29 One thing that we've not discussed much is the lighting at night. Now that we  
30  
31 know that they're bringing in a big PG&E transformer to run the lights that will run at  
32  
33 night, I have a feeling the amount of light pollution is really going to be a concern for a  
34  
35 lot of us who love our beautiful view of the harbor at night. It will be like looking out on a  
36  
37 stadium, so it might be something to consider when discussing the design further.

38  
39 But I am totally opposed to the size of this. Thank you.

40  
41 CHAIR COX: Okay, next is Millie Amis, then Leslie Hale, then Pat Zuch.

42  
43 MILLIE AMIS: I'm Millie Amis and I think pretty much what I had to say has been  
44  
45 spoken by the public. I just ask that scale and aesthetics be taken into consideration as  
46  
47 they relate to our town.  
48  
49  
50



1 I think this is a very industrial looking ramp or whatever, and gate, and think that  
2  
3 we've kept industry out of Sausalito, and we want to keep it out. We want it to have a  
4  
5 character of a village, and I think that if you can consider the aesthetics in our small  
6  
7 town, it would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for letting me speak.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Leslie Hale, the Pat Zuch, then Janet Dean.  
10

11 LESLIE HALE: I'm Leslie Hale and I would like to address the fact that aside  
12  
13 from the aesthetics and the very modern structure that I'm not very happy with, I have  
14  
15 not heard very much about the ferries. My understanding is that ships like this; their  
16  
17 lifespan is about 40 years. You're talking about our ferries being 40 years now, and so I  
18  
19 wonder what their impact is on our bay. Also, you talked about the Spaulding vessel and  
20  
21 the catamarans. We have Spaulding coming into Sausalito, but catamarans have a  
22  
23 shallower draft; they don't need as much deep water. Why aren't we using catamarans?  
24  
25 They are more fuel-efficient. Why isn't that being addressed? Why aren't we getting  
26  
27 more modern ferries instead retrofitting the existing ferries that are so old with so many  
28  
29 problems, even putting big doors on them? There's got to be another way, and then  
30  
31 maybe we don't need this huge structure to accommodate these ferries. Maybe we  
32  
33 should be doing something else all the way around and take a step back and rethink the  
34  
35 entire project.  
36  
37

38 I am in favor of the ferry. I think we need a ferry in Sausalito, but I'd like to see  
39  
40 one that will last more than 20 or 30 years. Thank you.  
41

42 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next is Pat Zuch, then Janet Dean, and then  
43  
44 Neil Whitelaw.  
45

46 PAT ZUCH: Hi, I'm Pat Zuch. I think I should point out to the audience that they  
47  
48 can easily find out why this design concept was developed as it was if they go to the  
49  
50

1 Moffatt & Nichol website. Moffatt & Nichol is an internationally known, humongous cargo  
2 ship and transit developer. They have one picture of a ferry landing, and that is San  
3 Francisco. They used to have a picture of a ferry landing that was next to a cargo  
4 terminal. The original documentation that Moffatt & Nichol prepared did not even  
5 acknowledge, and apparently didn't know, that this ferry terminal was in the middle of  
6 our Historic District, so I think it's clear that this design was not developed with the  
7 Historic District in mind. You, I think, are going to be giving specific direction, and I have  
8 some specific suggestions.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 As to siting, I think it is appalling that the concrete pier addition has been pushed  
18 so close to the Sausalito Yacht Club. The existing dogleg configuration allows for an  
19 expanse of open water between the club and the facility, and I have no understanding  
20 as to why this massive concrete platform has been moved so close to the ferry landing.  
21

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 The truss gangplank, that gangway, is justified because they have 19 feet of  
27 planking to support. Why not, as I think somebody suggested, divide it into two  
28 gangways, not one? With two gangways you have a lighter individual structure and you  
29 could probably have a much lower profile situation as well as being able to dedicate one  
30 gangway to bikes and one to people.  
31

32  
33  
34  
35  
36 The design elements here are absolutely inconsistent, I think, with any kind of  
37 historic town. It's simply appalling.  
38

39  
40 Finally, if you were looking at any kind of a development of this nature, you  
41 wouldn't consider it without a traffic management plan. Now, I know Mr. Van Meter  
42 thinks that this project is going to considerably reduce congestion. I think if you look at  
43 the exhibit in the presentation materials that show little bicycles spread throughout  
44 Parking Lot 1, and people passing each other by, I think there's a better traffic  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 management plan that might actually include notice that bike parking in Sausalito is full,  
2  
3 or since the ferry is going to a reservation method perhaps, a notice that the ferry for  
4  
5 bikes is full, and put it up with the bridge so that people can turn around and go home  
6  
7 before ending up stranded in Sausalito.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Okay. Again, folks, if we can hold our applause, we'll get through  
10  
11 more quickly. I still have a large number of people who would like to speak. We're going  
12  
13 to hear next from Janet Dean, then Neil Whitelaw, and Aaron Singer.  
14

15 JANET DEAN: Janet Dean, I'm 166 Cazneau Avenue. I have a personal  
16  
17 comment, and then I want to read what my Godmother, Velma Campbell, who is 100  
18  
19 years old, wrote about this project.  
20

21  
22 The first thing I want to say is that this meeting is unacceptable. There is no  
23  
24 Internet streaming happening, it's not on television. No, somebody went to the library to  
25  
26 check. It's not live streaming. When you're in the hall, as I was, there is an echo  
27  
28 because there is a lag between what is being said here and what is being said there, so  
29  
30 basically, even if we're here, we're not hearing, we're not seeing, we don't know what is  
31  
32 going on. I think that the next meeting should probably be at the Spinnacker.  
33

34 This is what Velma wrote in her own hand at age 100. I'm nervous.  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Did you give a copy of that to us?  
37

38 JANET DEAN: No, but I'll give it to you.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Okay, please.  
41

42 JANET DEAN: It's historic. "What did the Golden Gate Bridge District give for  
43  
44 this proposed massive expansion? When did they apply? When did the City inform us?  
45  
46 Elected Council members do not defy the people who elected them! The last time this  
47  
48 happened was 1998 when Council members wanted to turn MLK into the Bay Club, a  
49  
50

1 private club, and build a two-story shopping center on the downtown parking lot. We  
2 stopped them with an initiative. This too must be stopped. To reiterate, what is the real  
3 purpose of this massive development?”  
4

5  
6  
7 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next we have Neil Whitelaw, then Aaron Singer,  
8 then Denise Suto.  
9

10  
11 NEIL WHITELAW: Good evening, everyone. I'm Neil Whitelaw, resident of 48  
12 years.  
13

14  
15 I didn't write this ahead of time. These are some notes I typed so I don't miss the  
16 points I want to bring up. Two things to start out with though.  
17

18  
19 I'm really kind of surprised, if not shocked, that these two committees, from what  
20 I could see, about 80% had not been in touch with the public of Sausalito as to what the  
21 public wants. That's kind of amazing to me.  
22

23  
24  
25 And two is everybody is talking as if this is a done deal already. I didn't know it  
26 was a done deal, so I'm going to start now.  
27

28  
29  
30 Back whenever it was, Mauro Dosolini, who started Caffè DiVino and is now the  
31 owner of Sausalito Seahorse, and I met with the City manager and talked about things,  
32 and said, "This isn't right." And so were the beginnings of a committee that was known  
33 as "No on B," because nobody listened to what the people wanted, and people decided  
34 we need to take this into our own hands. It's our town, we live here, this is for us;  
35 everything else is a side issue. So that's how the committee No on B started. People  
36 think I dropped out of it because I wasn't getting my way, and that was not true at all. I  
37 dropped out so I could appear to neutral, so nobody would think I was against this or  
38 against that, that I would listen to everybody impartially, and that's the stand I take.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 I'm amazed at how similar this whole process is to the No on B issue. There were  
2  
3 the beginnings of the new public safety building. The small committees hadn't paid  
4  
5 attention to what the City residents wanted, the people that pay their salaries  
6  
7 essentially, wanted, and so it had to come to a vote, and No on B won, and we stopped  
8  
9 this monstrosity of a building, or two buildings, for the police and fire department, from  
10  
11 happening.

12  
13 I'm seeing some of the same issues here. Too big, too ugly, too expensive. I'll  
14  
15 detail that out a little bit.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: We're giving everybody three minutes, but there are going to be  
18  
19 three more hearings, and if you have written it down, I would appreciate it if you would  
20  
21 send it so that we can look at it. We have 43 letters we've seen from residents in our  
22  
23 packet so far.

24  
25 NEIL WHITELOW: Absolutely, you got it.

26  
27 CHAIR COX: Appreciate it. Okay, next is Aaron Singer, then Denise Suto, and  
28  
29 David Suto.

30  
31 AARON SINGER: Hi, I'm Aaron Singer; I've been here since 1994 and own  
32  
33 several businesses in Sausalito. My family currently owns Seaplane Adventures at the  
34  
35 north end of town. Seaplanes have been woven into the fabric here for a long, long  
36  
37 time, since 1946.

38  
39 But I'm also Chairman of the Sausalito Chamber of Commerce. I wanted to make  
40  
41 a few comments just from that standpoint, which is I actually was introduced to  
42  
43 Sausalito in 1976 when I came here with my grandmother. I grew up in a little town in  
44  
45 Oklahoma, and my grandmother always wanted to come to not only San Francisco, but  
46  
47 where she really wanted to come was Sausalito. This I was one of her dream places,  
48  
49  
50

1 and being from a small town in Oklahoma, people didn't really travel that much in 1976  
2  
3 where I came from, so it was a special trip. I actually still have a Sally Stanford doll in  
4  
5 my house that my grandmother bought while she was here.  
6

7         The tourist and hospitality industry is a huge part of our town; it's a huge part of  
8  
9 the economic activity in Sausalito. In Sausalito people come from literally all over world  
10  
11 and in a single summer, last summer, at Seaplane Adventures we flew people from 47  
12  
13 countries. Forty-seven countries. Pretty amazing.  
14

15         So the ferry is one of the modes of transportation that people take in and out of  
16  
17 Sausalito. I also commuted for three years into the City and I took my bike, and so I  
18  
19 know how that whole process is, and I think we can all agree at least that the current  
20  
21 configuration is fairly substandard, even though it was only built 20 years ago.  
22

23         Nonetheless, everywhere is growing, and we're no different. San Francisco is  
24  
25 growing. Sausalito is growing. Tourist activity into our beautiful city and town is growing,  
26  
27 so I do believe that this is a good project. I would like to actually commend BCDC and  
28  
29 the District for starting to work with the folks who live here. I think it's important that  
30  
31 BCDC listen to some of this commentary and criticism, but it is a good project for our  
32  
33 town. Mr. Van Meter brought up some good points. Congestion is a huge problem; we  
34  
35 need to reduce that too, so I would consider this favorably.  
36  
37

38         CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next is Denise Suto, then David Suto, then Peter  
39  
40 Pastreich.  
41

42         DENISE SUTO: Hello, my name is Denise Suto; I live on 411 Locust Street.  
43

44         I had the benefit of sitting next to one of our local architects, so I wasn't  
45  
46 concerned. I'm confident that there is enough creativity that our aesthetics will be taken  
47  
48 care of. I appreciate the comments and feedback that people have given and agree that  
49  
50

1 we want to reduce the visual impact, so the swing gate has the least visual impact. The  
2  
3 lower the flat also. We looked at all the different angles, and my perspective is one of  
4  
5 the pedestrian. Because my husband rides the ferry I'm the one who gets the view  
6  
7 walking with the dog to greet him, and I heartily agree with Peter Van Meter that this is  
8  
9 needed and it's vital.

10  
11 I would say one of the reasons why we stayed in Sausalito is because there is a  
12  
13 livelihood here as far as in people who ride the ferry. I don't think they're very well  
14  
15 represented in this meeting right now, but it's just a wonderful group of people who  
16  
17 enjoy the ferry and it is, frankly, less intrusive transportation riding the ferry versus the  
18  
19 buses, which are not that great; there is a lot of pollution with the buses and we can't  
20  
21 control that. And it's the most environmentally friendly compared to the automobiles. So  
22  
23 I think that's vitally important too, and it's also important to think about the people who  
24  
25 are riding the ferry.

26  
27  
28 For the people who are walking around it, increasing that so the traffic can move  
29  
30 in and out is important and I agree that this is a vital project. It's important that it isn't  
31  
32 derailed, but I think that we can come up with a solution to address some of the  
33  
34 aesthetics, most if not all of them, as well as the traffic issues.

35  
36 I think that this is a reality factor of Sausalito is a tourist town. It's part of our  
37  
38 livelihood and it's important to the City of Sausalito. One of the reasons why we have  
39  
40 some of the benefits other towns don't have is because we do have dollars from  
41  
42 tourism. I appreciate all of the boutique businesses that wouldn't be able to exist without  
43  
44 those tourism dollars. There is industry, so there are people's livelihoods that are being  
45  
46 impacted.

1           There are environmental issues, but it's also a safety issue. I've watched the  
2  
3 people, because again, I'm walking from the perspective of watching everyone cram  
4  
5 and jam in there, and I have watched during some storms when that float moves up and  
6  
7 down and I think it's just vitally important that ADA compliance, it's a reality, and at the  
8  
9 end of the day we're blessed, because the thing we're wringing our hands over is  
10  
11 aesthetics, so thank you.

12  
13           CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next is David Suto, then Peter Pastreich, then  
14  
15 Stephen Barber.

16  
17           DAVID SUTO: Hi, my name is David Suto; 411 Locust.

18  
19           I also agree with Peter Van Meter's comments. I think his design aesthetic  
20  
21 choices I would agree with. I also think if we're going to go to colors, maybe find a color  
22  
23 scheme that breaks up the structure to make it less imposing.

24  
25           I'm an engineer, so I understand the engineering aspects to this, and I guess the  
26  
27 whole engineering and the scale of the project kind of came from the ten minute  
28  
29 disembarking and boarding, and I guess one of my questions would be why was that  
30  
31 ten minutes chosen over like 15 minutes, for instance? Because at 15 minutes it's five  
32  
33 minutes longer, but you'd be able to reduce your boarding capacity by 50% maybe, or at  
34  
35 least 25%.

36  
37           Also I'm concerned about circulation on the boat. You have the bicycles coming  
38  
39 in two at a time rather quickly, and once you get about 100 bikes on that boat I think  
40  
41 your boarding speed will drop drastically, just something I've seen.

42  
43           But I do appreciate being able to board more efficiently. The 6:45 ferry in the  
44  
45 evenings during the summer, we regularly leave San Francisco at 7:00 or 7:10  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 sometimes because the boarding. It takes 20 minutes for bikes to get off that boat, and I  
2  
3 would really like to have the improved.  
4

5 I also know that the Spaulding boats are much better in storms than the  
6  
7 catamarans. Take a catamaran from Larkspur during a storm and see if you enjoy the  
8  
9 ride, especially once you get into the open water. I think after you lose your lunch you'll  
10  
11 agree the Spauldings are better.  
12

13 I guess the last thing to understand is I think some of this federal money is tied to  
14  
15 the disaster preparedness, and being able to evacuate people efficiently from San  
16  
17 Francisco in the financial area, so that's another reason to have the ramps as wide as  
18  
19 they are is to efficiently get people out of San Francisco and turn the boats around and  
20  
21 get more people out. Things to consider.  
22

23 Finally, if people need to look at the scale of this project, while it's not perfect,  
24  
25 probably the closest model to what we have proposed here is the Oakland end of  
26  
27 (inaudible) floats over in San Francisco right now. They have coverings on them, but  
28  
29 otherwise their scale is very similar to what's being proposed here, I think. Thank you.  
30  
31

32 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Peter Pastreich, then Stephen Barber, then  
33  
34 Clayton Smith.  
35

36 PETER PASTREICH: My name is Peter Pastreich; I'm the former executive  
37  
38 director of the San Francisco Symphony. I'm a Sausalito resident and have been a  
39  
40 regular commuter on the ferries.  
41

42 I think there is an underestimation of how much people like being in crowds,  
43  
44 something I've learned both at the Symphony and on the ferry. To me, the idea of a 21-  
45  
46 foot wide gangplank makes no sense whatsoever. If it has to be increased to 9-10 feet, I  
47  
48 could see that, it will make it more efficient, but it doesn't need to be. People like being  
49  
50

1 together. Part of the thrill of being on the ferry is being with other people, and I find the  
2 charm of getting on the ferry and being on the ferry is part of what makes it so nice to  
3 live in Sausalito.  
4

5  
6  
7 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next is Stephen Barber, then Clayton Smith,  
8 then David Schonbrunn.  
9

10  
11 STEPHEN BARBER: I've lived here for 42 years and I've loved every minute of  
12 it, and it's just wonderful that they want to do something now and that you all want to do  
13 something and make it better.  
14

15  
16 I'm concerned that there's only one design. I think there should be more than one  
17 design. I think we should have a choice. I mean I can choose Jack in the Box or  
18 McDonald's. I should get a few choices. There needs to be some more perspective  
19 here. It seems like it should not go forward until something is done.  
20

21  
22 And it's not quite Sausalito yet. The design that you have is a good design, but  
23 it's somewhere else, I don't know. It's some other place; it's not Sausalito. So I'm  
24 concerned that the design needs to transform a bit before we get serious.  
25

26  
27 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Clayton Smith, then David Schonbrunn, the  
28 Nate Berkowitz.  
29

30  
31 CLAYTON SMITH: Yes, this under the category of if you build it, they will come.  
32 This is a very expensive project. It is obviously intended to increase throughput of  
33 people in and out of the town, and I think it's very disingenuous to assume that they  
34 don't have additional facility to add boats to this route, because if you go up to Larkspur,  
35 particularly on the busy weekends, there's not much going on in Larkspur, and pulling  
36 one or two of those boats out of Larkspur and putting them out here in Sausalito is  
37 pretty much a brainless function. It's just a few computer strokes. So this whole idea of  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 well we'll get to that later, or we haven't thought about it... I don't know, we haven't  
2  
3 thought about it. I'm sure they've thought about it, and they thought about it deeply,  
4  
5 which is why this is a major concern for them to increase this throughput.  
6

7         And then we hear about growth. The one thing that's not growing is the  
8  
9 geographic footprint of our communities: Sausalito, Mill Valley, Tam Valley, Muir  
10  
11 Woods, Stinson Beach. We live in, I would almost say, a damn tourist nightmare, and  
12  
13 we are basically getting tired of it. People who live in Marin County are tired of being  
14  
15 inundated by so many people. I don't come down to Sausalito, which I used to. I've lived  
16  
17 here since 1969. Sausalito on the weekends is a very distasteful place to come. The  
18  
19 closest I will get here is the parking lot at the Spinnaker. I will not come down and walk  
20  
21 around in this town on the weekends, even though I live right up the road here.  
22

23         Now, the other thing I'd like to say in terms of their presentation, and this goes to  
24  
25 something I went through at that meeting about the transportation agency when they  
26  
27 were presenting the idea of reworking the Greenbrae intersection, we need a three-  
28  
29 dimensional model. With the amount of money that the Bridge District has, they  
30  
31 shouldn't send us these cheap photographs. What they need to do is put some clay on  
32  
33 a piece of plywood and show us what it really looks like and the real alternatives, and  
34  
35 maybe what we have right now, so people can actually see what it is that they're  
36  
37 presenting. Because I tell you, most people cannot get a touch and feel about what's  
38  
39 going down here. With all the money, and I say all the money, they gotta have the  
40  
41 money somewhere in their cash drawer to come up with that model so we can get a  
42  
43 sense of what's really being proposed. Thank you.  
44

45         CHAIR COX: Thank you. For those of you who are sitting in the overflow room, I  
46  
47 want to let you know there are about ten seats now open here in the main room, if you  
48  
49  
50

1 want to come over. Next up to speak is David Schonbrunn, then Nate Berkowitz, then  
2  
3 Jann Johnson.  
4

5 DAVID SCHONBRUNN: I couldn't disagree more with the previous speaker than  
6  
7 if I had tried. I came tonight because of this very alarmist door hanger that somebody  
8  
9 put a very large amount of money into to freak people out essentially and turn them into  
10  
11 panicked hoards.  
12

13 Frankly, I was not able to see the presentations, because the City has not made  
14  
15 facilities available for large overflow crowds. I couldn't hear, I couldn't see, so I've  
16  
17 missed the technical details of this.  
18

19 But I believe that what I heard was that the float, which is deeper, needs to be in  
20  
21 deeper water, and that raises the question, could the area where the float would  
22  
23 otherwise be be dredged, so as to provide the clearance that would then allow, I  
24  
25 believe, a shorter access ramp, which then might reduce the height of the truss? So it's  
26  
27 possible to collapse all of this, I believe from what I was able to hear but not see, if it  
28  
29 was all compressed in space and that would in and of itself make it less intrusive.  
30  
31

32 So I was expecting who knows what at this hearing, but what I heard were a lot  
33  
34 of very thoughtful concerns about aesthetics that sounded quite appropriate to me, and  
35  
36 so obviously that's why you're empaneled. I used to be on the Tam Design Review  
37  
38 Board before I moved here, but now I live on Bridgeway in the midst of all of the tourist  
39  
40 hubbub, and it's kind of fun. My cousin said to me that it's like being in a resort.  
41

42 So what I wanted to say is that faster loading is good. I'm an occasional user of  
43  
44 the ferry. The idea that there was ten-minute access time was entirely an appropriate  
45  
46 process in terms of setting the goal for this. The faster the vehicle can turn around, the  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 more trips that you can get with the same crew, so it's an absolute good to move people  
2  
3 faster.

4  
5 This is not an issue of flooding the town with tourists; it's a matter of having  
6  
7 people get here in a way that doesn't involve cars. What could possibly be better?  
8

9 Thank you.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Sir, she would like to have your door hanger.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I didn't receive one and I'm just  
14  
15 curious to what it says and if it is inaccurate. Thank you.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay, Nate Berkowitz, then Jann Johnson, then William Meehan.  
18  
19 And I only have another three speaker cards after that. If there is anyone else who  
20  
21 would like to speak but hasn't given us a speaker card, please do so, so that we can  
22  
23 include you in this dialogue.  
24

25 NATE BERKOWITZ: My name is Nate Berkowitz. I've been kicking around  
26  
27 Sausalito for 55 years or more.  
28

29  
30 I want to applaud the engineering department of Golden Gate Bridge, because it  
31  
32 gave us a good engineering setup of what the issues are that require them to build the  
33  
34 project they've got in mind. However, like war is too important to be left to the generals,  
35  
36 boats, piers and flouting docks really are too important to be left just to the engineers.  
37

38 What we're hearing is that we need a little more artistic ability to it. I'd like to see  
39  
40 a naval architect involved; I'd like to see some green ideas involved.  
41

42 Then I want to bring out the fact that we're taking this whole project out of  
43  
44 context. The real context is Sausalito has one hell of a transportation mess. You can't  
45  
46 walk on the sidewalks, nor can you walk on the streets, and until you compromise this  
47  
48 program by laying it right in front of one of our best pieces of real estate, which is  
49  
50

1 nothing more than a parking lot. It is the stupidest thing of all. Where we should have a  
2  
3 building similar to the City opera house, what we've got is a parking lot. And we don't  
4  
5 have it just for cars; in the summertime it's full of bicycles. Now, if you think that that  
6  
7 adds class to this city, you're wrong.  
8

9 Ergo, I think this is a good project; I think it's needed. I think we also need some  
10  
11 kind of a wave breakwater stretching out from the shoreline somewhere along the  
12  
13 waterfront, because we also need to berth small boats. We need to be able to bring a  
14  
15 small dinghy into town, into a public facility. We don't have it.  
16

17 What you've got to think about is the overall situation, and until we think about  
18  
19 the whole package, to vote on this is really wrong. Thank you.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next we have Jann Johnson, then William  
22  
23 Meehan, then Suzanne Gooch.  
24

25 JANN JOHNSON: Hi, Jann Johnson, 301 Second Street. Thank you for this  
26  
27 meeting. I believe in participatory democracy, so I am glad that the public outcry forced  
28  
29 this to be able to become transparent. I have a bunch of questions I'd like to be  
30  
31 answered at some point.  
32

33 The contract in 1995 said that the lease for this property was \$600 a year, kind of  
34  
35 of low in my opinion. It said the City could increase it every five years according to the  
36  
37 consumer price index. I'd like to know from the City, has this been done, and if not, why  
38  
39 not?  
40

41 The proposed new ticket location is actually not on the leased property. In the  
42  
43 current contract it will be on City property, so does the Bridge District propose to pay us  
44  
45 for that? The Bridge District is supposed to police and keep and maintain their part of  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 the property, so will they then maintain this area that's going to be littered with trash  
2  
3 from all the tourists, or is that going to be up to the City for policing?  
4

5 I am all for ADA and access, but it seems to me a two-lane highway that will  
6  
7 accommodate a Sherman tank is a little bit large for our needs, and it's ugly. Sorry.  
8

9 And no offense, but we're a population of 7,000 people. Most of the residents do  
10  
11 not want to encourage increased tourist bikes. I'm all for resident bikes, but proposing to  
12  
13 accommodate 1,000 to 3,000 bicycles per day now with an increase, that's like half the  
14  
15 population of Sausalito running through ten blocks of town to a ferry stop. The bicycle  
16  
17 companies are now providing packed lunches, so they're not even going to stop and  
18  
19 buy lunch in Sausalito; they're just going to litter it all and leave it here.  
20

21 And I have read somewhere, and I could be wrong, but people keep saying this  
22  
23 decreases cars and it's good for the environment. Somewhere in all this reading I read  
24  
25 that it's actually more carbon intensive to come to Sausalito by ferry than it is by car. I  
26  
27 don't know if that's accurate, or if that's based on the old boats and not on the new  
28  
29 boats, but I'd like to know what the reality is.  
30

31 The last thing is you kind of skirted over any landside improvements that this  
32  
33 would need, and I think that's a little disingenuous. I'm about to enter my fixed-income  
34  
35 years and I'd like to know what exactly this is going to cost the property owners of  
36  
37 Sausalito in landside improvements that are required for this in terms of increased  
38  
39 property taxes or increased bonds? And I think before this passes we all need to know  
40  
41 that, because we may not be able to afford to live here anymore. Thank you.  
42  
43

44 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, next I have Suzanne Gooch, and then John  
45  
46 Dyer, and that's all the speaker cards I have, so if there's anybody else who wants to  
47  
48 speak.  
49  
50

1 While he's approaching the mic, I want to let those of you know who couldn't  
2 hear or couldn't see that the City will be posting this on its website. Yes, Lilly?

3  
4  
5 LILLY SCHINSING: I'm just going to take the opportunity to say to the comment  
6 that this is not live streaming right now, it has been live streaming in the other room the  
7 entire time, and we checked with someone that they're able to watch it outside of  
8 Sausalito. So it is live streaming right now and it will be archived, just like all other  
9 Planning Commission meetings.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 CHAIR COX: So anybody who was out in the hall or couldn't see or hear clearly,  
16 you may watch this meeting again online on the Sausalito website. Okay.  
17  
18

19 WILLIAM MEEHAN: Hi, I'm Bill Meehan. I love the tourists largely because they  
20 remind me that I live someplace beautiful that people want to come to; in the daily life  
21 you can forget that, and it's nice to be reminded.  
22  
23  
24

25 This ferry terminal doesn't seem to me to be a tourist question. This seems to be  
26 they want to turn our city into a transportation hub. They want to turn us into something  
27 like an airport, and I think it's just going to take over the whole town.  
28  
29

30 The thing about the cars, it being fewer cars, those cars are going to be here.  
31 The cars that aren't going to be on the road, because people are on the ferry, they're  
32 going to be here. They're going to be on our streets and our parking lots. That's how  
33 you get to the ferry. I mean some people may be coming by bike, but if there's going to  
34 be an increase in commuter traffic from Marin to San Francisco via ferry, there are  
35 going to be a whole bunch of cars here. I think the whole thing about taking X number of  
36 cars off the road is really quite disingenuous.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 I don't think we should trust the Golden Gate Commission. Not that they're  
47 dishonest, but they have their own set of ideas of what they want to do and what they  
48  
49  
50



1 think is reasonable. Their idea of reasonable reductions is 3 feet here, 2 feet here, a  
2  
3 couple of more feet there. They're talking in terms of shelters for people to take refuge  
4  
5 from the crowds that they're planning to attract. Thank you very much, no. I think this is  
6  
7 a mistake. I think that to the extent that the City is the owner of this property and has an  
8  
9 ability to prevent this, this particular size of a project, I think you have a responsibility to  
10  
11 the citizens to do that. Thank you.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Suzanne Gooch, and then John Dyer. Suzanne  
14  
15 left? Okay, John Dyer.

16  
17 JOHN DYER: Hi, I'm John Dyer. One of the things that I guess I learned tonight  
18  
19 was that the scope of this project is as large as it is because of this offload rate target of  
20  
21 700-plus people projected in ten minutes rather than the 600 people in 30 minutes max  
22  
23 right now.

24  
25 Apparently the other thing I learned was certain things have been rejected, like  
26  
27 more ferry trips, another ferry, or even more electric hybrid buses, and I don't  
28  
29 understand why those options have been rejected. This whole thing has been driven  
30  
31 because of that offload rate. By the way, instead of 600 people in 30 minutes, what are  
32  
33 you going to do with 700 people in ten minutes? More people in a more concentrated  
34  
35 amount of time; that's going to mean more congestion in that area.

36  
37  
38 And the other thing I thought of is what happens when this number gets larger in  
39  
40 2022, 2024. It's at 700-plus now. Eight hundred, 900, 1,000? Does that mean we get an  
41  
42 even larger structure out there? At some point Sausalito is just too small for this. I left  
43  
44 San Francisco a few years ago to avoid some of these problems, and I just keep seeing  
45  
46 more and more of these over the last two years trying to happen in this town.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 I'm in favor of updating the present facility, but not at the scale that is being  
2 talked about; at a much smaller scale I think makes sense. Thank you.  
3  
4

5 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Ann.  
6

7 ANN ARNOTT: Ann Arnott. I've lived here for over 50 years.  
8

9 A lot of good questions have been asked of this group, all of you, and a lot of  
10 people had good suggestions. There is a perception in town, whether it's real or not,  
11 that nobody is really listening, that this is a slam-dunk and it's going to go through no  
12 matter what any of us say. So I'm asking this group here now, please, it's recorded,  
13 you've been patient. I've sat through this whole thing myself. Listen to some of these  
14 things. The best government is compromise.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 We have a problem here. There are just more people in the world, people, and  
22 we're not going to be able to keep them all out of here, whether we like it or not. So we  
23 have a problem, we need a solution, and I think most people agree on that. I'm just  
24 saying I hope the Bridge District and everybody else, paid attention. There were lots of  
25 terrific questions and comments, and that you're going to really make us feel that you  
26 listened to them and you're going to respond to them, because that's as important as all  
27 of this other stuff. Perception can move people, and now you've got this mentality and  
28 with all the technology we have, a lot of misinformation can be out there, and now  
29 you've got another problem with people feeling like gee, I'm a little person and I live  
30 here, and nobody cares what I say anyhow. So that's my comment.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, thanks everybody who commented or gave us  
43 questions. We're going to take between a five and 15 minute break to give staff the  
44 opportunity to compile the questions, and then they will decide which questions they'll  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 address this evening and which questions they'll save for written feedback from the  
2  
3 District in our next staff report.  
4

5 For people who are leaving, Lilly, when is our next meeting? April 1<sup>st</sup> is the next  
6  
7 joint HLB and Planning Commission meeting, and that will actually be a formal meeting,  
8  
9 not just a study session. So thanks to all of those who came. Everything will be open to  
10  
11 public comment, and we will talk to staff about perhaps a different venue or figuring out  
12  
13 a better way to make sure everybody can see and hear the presentation.  
14

15 Okay, so I'm now going to close public comment, and when we come back it will  
16  
17 be time for questions and answers up here, and then for the comments up here. Okay,  
18  
19 we're going to take a break. Thanks.  
20

21 (INTERMISSION)  
22

23 CHAIR COX: Okay, folks. Welcome back. We took a little longer than we had  
24  
25 estimated. Staff was making a valiant effort to really compile all of the questions that  
26  
27 were posed during our Q&A and comment period, so that's the reason for the delay, but  
28  
29 we're going to get started. I think we're going to start out with having staff call out some  
30  
31 of the questions, and give the District an opportunity to give us some feedback. But we  
32  
33 want to make sure to leave time for the folks up here who have studied the plans and  
34  
35 specifications and the narrative to give some initial feedback to the District that the  
36  
37 District can use in submitting their application.  
38

39 So Lilly, even if you can't project, you can just call them out.  
40

41 LILLY SCHINSING: That's fine. You have a microphone at the table. Chair Cox,  
42  
43 do you prefer they come to the dais to answer the questions?  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: No, I don't mind if they pass the microphone. It's really important  
2  
3 that you speak into the microphone. I got a lot of complaints during the break that  
4  
5 people could not hear and understand what folks were saying.  
6

7 LILLY SCHINSING: The first question is can more attention be paid to the color  
8  
9 of the structure?  
10

11 JOHN EBERLE: The district would look for feedback from the Commission on  
12  
13 that.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Great. Next.  
16

17 LILLY SCHINSING: Can the width of the structure be reduced?  
18

19 JOHN EBERLE: The 21-foot width of the structure is the reduction that we've  
20  
21 determined is the minimum.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: But that 21-foot width is the width necessary to accommodate the  
24  
25 load you have calculated, correct?  
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: No, there are two different structures. The 16-foot structure,  
28  
29 that's for the load. The 21-foot structure is the access pier. So the 16-foot wide and 90-  
30  
31 foot long structure is on the load, and that there cannot be reduced either.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: So how are we making due now with 5 feet?  
34

35 JOHN EBERLE: We're trying to improve that. That's one of the purposes  
36  
37 (inaudible).  
38

39 CHAIR COX: No, I understand, but in other words, if you did not need to load  
40  
41 people so quickly, if you maintained a smaller, slower loading capacity, could you make  
42  
43 due with 10 feet instead of 21 feet?  
44

45 JOHN EBERLE: One of our desires for this project is for consistency with our  
46  
47 other facilities and to have this speed of loading, so that is why we determined this, and  
48  
49  
50

1 if we go to a smaller facility we will not be able to have that, and it's not our desire when  
2  
3 we look at this project.  
4

5 CHAIR COX: I understand your objections, but I'm asking you is it feasible to  
6  
7 improve this structure to a 10-foot structure instead of a 21-foot structure? If that was  
8  
9 something that the District was committed to doing, could it do so from an engineering  
10  
11 perspective?  
12

13 JOHN EBERLE: We could design and build anything, that's correct.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
16

17 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Can I just pursue that for one moment?  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Please.  
20

21 VICE CHAIR WERNER: If we assume that the 16-foot width on the gangway is  
22  
23 what's is being driven by the 8-foot doors on the ferries, and the 8-foot gangplanks that  
24  
25 connect to a 16-foot landing on the float, and then to the 16-foot gangway, which is now  
26  
27 opening onto a 25-foot that you say might come down to a 21-foot access pier, which  
28  
29 then goes back down to an existing 20-foot landside pier.  
30  
31

32 So you've got a whole series of choke points here that. You've got people lining  
33  
34 up on the landside pier waiting to get on, and people getting off of the ferry. I don't  
35  
36 understand how these two 16-foot streams manage to squeeze through a 20-foot  
37  
38 landside pier and then back through these gates again. Doesn't make sense to me. I  
39  
40 looked at the drawings that you showed and they don't make sense.  
41

42 JOHN EBERLE: What we're proposing is to unload separately from loading, so  
43  
44 the two 16-foot streams would not be simultaneously next to each other. So the 16-foot  
45  
46 pathway would go from the float, up the gangway, and then continue through the new  
47  
48 access pier, and then on to the existing 20-foot landside pier. And the reason for the 21-  
49  
50

1 foot is because the new guardrails will be surface mounted on that 21-foot pier, as  
2  
3 opposed to some other configurations, so the clear distance would be the same as the  
4  
5 landside pier, the 21-foot.  
6

7 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Okay, but the point is still you've got your 16-foot exit or  
8  
9 disembarkation collection, which is bicycles on one side and pedestrians on the other if  
10  
11 they're coming from San Francisco, which rental bikes don't ride over on the ferry, but  
12  
13 nevertheless, let's assume that they're coming off.  
14

15 You've also got an equal amount, if you're going to use it that way, of a 16-foot  
16  
17 collection of people waiting to get on the ferry. How are you going to stop them? Don't  
18  
19 you have a situation where you end up with 32 feet worth of people going next to each  
20  
21 other somewhere?  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: No, folks will have to be managed similarly to how they're  
24  
25 managed now. When you have the 20-foot existing pier, when the vessels are  
26  
27 disembarking, that pier isn't full of 20 feet wide of people waiting to board.  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: That's right, it all happens on the 20-foot wide landside  
30  
31 pier now, which has the lanes divided by some benches. You can just shove so much  
32  
33 through narrow space going in both directions. How are you going to patrol it,  
34  
35 especially if you want to move the gate even further out over the water? What you're  
36  
37 creating is a situation where people want to get out onto this access pier. BCDC wants  
38  
39 you to have people sitting out there on benches, munching on the burgers they picked  
40  
41 up across the street, with their baby carriages or whatever it is, hopefully to be able to  
42  
43 have a passive view of the bay, and all they're doing is clogging up the process of  
44  
45 disembarkation and embarkation at the same time.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: I'm not saying it will not have to be managed. It will have to be  
2 managed.  
3

4 VICE CHAIR WERNER: By whom?  
5

6 JOHN EBERLE: Currently it's being managed by a combination of District  
7 personnel, and I believe the City is involved with that also.  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: And then you're also going to throw this to the landside  
10 development to try to figure out how to make it work. Otherwise this is a bridge to  
11 nowhere.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay, I'm going to ask Lilly to continue on.  
14

15 BO JENSEN: If we could respond a little bit? One aspect of that that I haven't  
16 heard is just take a look at downtown San Francisco. They have the same situation.  
17 They're fairly crowded, definitely not as significant as the Golden Gate system, but they  
18 are relying to a large extent on the intelligence of the passengers. They don't control  
19 everything. The passengers seem to understand what's going on and it works quite  
20 well. And they have their passengers lined up and they get off, they deboard and they  
21 board, and they do that together, and they don't have policemen holding them apart.  
22

23 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Are you talking about the San Francisco loading area  
24 for the Golden Gate tickets? There are two separate entrances for that.  
25

26 BO JENSEN: Well, take Gate B, for example. It's the same thing. You're  
27 depending on passengers, and so in a sense they're using the intelligence of the  
28 passengers and it seems to work.  
29

30 SECRETARY FRASER: I'm sorry, if I can just say...  
31

32 CHAIR COX: I'm sorry, the public comment period is closed, so I can't take any  
33 more public comment tonight, but people in the audience who would like to comment,  
34

1 please write, or email, or come to a next meeting. Natascha, I'm going to let Lilly  
2  
3 continue with this process, and then we'll have time for comments here. Okay, Lilly.  
4

5 LILLY SCHINSING: Can the design be more reflective of Sausalito's Historic  
6  
7 Downtown District?  
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: And again, we're looking for feedback from the Commission on  
10  
11 what that means.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Lilly.  
14

15 LILLY SCHINSING: Can a dark color like bronze or black be considered?  
16

17 JOHN EBERLE: Yes, it could.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Lilly.  
20

21 LILLY SCHINSING: Is 1:12 the absolute minimum criteria for a ferry landing?  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: 12:1 is the ADA standard requirement, yes.  
24

25 LILLY SCHINSING: How come you have not provided story poles?  
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: We will be providing a story pole or demonstration at the site.  
28

29 LILLY SCHINSING: Is the scale appropriate for Sausalito?  
30

31 JOHN EBERLE: Again, we designed this, as was stated, with the operations and  
32  
33 ADA requirements in mind.  
34

35 LILLY SCHINSING: Is ADA compliance carved in stone, or is there room to  
36  
37 reduce the scale?  
38

39 JOHN EBERLE: 1:12 is set in stone.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: But we already asked the question about reducing the scale. That  
42  
43 would simply take a reduction in the loading capacity.  
44

45 LILLY SCHINSING: Can we take design cues from other ferry landings?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 JOHN EBERLE: We have looked at other ferry landings. We've looked at San  
2  
3 Francisco. We looked up in Washington. If there are other locations that are suggested,  
4  
5 we'll definitely take a look.  
6

7 LILLY SCHINSING: What are the light pollution impacts of this project?  
8

9 JOHN EBERLE: We will not be having the lights on all night long. The lights will  
10  
11 be for when we're operating, and then as security level lighting on the float. The  
12  
13 handrails on the gangway and the pier, those will be on all night and they're straight  
14  
15 down, similar to what is out there now.  
16

17 LILLY SCHINSING: Why can we not use catamarans?  
18

19 JOHN EBERLE: I think this question was posed with respect to shallower draft  
20  
21 catamarans, and the real issue is the float has to be located out in the deeper water; it's  
22  
23 not to do with the drafts of the catamaran coming in closer to shore.  
24

25 LILLY SCHINSING: Why can we not get new vessels instead of retrofitting the  
26  
27 existing?  
28

29 JOHN EBERLE: We're not planning at this time to replace our entire fleet of  
30  
31 vessels with new vessels.  
32

33 LILLY SCHINSING: Can the structure be located to give more relief and water  
34  
35 space to the Sausalito Yacht Club?  
36

37 JOHN EBERLE: The existing dogleg configuration was constructed because of  
38  
39 the other obstructions that were out there at the time, and the way that we have this  
40  
41 currently laid out is as far away from the Yacht Club as possible.  
42

43 LILLY SCHINSING: Why is the width necessary to be 21 feet?  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: Again, the 21 feet, it lines up first of all with the landside pier,  
2  
3 and we have handrails on each side that reduce the interior clear width to the 20 feet,  
4  
5 so that's where the 21 feet comes from.

6  
7 LILLY SCHINSING: Can the design be transformed to be more akin to the  
8  
9 Sausalito aesthetic?

10  
11 JOHN EBERLE: Again, we're looking for feedback tonight.

12  
13 LILLY SCHINSING: Can a 3D model be created in addition to the supplied  
14  
15 photographs?

16  
17 JOHN EBERLE: We are not contemplating making a 3D model.

18  
19 CHAIR COX: Could you? I think that was the question, could you?

20  
21 JOHN EBERLE: Until we have the design features that you're looking for, it's  
22  
23 premature to make a model that's just going to get not used.

24  
25 LILLY SCHINSING: Could the area where the float would be located be dredged  
26  
27 to collapse the project down in scale?

28  
29 JOHN EBERLE: We've already cleared this project environmentally. Dredging is  
30  
31 a big, big environmental concern. We want to avoid dredging whenever possible, and  
32  
33 we're able to design this without dredging.

34  
35 LILLY SCHINSING: Can a naval architect and sustainability trained  
36  
37 professionals be included in the design dialogue?

38  
39 JOHN EBERLE: We do have architects on staff. If there's a dialogue that others  
40  
41 want to contribute, we're willing to listen.

42  
43 LILLY SCHINSING: That concludes the list of questions that were easy to  
44  
45 answer right now. That's about half of them that we captured. So what we'll do is we'll  
46  
47 take all the questions and prepare a FAQ to post online.

1 CHAIR COX: So you'll have a written Q&A separate from the video presentation  
2  
3 for people to be able to review?  
4

5 LILLY SCHINSING: Correct. I'll post it at [www.sausalitoferrylanding.org](http://www.sausalitoferrylanding.org).  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Great. Okay, so I'm going to return. I know not all of the HLB and  
8  
9 Planning Commissioners got to ask their questions. I know all of us want to comment  
10  
11 and provide our feedback. If each of us speaks three minutes, that's 30 minutes  
12  
13 additional time just for each of us to give our comments, so I'd like you to bear that in  
14  
15 mind as you consider what additional questions you want to ask before we move to the  
16  
17 comment period. So HLB, questions?  
18

19 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Chair Cox, I just want to interject quickly with a  
20  
21 procedural question that wasn't really addressed tonight, and this is more addressed to  
22  
23 staff. As part of the process there is an HLB memo that was be created that assessed  
24  
25 the historical significant of this, and I thought that was going to be done prior to the  
26  
27 public meetings. Is that not the case?  
28

29 CHAIR McCOY: That is not the case. This is the first Historic Landmarks Board  
30  
31 meeting where this was an agendized item.  
32

33 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: And through the Chair, could you clarify for me  
34  
35 whether or not this HLB memorandum is underway, and will we be seeing that at some  
36  
37 point in this process, or has that been passed over?  
38

39 CHAIR McCOY: No, the way I understand it, this process is going to operate like  
40  
41 any other joint hearing where our comments and our recommendations will be at the  
42  
43 verbal level during the joint session, just like when we review anything within the  
44  
45 Historic District overlay.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Great. So as a follow up, is anybody reviewing the  
2  
3 property for historical significance that we can then have as reference for our  
4  
5 deliberations?  
6

7 CHAIR McCOY: Technically as a body that's what we're doing this evening and  
8  
9 the next two meetings. This is on our agendized item separately.  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Okay, so Morgan, I'm going to ask you to confer with staff about  
12  
13 how to best accomplish that so that we can keep this process moving.  
14

15 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay, other questions from HLB members?  
18

19 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have two questions based upon what was raised  
20  
21 tonight. One was whether the belvederes could be removed from the access platform?  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: And the second?  
24

25 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: The second is whether a design could be offered to  
26  
27 us about having a dual gangway structure, which would require smaller trusses and  
28  
29 perhaps be a lighter design, for our consideration?  
30

31 JOHN EBERLE: To answer your first question about the belvederes, physically  
32  
33 can they be removed? Yes, they may. They can be removed. In our discussions with  
34  
35 BCDC staff, BCDC staff and the District thought it would improve public access to  
36  
37 include them, and we were being respectful to BCDC staff and that's why they're  
38  
39 included right now. But physically can they be removed? Yes, they don't have to be part  
40  
41 of the design.  
42

43 Your second question...  
44

45 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Had to do with whether a gangway design with  
46  
47 smaller size trusses, smaller in diameter, is feasible.  
48  
49  
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: A dual system is feasible.

2  
3 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Could we be offered a design to look at for that?

4  
5 JOHN EBERLE: We can look at a high-level design of what that would do. The  
6  
7 implications that we have concerns with are it would make the gangway potentially  
8  
9 wider, because you have two trusses on two gangways side-by-side, so it would  
10  
11 potentially increase the width. But we could do a high-level look at that.

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: Other questions from HLB?

16  
17 SECRETARY FRASER: On Exhibit 2 I need some clarification. It's your site  
18  
19 plan. There's reference to a BCDC public access easement and approximate location,  
20  
21 and it says that's where you'd be locating the ticket vending machine and there would  
22  
23 be the relocated newsstand. I haven't heard anything about the public accesses and I  
24  
25 don't have any information. I was wondering if you had some information to share about  
26  
27 that?

28  
29  
30 JOHN EBERLE: BCDC has a public access easement within this area that's  
31  
32 depicted on this exhibit, so BCDC, in addition to their jurisdiction over areas in the water  
33  
34 has this public access easement where they have say on what may or may not go  
35  
36 within that area.

37  
38 SECRETARY FRASER: So it's not an easement that they would have by  
39  
40 agreement with the City of Sausalito, you're saying that...

41  
42 JOHN EBERLE: Their public access easement, I don't know the...

43  
44 EWA BAUER: Their jurisdiction extends 100 feet inland from I believe (inaudible)  
45  
46 low water, or whatever that benchmark is, and they have a say in terms of issuing  
47  
48 agreement on any developments within that 100-foot (inaudible).  
49  
50

1 SECRETARY FRASER: Thank you.

2  
3 CHAIR COX: Is that it?

4  
5 SECRETARY FRASER: That's it for questions, yes.

6  
7 CHAIR COX: Okay. John, question?

8  
9 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Just following on what Board Member Brown  
10  
11 said, is there a design that could be offered to us that has more historic elements  
12  
13 presented in keeping with the Historic District that the ferry landing will be in?  
14

15 JOHN EBERLE: And again, we're looking for feedback from you on what that  
16  
17 really represents.

18  
19 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Was there in the bid process any request for  
20  
21 that element to be included in the design, before the engineering firm that designed it?  
22

23 JOHN EBERLE: There was not a specific item for Sausalito Historic District  
24  
25 features, no.

26  
27 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Could that be something that you discuss, to  
28  
29 add that overlay?  
30

31 JOHN EBERLE: Again, we're looking for feedback from you on what that means,  
32  
33 so to the extent that you give us feedback on that, we will definitely look at it.  
34

35  
36 CHAIR COX: So you just have to frame your comments to ask for whatever  
37  
38 specific historic elements you would like them to consider and incorporate. Other  
39  
40 questions?  
41

42 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No, thank you.

43  
44 CHAIR COX: Okay, Morgan.

45  
46 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you. In the 1995 upgrades and in some of the  
47  
48 comments made by some of the citizens via email that we received, I guess in the 1995  
49  
50

1 plan there was comment that there was a proposal for a covered waiting area, and I  
2  
3 notice that there was also a request for that from some of the citizens for tonight's  
4  
5 application. Had that been considered at all in this process?  
6

7 JOHN EBERLE: Actually, when we designed this we did not consider including  
8  
9 any covered features on this facility.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: My other question is a reiteration of a comment that  
12  
13 one of the members of the public made that I didn't get a chance to answer, but I am  
14  
15 curious. Can the gate be rotated perpendicular to shore in this current design?  
16

17 JOHN EBERLE: I'm trying to locate where that would be on this layout. It's  
18  
19 challenging, so we would have to look at that, how it would still function in that  
20  
21 configuration. Right now, I don't see where it could be located, but we could look.  
22

23 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Okay, thank you.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Okay, Susan? Vicki?  
26

27 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: My question would be, again, to look into the two  
28  
29 trusses situation, and then what else did I want? Can you come back to me?  
30

31 CHAIR COX: Sure. And you're still going to have your time to comment. Bill,  
32  
33 questions?  
34

35 VICE CHAIR WERNER: None.  
36

37 CHAIR COX: I have a couple of questions. I just want to confirm that in  
38  
39 designing this you did not consider Sausalito's General Plan, or Sausalito's Bicycle  
40  
41 Plan, or Sausalito's Historic overlay?  
42

43 JOHN EBERLE: That's correct.  
44

45 CHAIR COX: Do you contemplate any shared use of the landing?  
46  
47

48 JOHN EBERLE: Shared use by?  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Like by other watercraft or other boats?  
2

3 JOHN EBERLE: Blue & Gold is currently using the existing facility and will  
4  
5 continue to use the facility, no one else. We have not contemplated or spoke with  
6  
7 anyone else about using it.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: You indicated that the walkway is elevated 3 feet from the truss  
10  
11 frame, and by that elevation you're increasing the height differential that is subject to the  
12  
13 12:1 ratio. If you used a different support system, could you make the ramp shorter and  
14  
15 more streamlined if you didn't have that 3-foot height differential between the frame and  
16  
17 the walkway?  
18

19 JOHN EBERLE: The way that this is framed; it's lowered already at the pier, if  
20  
21 you look at the cross section. The 12:1 is the 12:1, and regardless of that, that length is  
22  
23 going to be the same.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: You spoke earlier about the fact that the concrete and the—I think  
26  
27 you said—steel support systems were not feasible because of the weight. But if you  
28  
29 loaded fewer people and had a narrower loading ramp or gangway, would those then  
30  
31 alternative support structures become more feasible?  
32

33 JOHN EBERLE: I think you're asking if it's narrower, would the trusses be  
34  
35 smaller, and since there is less load, correct, it would be smaller.  
36  
37

38 CHAIR COX: What is your maintenance plan for the new structure? We, as  
39  
40 residents of Sausalito, have been disappointed in the District's maintenance of the  
41  
42 current system.  
43

44 JOHN EBERLE: They'll will be brand new facilities when they're constructed,  
45  
46 and our maintenance plan, I could get a copy of our maintenance and operation plan.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 CHAIR COX: Okay, I think we'd like to see that. And we'd also like to see your  
2  
3 lifecycle cost projections.  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: Okay.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Okay, I think those are my key questions. Go ahead.  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I have a question.  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Oh, I have one more too.  
12

13 VICE CHAIR WERNER: If one of the primary objectives of this exercise for the  
14 District is to refit all three ferry landings/terminals in San Francisco and Larkspur and  
15 the landing here with main deck loading, and since Sausalito currently is the only one of  
16 those three that has main deck loading, why are you starting here rather than in  
17 Larkspur or San Francisco with this first prototype of the float and all of its hydraulics  
18 and so on and so forth?  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 JOHN EBERLE: Well, frankly, we felt that we were replacing an existing facility  
26 and this project would move along quickly in Sausalito, so we decided to start here.  
27  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: In other words, you thought you could get away with it.  
30  
31 The second question...  
32

33 JOHN EBERLE: Hold on one second.  
34  
35

36 EWA BAUER: The reason we proceeded with Sausalito is because this is one of  
37 three parts of the overall project to basically replace our ferry landing facility at three  
38 locations. If you look at the scope of two other locations, their scope is much larger, and  
39 to give you an example, in Larkspur we are sitting on the edge of a wetland, so we are  
40 dealing with many more issues as well as many more features that we'll have to deal  
41 with at the Larkspur ferry terminal. Compared to San Francisco and Larkspur, this is  
42 simpler and much smaller scope.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yeah, I know, but it's still not doing the job. I mean you  
2  
3 have main deck boarding. If your objective is to have main deck boarding everywhere  
4  
5 else, just because it was easy to do it here doesn't answer my question.  
6

7 EWA BAUER: Okay. The main deck loading from Sausalito right now occurs  
8  
9 through one basically 4-foot opening. The goal of this project is to provide two 8-foot  
10  
11 wide doors, and we heard some comments that express the concern that this is not in  
12  
13 any way a comfortable way for passengers to board and unload those boats, and  
14  
15 (inaudible) the boats. So what we're trying to provide here is, yes, right now it can be  
16  
17 main deck boarding, but it's through one narrow door, so this project will allow us to  
18  
19 board from the main deck in Sausalito and two other locations through two 8-foot doors.  
20

21 MALE: I have one last comment, and that is that John mentioned it well in the  
22  
23 beginning, and that is the condition of the float. It's a steel float, they don't last forever,  
24  
25 so they're looking at it from a safety point of view as well, I'm sure.  
26

27 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Just one more follow up on that, about the  
28  
29 standardization. This is a line from page three of your document that you handed out,  
30  
31 the ferry terminal things. "Standardizing and upgrading the passenger boarding system  
32  
33 will eliminate the need for the use of wheelchair lifts." Are you implying that the disabled  
34  
35 have to stay on the main deck?  
36

37 JOHN EBERLE: We're stating that right now a person in a wheelchair that gets  
38  
39 on in Sausalito somehow has to get up to the upper deck to get off in San Francisco. So  
40  
41 how is that done? It's done with a lift on the boat.  
42

43 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Right.  
44

45 JOHN EBERLE: If you eliminate that, then you could eliminate the lift on the  
46  
47 boat. That's what the comment states and what it means.  
48  
49  
50

1 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So if somebody is in a wheelchair and wants to go  
2  
3 upstairs for a drink, they can't?  
4

5 JOHN EBERLE: They take the lifts currently.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: But the future when you eliminate it...  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Well, but you say you're eliminating it. Or is this  
10  
11 sentence not correct?  
12

13 JOHN EBERLE: We're going to eliminate the lift on the boat; that's what we  
14  
15 intend to do.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: So then wheelchair passengers will not have access to the  
18  
19 facilities.  
20

21 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Wow, there's a lawsuit waiting to happen if there ever  
22  
23 was one.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: They will not have equal access on the boat.  
26

27 JOHN EBERLE: No, we can make equal access on the bottom of the boat.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: My last question had to do with the landside improvements. Have  
30  
31 you all conceived what landside improvements will be necessary to accommodate the  
32  
33 new waterside plans?  
34

35 JOHN EBERLE: The waterside improvements are a standalone project.  
36  
37 Basically it's the same condition as it is functioning now. The landside improvements  
38  
39 are being taken up by the City of Sausalito.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: But have you given any guidance or do you have any design  
42  
43 requests for the City regarding the landside improvements that you will be seeking to  
44  
45 coordinate with your new waterside improvements?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 JOHN EBERLE: We do not have that at this time, the scope being of the  
2  
3 landside improvements as yet to be done.  
4

5 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, if I may add to that, and this has been stated  
6  
7 to the Council level, because this question has come up a few times. The City is going  
8  
9 to undertake the process on the landside improvements. It will be it's own public  
10  
11 process that will involve public input and public hearings and all of that. That process  
12  
13 has not started yet.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: The reason I ask is that I'm concerned about the flexibility that the  
16  
17 City will have for the landside process if the waterside process is already a fait accompli  
18  
19 and there's been no thought given to the coordination of the two.  
20

21 Okay, any other questions?  
22

23 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I did have a couple.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Morgan.  
26

27 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: This is a follow up to I believe the question  
28  
29 regarding the Blue & Gold Fleet in conjunction with the lease terms of the Golden Gate  
30  
31 Ferry using the City property. What does Blue & Gold Fleet pay for their sub-lease?  
32  
33

34 JOHN EBERLE: I do not know that.  
35

36 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: So maybe we can get that information. And then the  
37  
38 other one, there was mention made of concrete as being unacceptable from a weight  
39  
40 standpoint for the gangway. Is lightweight pre-cast not suitable material for that  
41  
42 condition?  
43

44 JOHN EBERLE: That's what we were looking at, and it's still much too heavy.  
45

46 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Okay, thank you.  
47

48 CHAIR COX: Vicki.  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: We had one speaker, maybe two, that talked  
2  
3 about that the project might have been designed for the ten-minute loading time, and  
4  
5 they suggested maybe looking at a longer duration. Is that something that you could do  
6  
7 that might change the loading requirements, say looking at 15 minutes or 20 minutes?  
8  
9 Is that going to significantly change anything in your view in terms of level of service?  
10

11 EWA BAUER: I know it is quite a difficult to explain the basic assumption of the  
12  
13 projected volume of passengers, but I hope I can repeat what John tried to explain.  
14

15 We are looking at a 4% increase per year in the number of passengers, and we  
16  
17 are basing that projection on the volumes from 2009. So we are looking right now at the  
18  
19 situation that the increase in the number of passengers between years 20013-14 was  
20  
21 10%. We are quite into the new year and we see that we may have a repeat of the  
22  
23 situation.  
24

25 The reason I'm saying this is to explain that we are not basing our design on the  
26  
27 true maximum values that we could potentially be facing here. What we tried to do is so-  
28  
29 called "normalize" that projection by using so-called 85% percentile point, which means  
30  
31 that we are rejecting 15% of the highest volume trips and we're going down to the 85%  
32  
33 percentile of the volume, and then looking at this we making our calculations based on  
34  
35 the standards that John explained related to the level of service. What it does is it  
36  
37 creates a certain indication of the time required. However, this means there will still be  
38  
39 15% of trips that will require more time, and this may involved that in high season on  
40  
41 weekends we are not talking about ten minutes, we're talking about going back to  
42  
43 probably 15-20 minutes.  
44

46 Yes, we could design this facility to 10 feet, but if you consider what's going on  
47  
48 with public transit right now, I really think that we need to properly spend the money, we  
49  
50

1 need to look at least 20 years ahead and look at something that in our opinion will be a  
2  
3 valuable asset to more people between Sausalito and San Francisco, and moving  
4  
5 basically not only the tourists, but mostly the people who reside here.  
6

7 I know it's a long explanation, but the 10% is not a number that is used for  
8  
9 scheduling the ferry runs, it is an order of magnitude estimation, what we will see as a  
10  
11 result of building this facility, and then we can compare to what's happening right now  
12  
13 and we can make the judgment, the assessment, saying we're improving the loading  
14  
15 time twice to three times. So this is what it serves.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay. Thank you for answering our questions. I'm now going to  
18  
19 ask first the HLB and then the Planning Commission to provide you with our initial  
20  
21 comments. And again, in the interest of time, I'm going to ask us to limit ourselves to  
22  
23 three minutes of comment to start, and after we get through everybody once at three  
24  
25 minutes apiece, then we can go back and see if somebody has a burning desire to add  
26  
27 to their initial comments. Does that sound okay? Okay. Do you want to start? All right,  
28  
29 who would like to start from the HLB?  
30

31 CHAIR McCOY: I'll start.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: Okay, thanks, John.  
34  
35

36 CHAIR McCOY: First, thank you for the presentation, and thanks to members of  
37  
38 the public, those that are left. I think it's really important and valuable that we have  
39  
40 these publicly noticed and open meetings so we can have board members and  
41  
42 residents and designers, everybody who is attached to this and involved with it, it's  
43  
44 really important to the process.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           When I started looking at this project as a member of the Historic Landmarks  
2  
3 Board it poses a couple of issues for us in the sense of how do we look at it, because it  
4  
5 is in our overlay district and it does impact our Historic District and our historic buildings.  
6

7           That said, the current facility is not an historic monument or a historic structure,  
8  
9 and that being said, ferry service from Sausalito to San Francisco has an extremely  
10  
11 significant historic impact and history on our city. The ferry service is an historic element  
12  
13 to Sausalito and it always has been. The structure that is there now is not.  
14

15           I've been trying to figure out how do I assess that and what criteria do we put to  
16  
17 this when we're talking about designing within an historic overlay district, and there are  
18  
19 a number of things we could look at. The California Secretary of the Interior's Design  
20  
21 Standards, Historic Design Guidelines is one thing we can look at, but this doesn't really  
22  
23 trigger that due to the fact that that's typically applied to structures that have been found  
24  
25 to have a historical significance, and like I said, I don't believe the existing structure  
26  
27 itself meets that. But we are in the historic overlay, so we want to make sure that we do  
28  
29 address the concerns.  
30

31           My concerns are mostly the impact to the Historic District and is it going to be a  
32  
33 positive impact or negative? I think it's going to be a positive impact, and I think a lot of  
34  
35 the speakers that we did hear tonight, even if they have concerns or issues, they  
36  
37 understand that the ferry is integral to Sausalito and our current facility is failing. It's  
38  
39 actually disappointing to me that it lasts 20 years. I'd like to really see the maintenance  
40  
41 plan on that. So we need to do something.  
42  
43

44           But a lot of comments did have to do with aesthetics, and I think we can look at  
45  
46 this one more time. I think you've heard a lot of comments, and I agree with them, if we  
47  
48 can look at doing three trusses just to lower the mass, to bring it down. If that were  
49  
50

1 feasible, I would strongly urge you to research that and come back to us either with an  
2  
3 alternate design or really help us get our head around why that can't happen.  
4

5         Again, those belvederes have been problematic for me from the beginning. I  
6  
7 understand the BCDC requirements. I would again request that you at least try to meet  
8  
9 with them again and express what you've heard here tonight from the members of the  
10  
11 public and what you may or may not hear about people who have some disappointment  
12  
13 with those and see if it that has an impact on their decision. Thanks.  
14

15           CHAIR COX: Okay. Thanks.  
16

17           SECRETARY FRASER: Hi. In the interest of time I'll just say I agree with what  
18  
19 John has said so far and I'll try not to repeat any of that.  
20

21           One of the things that first caused me concern when I read the bundle of  
22  
23 documents—and thank you for these, I'm glad I got the colored copies versus the black  
24  
25 and white—was that there was a reference on page two, “The City of Sausalito’s  
26  
27 Historic District is located to the south of west of the site,” but you're in the Historic  
28  
29 District site; you're an integral part of it, and that's just an important thing, I think, to  
30  
31 keep in mind. I think that your being here, and from what I've heard so far from your  
32  
33 presentation, you're interested in our feedback and you do want to hear from us some  
34  
35 design recommendations, and I appreciate that.  
36  
37

38           I think one of the concerns that I have is that I've heard that you want this site to  
39  
40 be consistent with the Larkspur and San Francisco sites, but we are a very different site.  
41  
42 So while I respect that you want that consistency, I would hope that you just keep in  
43  
44 mind that there is also a huge difference in the nature of this town where the ferry  
45  
46 landing is located.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 One of the concerns that I have, and I haven't heard addressed at all, is this  
2  
3 greater ferry landing is going invite greater service, which is great. I love the ferry. I was  
4  
5 raised here. I ride the ferry, I ride the buses, and I hope more people use it. But it's also  
6  
7 going to cause greater traffic to the parking lots, there's going to be greater congestion,  
8  
9 I think. I don't know if there's a way that you could participate in helping resolve that. If  
10  
11 you're going to be inviting more people by increasing the capacity of the ferry landing  
12  
13 area, I'd like to know how you're going to help resolve the traffic issues that I think will  
14  
15 be coming along with that, especially with the bicycles.  
16

17 Right now I think perhaps we've been working with the bike companies on some  
18  
19 solution with how we can maybe get the bikes back into the City and not through the  
20  
21 town as much, and I think there's going to be a disincentive for them to maybe keep the  
22  
23 bikes from traveling through town so much with this greater ability to get them on the  
24  
25 ferry as much; but it's really an issue for the citizens of this town, so your participation in  
26  
27 a process, somebody called it "the whole package" of the transportation issue in  
28  
29 downtown Sausalito is a big deal. I'd like to hear if there's a way that you think you  
30  
31 could participate in resolving that bike issue with the City of Sausalito.  
32

33  
34 Let's see. I've got so many notes here.  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Can you pause the time for a second? Oh, that was it.  
37

38 SECRETARY FRASER: Okay.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: As people are giving their comments, I'd like to remind us of the  
41  
42 specific call of the question in our staff report, which was to give feedback. If you think  
43  
44 the designs are completely unacceptable, then I think we don't need feedback on these  
45  
46 issues, but the District was specifically seeking feedback on the width of 25 or 21 feet;  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 the trusses, whether they should be curved, or a lowered curve, or flat? The color. So  
2  
3 there were some specific... The lighting and the design of the gate.  
4

5 SECRETARY FRASER: Can I get 30 more seconds and I can tell you exactly  
6  
7 that?  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Yeah, absolutely.  
10

11 SECRETARY FRASER: Okay. I preferred the simplest gate, the one that didn't  
12  
13 have a top, just had the line in the middle. I didn't have a problem with that gate at all; I  
14  
15 thought that was great.  
16

17 The railing, Exhibit 22 was my preferred one. I think that was the simplest and let  
18  
19 the most amount of light through the least amount of blockage.  
20

21 I really don't have a strong preference with regard to the paint at this point in  
22  
23 time. I'd like to see a final design, and then I'll form a preference on the paint.  
24

25 I do have a question about the security cameras and whether they would be  
26  
27 pointing out toward the more public access area, and I don't know if we have security  
28  
29 cameras right now, but that's a question I'd like answered.  
30

31 I don't care for the belvederes. I think what you've got right now is a whole lot of  
32  
33 people standing in each other's way. I like relying on the intelligence of the riders, but  
34  
35 my experience is when you've got a bunch of people speaking all different languages,  
36  
37 not sure where they're going, they're bumping into each other and standing in each  
38  
39 other's way, and I think the belvederes are going to add to the congestion and I would  
40  
41 prefer that they wouldn't be there, and the smaller the better.  
42  
43

44 I loved though that this would be an ADA compliant ferry landing and that  
45  
46 everybody would board at the same level. I think it's a great project if we can just have  
47  
48 the design fixed. I really do support it.  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, thanks. Who would like to go next?  
2

3 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I'll go next. First, thank you all for all the  
4  
5 work that's gone into this. You can tell there's a lot of effort and thought.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Now, I have a hard time hearing you right here, and I know people  
8  
9 are trying to hear at home.  
10

11 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. I just want to say thank you very  
12  
13 much for all the work that went into the planning. You can tell a lot of effort has gone  
14  
15 into this, and a lot of thought.  
16

17 Thank you for clarifying the question before the HLB and what we're looking at. I  
18  
19 do have to say that I am a little concerned that all the options that we're looking at seem  
20  
21 to very industrial in nature, but if the charge is to look at the three options, I do have my  
22  
23 preferences for that, and if that's what we're doing at this moment, I can go through my  
24  
25 list.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Yeah.  
28

29 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: The simpler gate. The squared trusses. I still  
30  
31 would like to see lighter trusses. Paint, irrelevant. I had the same concern over the  
32  
33 belvederes that John McCoy does. And I think was there another option before me?  
34  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Railing.  
37

38 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Railing. I'm Switzerland on that one.  
39  
40 Actually, part of my job is to have an opinion, so let me take another look. Can we get  
41  
42 back to me on that one?  
43

44 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
45

46 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I wanted to thank you for a very nice presentation;  
47  
48 it was very thorough and very professional, very helpful.  
49  
50

1 My recommendations, of the options currently presented I favor the 21-foot  
2  
3 access pier width. I favor the roofless with swinging door access control gate. I favor the  
4  
5 gangway truss with the flat top cord. I favor the pier railing with the horizontal stainless  
6  
7 steel cables. I would like to see smaller trusses, if possible. I'd like to see the  
8  
9 belvederes eliminated.

10  
11 From what we heard tonight, size matters to people in this community, because  
12  
13 it's a small community. We're not Larkspur Landing. I don't think most of us want to be  
14  
15 Larkspur Landing. And we do face a problem, that has been mentioned for here and  
16  
17 was discussed at some length at the last Council meeting, with an excessive number of  
18  
19 tourist bicycles in this town that impede pedestrian access to a lot of businesses as well  
20  
21 as other areas on weekends. That's a concern for many residents here that hasn't  
22  
23 gotten as much airtime as it might, but it's a common topic of discussion and it's a  
24  
25 concern for us.

26  
27 I do think it's a great idea to have a reduced loading and unloading time by  
28  
29 having wider doors and unloading people on the same level; I think those are very good  
30  
31 recommendations. But I'm concerned that that could be abused to double the number of  
32  
33 tourist bicycles from San Francisco being shipped here in unit time, which is going to  
34  
35 create even more of a problem than we already have. It's wonderful for our commuters  
36  
37 going back and forth to San Francisco; that would be great. It might be nice if the hours  
38  
39 were extended to make it easier for people who work late hours, but I think many of us  
40  
41 are concerned about the large number of tourist bicycles that already inundate our city  
42  
43 on Saturdays and Sundays.

44  
45 That really all I have to say at this time.

46  
47  
48 CHAIR COX: Thank you.

1 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Thank you, again. To not repeat what was said  
2  
3 and keeping in mind the charge of the HLB, I think there's a general aesthetic in the  
4  
5 Historic Overlay District that honestly I just don't think was really appreciated, or came  
6  
7 across. I think the public sentiment was that, so to the extent that that needs to be  
8  
9 something that can be addressed.  
10

11 I felt like there was a little bit of a back and forth tonight that you're looking for  
12  
13 direction from us. I think we're still looking for direction in terms of an overview,  
14  
15 appreciating that intimacy of the Historical District, so my comments would be to keep  
16  
17 that in mind. The smaller, the more intimate the entire project, the better.  
18

19 That's it. Thank you.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Can I make one more quick comment here?  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Sure.  
26

27 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Just to address some of the design issues, I  
28  
29 wanted to make mention—but I ran out of time before, so I'll be quick—that when we  
30  
31 start talking about the industrial look of this I want everyone to keep in mind the  
32  
33 historical waterfront industry that Sausalito has had throughout its history of  
34  
35 shipbuilding.  
36

37  
38 Then there is also the technical and structural issues that go into this, but I don't  
39  
40 really have so much of an issue with industrial, so to speak.  
41

42 I think the color; my preference would be for galvanized steel as opposed to a  
43  
44 painted color, which would keep it more of a maritime look and a waterfront usage look.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 The only comment that I wanted to make, and there's more to address, the  
2  
3 comments I heard from the public about how often is it going to be noncompliant? When  
4  
5 something is designed, it needs to be compliant 100% of the time.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Thanks. Okay, who would like to go first? Okay, Morgan.  
8

9 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I will reiterate thanks to the applicant, and to staff,  
10  
11 and to these bodies, and to the public for everyone's hard work and consideration of this  
12  
13 project.  
14

15 I'm having a difficult time looking at it beyond sort of a bigger picture, but I see it  
16  
17 as this is a mathematical solution to a design problem within the historical context, and I  
18  
19 think my fellow table mates up here spoke clearly about some of the facets of it relative  
20  
21 to what they like about the truss design, and so on and so forth.  
22

23 But I still think it's a little premature to make decisions on the scale of this in the  
24  
25 absence of having these broader studies relative to circulation, and bicycles, and ferry  
26  
27 operational programs, and maybe adding another ferry location at the Bay Model or  
28  
29 something. I think there's a bigger picture here that needs to be addressed that we're  
30  
31 missing.  
32

33  
34 But if the task at hand today is to address this, I can do that. So that being the  
35  
36 case, I'd like to see the solution be as contextually sensitive as possible to Sausalito,  
37  
38 and that has to do with materials, and scale, and colors and finishes.  
39

40 I think their proposals for a rail system that are similar to ones we have now that  
41  
42 are in a galvanized metal or aluminum seemed relatively appropriate.  
43

44 The access pier with its belvederes seems out of scale, and if that could be  
45  
46 reduced in size with elimination of the belvederes and maybe a narrowing to serve a  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 more reasonable number of commuters embarking and disembarking, I would be in  
2 support of that.  
3

4  
5 I think the gate needs to be small and as discrete as possible. I mean it's access  
6 control; it's not security. Let's make it a subtle thing.  
7

8  
9 The gangway, I'd prefer something flat, I'd prefer something again, more discrete  
10 and less of an icon for the Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District and  
11 something that's more respectful of Sausalito as a community. If that means smaller  
12 diameter tubing for the structure and more diagonals to support that truss, I'd be  
13 interested in looking at something like that. If it means dividing that ramp with another  
14 truss to make it a three-part truss that makes it even smaller in section, I'd be interested  
15 in looking at something like that.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 As for materials again, things that are subtle and don't affect the views, or overall  
24 the historic character of our district, I'm in favor of that.  
25

26  
27 As for lighting, discretion. Preserving views, not creating light pollution, I'm in  
28 favor of that.  
29

30  
31 I'm in favor, as a bicycle commuter, of having improvements to what we have  
32 now. I think this is overkill for that, but I think there's a great solution that we can  
33 achieve, so let's see if we can find that. Thank you.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Great. I'd also like to thank all the  
39 members of the public who came out. I'd like to thank the Bridge District for their  
40 presentation, and both commissions for their comments.  
41

42  
43 I generally agree, I think, with a lot of the design comments. One of the  
44 comments I would like to make is I think the importance of the ferry and the ferry landing  
45 to the community and to the residents of Sausalito has been a little undersold tonight.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 My family completely relies on the ferry. Both my husband and I work in San  
2  
3 Francisco. We also take our children into the City frequently. Our kids go on fieldtrips on  
4  
5 the ferry. It's just an absolutely amazing resource that we have here, so I just don't want  
6  
7 that to get lost. I really don't see the ferry as primarily a tourist issue. Yes, it has a lot of  
8  
9 tourists and it does serve the tourists, but I feel, as a resident here, that it's very  
10  
11 important to me.  
12

13 I agree with the general purposes that the Bridge District has outlined, and the  
14  
15 need especially to upgrade the loading and the unloading. The ferry right now is running  
16  
17 off schedule pretty much, as far as I can tell, most of the time. I also think of the ferry as  
18  
19 the most important resource for this town in an emergency, and we've always made the  
20  
21 ferry landing our emergency access point for our family if and when there's an  
22  
23 emergency and my husband and I have trouble getting home from work.  
24

25 So that said, I'm very in favor of the upgrades. I've traveled on the ferry with  
26  
27 strollers; I've traveled on the ferry with my 88-year-old mother. There needs to be better  
28  
29 access. The gangway is too narrow at this point. That said, I agree with the comments  
30  
31 that the gangway at 16 feet or 19 feet, I thought it was 19 feet in the materials, seems  
32  
33 quite wide, and the reasons being given are not... I would really like to see the applicant  
34  
35 push on those numbers and see if the bulk of the gangway and the truss could not be  
36  
37 reduced through most of the solutions that Chair McCoy already mentioned.  
38  
39

40 One member of the public mentioned that it might be possible to use thinner  
41  
42 cylinders and have more of them. I would like to see that explored.  
43

44 I would like to see the double gangway idea explored. I would be willing to have a  
45  
46 little bit of an increase of width to get the height of the truss and the massiveness of the  
47  
48 truss reduced.  
49  
50



1           Also, in terms of the times, ten minutes seems extraordinarily fast. There isn't  
2  
3 that many ferries that go back and forth between San Francisco and Sausalito, so I  
4  
5 think that could be accommodated.  
6

7           In terms of a gate—I'm going to run out of time in one second—but I'm mixed on  
8  
9 the gate. I like the gate that swings, but I also see the gate as an opportunity to reflect  
10  
11 Sausalito. I mean there's not much here to do that really reflects the character of our  
12  
13 town. I don't like the roll-up gate; I think it's too massive. But the one that has the slight  
14  
15 arch, I think there could be some design elements there that could be really wonderful  
16  
17 to explore and an ability for the town to put its own mark on the ferry landing and to  
18  
19 have something unique that does differentiate us from Larkspur and San Francisco to  
20  
21 people who are coming and going. So I'm fine with the swing gate. I would kind of like to  
22  
23 see maybe a local architect come up with a design for a slightly arched gate that has  
24  
25 something unique about Sausalito to reflect.  
26

27           And I'm probably the only person that actually likes the belvederes. I've spent a  
28  
29 lot of time waiting for the ferry. I've spent a lot of time on the ferry landing when I'm  
30  
31 there at Jazz by the Bay with my kids. I like public access out on the bay. It is so  
32  
33 beautiful out there. It's a great place to sit, and it's not always crammed with people  
34  
35 waiting for the ferries, so I'd be fine with a narrower one, but I don't really object to the  
36  
37 belvederes.  
38

39           I guess I'm out of time, but those are my comments for now.  
40

41           CHAIR COX: Thanks. Vicki.  
42

43           COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'm going to just try to concentrate on what hasn't  
44  
45 been said by my two fellow commissioners.  
46  
47

48           CHAIR COX: Well, I think it's important...  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: You want it... Okay.

2  
3 CHAIR COX: I do, because this board has to evaluate...

4  
5 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Okay. My time is going. Okay.

6  
7 CHAIR COX: No, it's not. She stopped it. I think it's important that this board  
8  
9 understand our feedback.

10  
11 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Okay. So in terms of me looking at this project, my  
12  
13 biggest goal here is trying to get the improvements; I think they're drastically needed, in  
14  
15 the least impactful manner.

16  
17 One of the things I haven't heard considered at all is the view of this truss  
18  
19 arrangement from our open water corridor, and that's what I looked at with this. For  
20  
21 those reasons I preferred the flat, but then you've got more members on the side, so  
22  
23 you've got more of a view impact. I would love to see the ideas explored for the two  
24  
25 trusses, so you can have a separation, and they're possibly not as high, to get them at  
26  
27 the lowest level with the least obstruction through them.

28  
29 I think the white color really makes it stand out like crazy, so I want to go with  
30  
31 galvanized steel. I'd love to see that in a rendering with the trusses when you come  
32  
33 back. I think that would be fairly easy. I think it blends in more. When you're looking  
34  
35 down from the waterfront, that's our big jewel. In 1960 the citizens bought all those lots  
36  
37 so they'd never be developed. We have that open waterfront. When you're looking  
38  
39 through and you see this big white barrier, it's unsettling. So as much as can be done  
40  
41 with color to make that blend in.

42  
43 I'd like minimal gates. I like Susan's idea about the top of the gate, but I don't  
44  
45 ever want to see a Council 25 years down the road that prefers neon arrival times in  
46  
47 that little gate space. That's come up before (inaudible) the ferry landing, so I would  
48  
49  
50

1 make it minimalist or have something in there where that didn't happen. Art, I could go  
2 with, but not the neon sign.  
3

4  
5 The belvederes. BCDC, their whole role is to provide public access. I know why  
6 they're saying that. This isn't our water. Because it's so close, it's the public's water, but  
7 I would encourage the City to in a letter go back before BCDC to maybe say can we  
8 take a look at reducing them again? It's not a deal breaker for me, but I'd like to have  
9 them out, if we could.  
10  
11

12  
13 I'd prefer the 21 feet. What else? The lighting I'm happy won't be on all night, and  
14 it's downward facing like we usually condition, so you're not going to get blowback from  
15 up the hill, I understand.  
16  
17

18  
19 Let's see, did I miss anything? Colors.  
20

21  
22 CHAIR COX: Gates.  
23

24  
25 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: The gate. It would be the swing gate. Not the roll-  
26 up gate, but the minimalist gate. And all in all I appreciate all of these different options. It  
27 may not have seemed like that was the case for the public, but this is more than we had  
28 before.  
29

30  
31 And I know people looked at it, because we saw in the feedback that they went to  
32 the library and got the copy and they went here and there. We got a lot of response, so  
33 I'm glad we had this participation. I hope people come back again, because if we don't  
34 hear from them, we're not going to know what... I want to hear upfront, so there's not  
35 dissatisfaction later. We can get it worked out.  
36  
37

38  
39 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Joan, can I just add, in terms of  
40 color I definitely prefer the galvanized steel as opposed to a color. If there is going to be  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 a color, like the darker ones that would blend more with the background, like a dark  
2  
3 green, I think someone mentioned.  
4

5 And the second thing is the truss; flat is my preferred design at this time.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Vice-Chair Werner.  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Well, I'm going to start by saying first thing that  
10  
11 unfortunately it's too late to deal with and that this should have been dealt with in a  
12  
13 comprehensive, integrated approach that actually recognized the fact that you were  
14  
15 working in Sausalito, not in Oakland, not in some other industrial area, and if that had  
16  
17 happened we would not be sitting here having the difficulties we're having right now.  
18  
19 That said, it isn't going to happen anymore. We're faced with a whole separate issue.  
20

21 The second thing is that bifurcating the landside improvements from the  
22  
23 waterside improvements is also unacceptable in my view. We have no idea how the  
24  
25 landside improvements are in fact going to come about. They are in fact one of BCDC's  
26  
27 concerns that created the issue about the belvederes, because they said we don't know  
28  
29 whether or not landside access is going to be provided by the City. That said, it is not  
30  
31 BCDC's responsibility in providing maximum feasible public access to build a pile-  
32  
33 supported structure out in the bay with four benches on it, so the belvederes in my view  
34  
35 should be gotten rid of.  
36  
37

38 The other thing is that I'd like to read something that Councilman Mmm-mmm-  
39  
40 mmm said, previous mmm-mmm. He said the most important thing was to have a ferry  
41  
42 landing and entrance to the City from the water, which was consistent with the Historic  
43  
44 District in terms of scope and concept. That was May 17, 1995. We're still talking about  
45  
46 the same things.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           Anyway, make the trusses smaller, swing doors, vertical pickets like are out there  
2  
3 already, and then after that, you know, whatever shade of lipstick you want to put on it.  
4

5           CHAIR COX: Okay, I too appreciate the effort. I am sorry that the coordination  
6  
7 effort was delayed to the extent it was.  
8

9           I wholeheartedly agree with Vice-Chair Werner that I really think a blanket  
10  
11 approval of the seaside improvements is premature until we've done some design effort  
12  
13 on the landside. It's putting the cart before the horse. I think this is an integrated project,  
14  
15 so while I greatly appreciate the efforts that the Bridge District is going to to improve  
16  
17 what's out there, and while I sincerely believe what is out there does need improvement,  
18  
19 I think that it should be a coordinated effort. This is something you're hoping will last for  
20  
21 40 years, so I think it's really critical that you coordinate the structure you hope will last  
22  
23 for 40 years with a landside approach, and some of the things I see missing in this plan  
24  
25 are on the landside.  
26

27           No efforts have been made to figure out what impact on the City moving the  
28  
29 ticket vending machines will have, where those will be, where people will line up, who  
30  
31 will monitor that. Right now we're right next to the ferry, so if you have questions, you  
32  
33 have issues, there are ferry personnel there when the ferry comes in. But if you put it on  
34  
35 the other side of the parking lot, it's very remote. It's also not as readily accessible for  
36  
37 people who don't know where to go or where to get their tickets.  
38

39           So I think some thought and some coordination needs to go into how the Bridge  
40  
41 District will coordinate with the City on designing this facility, on designing the traffic to  
42  
43 and from the facility, and on policing and monitoring the facility.  
44

45           I am not in favor of the belvederes. I think it's a wonderful feature for our  
46  
47 residents, but I think it is also an increased burden for policing and cleanup for the City.  
48  
49

1 I think the focus has been on moving more tourists and bikes. I think the focus  
2  
3 also needs to be on aesthetics. It's very concerning to me that the designers didn't look  
4  
5 at Sausalito's General Plan, didn't look at our Historic District, didn't look at our Bicycle  
6  
7 Plan, and perhaps you were simply unaware of them, but didn't make any effort to  
8  
9 access the impact these improvements would have on the City.  
10

11 Page six of our staff report states that the CEQA process concluded with a  
12  
13 categorical exclusion on the basis that, "This project constitutes a facility modernization  
14  
15 through construction or replacement of existing components." I take issue with that. I  
16  
17 would assert that is not the case. This is a huge expansion. I would assert that this is  
18  
19 really at least doubling what's out there now. It's a huge expansion. We're going from 73  
20  
21 to 204 square feet over the water. We're going from a shadow impact of 6,057 to  
22  
23 13,000.  
24

25 I think that we have to figure out how to have this have the least aesthetic impact.  
26  
27 I think that we need to reduce the height, the bulk, and the profile. I think 21 feet is way  
28  
29 too much; I would be okay with 10 feet. I think that the Bridge District needs to be  
30  
31 provided with a copy of our petition, that we haven't yet seen, that has the signatures of  
32  
33 700 residents who apparently oppose this project, so I think it's something that the  
34  
35 Bridge District has to carefully consider.  
36  
37

38 I think the look should be nautical instead of industrial. I think you have to  
39  
40 consider whether there will be lighting pollution at night as a result of the lights.  
41

42 I like the lower profile gate. I don't like the slide-up.  
43

44 I like the gray color.  
45

46 I'm concerned at the siting of the facilities so close to the Yacht Club. I'm not  
47  
48 clear on the need of the dogleg in the plan. In our plans we saw plans for a temporary  
49  
50

1 facility, but we haven't heard anything about the logistics and the timing of that  
2  
3 temporary facility.  
4

5 I also am in favor of reducing the trusses. You've obviously heard my questions  
6  
7 about that.  
8

9 I think we should consider a traffic management plan, although I don't think that's  
10  
11 necessarily your job.  
12

13 I think this expansion is based on the mistaken premise that Sausalito is growing  
14  
15 at the same pace as Marin and San Francisco. That's not true. If you look our Housing  
16  
17 Element, you will see that we are not growing at that same pace, although I understand  
18  
19 ridership may be increasing, but the growth of the town itself does not support this  
20  
21 wholesale expansion, in my opinion.  
22

23 I think we should have a choice of designs, and I appreciate you've given us  
24  
25 some options, but I think we need more.  
26

27 I think that we need story poles. I understand that we have a plan to put story  
28  
29 poles out there with ropes for two hours on a Saturday. I think that is absolutely  
30  
31 inadequate. I think that we need a better and more transparent approach with great  
32  
33 publicity so that our residents can go out and actually see the impact.  
34  
35

36 Personally, I would love to see a 6-foot mockup in the parking lot that shows  
37  
38 exactly how wide, how tall, how big the pylons are, how big the trusses are, what color it  
39  
40 would be, so that our residents can really understand the size and scope and scale.  
41

42 I don't want to be naysayer. I'm totally in favor of this project, I think it has many  
43  
44 good intentions, but I think some substantial additional work, including coordination,  
45  
46 needs to be done.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Thank you for accommodating my extra time. Who else would like to make any  
2  
3 further comments? Okay, thank you for bearing with us this evening. I know that you've  
4  
5 heard from a ton of people, so thank you for your forbearance, and thank you all for  
6  
7 coming and carefully listening to the feedback from us and from our community.  
8

9 Okay, Lilly.

10  
11 LILLY SCHINSING: We wanted to talk about the story poles for a minute. As I  
12  
13 stated in the staff report, and this diagram was also in the staff report, the District is  
14  
15 proposing to put up rope that would go from this point to this point, and this point to this  
16  
17 point, to simulate as best as they can the width of the new access pier here, and that  
18  
19 would be up for the ten days, so that's not the two-hour period that we're talking about.  
20

21  
22 In addition, they would propose that on a Saturday or Sunday morning, and we  
23  
24 would notice the community as far as what day it would be, they would have a boat go  
25  
26 out and put two buoys out here to mark the extent of the float, so folks can see how far  
27  
28 that would go out into the water. And we would take pictures of all that.

29  
30 SECRETARY FRASER: Why just two hours for the buoys?

31  
32 JOHN EBERLE: (Inaudible).

33  
34 SECRETARY FRASER: On just one day? I mean for the whole...

35  
36 COUNSEL WAGNER: That's a good question for the District, I believe.

37  
38 CHAIR COX: Yeah, so would it be feasible to do it on more than one two-hour  
39  
40 period on a Saturday? Maybe do it on a Saturday and Sunday, and then on a following  
41  
42 Saturday and Sunday, or something of that nature, because obviously not everyone is  
43  
44 here on one Saturday.

45  
46 SECRETARY FRASER: In those two hours.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 CHAIR COX: And you saw today the degree of interest in this project from our  
2 community, so we just are trying to be transparent in our process and make sure that  
3 the public has an opportunity to understand and weigh in.  
4  
5

6  
7 EWA BAUER: If I may answer. We'll certainly look into it. The critical issue for us  
8 is we cannot be in the way of our ferries, so it's not that we do not want to have a longer  
9 time of the presentation. I mean you have to weigh the pros and cons of what we can  
10 and cannot do. But we will certainly look at the times and our schedule and see how  
11 much we can accommodate your request to do it on Saturday, Sunday and maybe  
12 repeat it.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 CHAIR COX: We appreciate that.  
20

21 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: And is there any way to identify the other two  
22 corners of the proposed float at the same time, whether through buoys or flagging on  
23 the existing structure?  
24  
25  
26

27 EWA BAUER: Yeah, we can look into it. As you may notice, one of the corners  
28 will be right on the existing landing, and we can put another buoy where the remaining  
29 corner is.  
30  
31  
32

33 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Great, so maybe just some corresponding flagging  
34 or something that would indicate on the float.  
35  
36

37 EWA BAUER: Right.  
38  
39

40 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.  
41

42 CHAIR COX: And I think it would be helpful if we posted a diagram like this out  
43 there that folks who go out there could look at the diagram and understand what the  
44 buoys mean and what they're signifying, because a lot of folks who weren't here tonight  
45 are our commuters who I sometimes see in the mornings, so I think it would be great,  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 even beyond the time that the floats are out there that a diagram of this nature be  
2  
3 posted on the site so the people who are the actual users have the opportunity to see  
4  
5 what's planned as well.  
6

7 EWA BAUER: What we intend to do is to work with Lilly, and through her provide  
8  
9 some probably technical explanation of the elements we will use, so you can see in  
10  
11 advance what we plan to place there. And of course we would like to get some input  
12  
13 through Lilly, if this will suffice, but I really ask that you keep in mind that we are here in  
14  
15 the rock and hard place. We really want to post to your liking what it could look like, but  
16  
17 we have to run those boats.  
18

19 And if I may add, we also have to strike the right type, and so there will be some  
20  
21 flexibility that we need to have, and especially if we run into bad weather. That may  
22  
23 create a problem, but we will try to do our best with everything we can control.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, with that I think we've completed this agenda  
26  
27 item. Next is New Business. I don't see any. Next is Old Business. None. Any  
28  
29 communications from staff?  
30

31  
32 DANNY CASTRO: Just have your preliminary agenda for March 25<sup>th</sup>.  
33

34 CHAIR COX: Yes, I see a quite full agenda for March 25<sup>th</sup>.  
35

36 DANNY CASTRO: Yes.  
37

38 CHAIR COX: Communications from Planning Commissioners? Anything from  
39  
40 HLB Members? All right, then did you want to adjourn your meeting?  
41

42 CHAIR McCOY: Can we get a motion to adjourn the Historic Landmarks Board  
43  
44 meeting?  
45

46 (Inaudible voices.)  
47

48 CHAIR McCOY: All in favor? Thank you, Chair Cox.  
49  
50

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

CHAIR COX: Okay, may I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: So moved.

VICE CHAIR WERNER: Second.

CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 5-0 and we are adjourned. Thank you  
all.

---

Submitted by  
Danny Castro  
Community Development Director

---

Approved by  
Joan Cox  
Chair

\\ASTROBOY\data\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2015\03-11-Ferry Landing Project - Approved