

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

**SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday, April 15, 2015**  
**Draft Verbatim Minutes<sup>1</sup>**

**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:** As directed by the City Council, make a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not the Design Review findings in Sections 10.46.060.F, 10.46.060.H and 10.54.050.D of the Sausalito Municipal Code can be made for the District's proposed project, make modifications necessary to the draft resolution of **Exhibit S** to memorialize the recommendation, and provide any other recommendations to the City Council as appropriate. The Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board will discuss and vote on each finding. The Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board are not limited to discussing the findings only (other recommendations to the Council may be provided), however, the Council has directed the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board to at a minimum discuss and vote on each finding to provide a determination of the findings.

**Planning Commission**

PC Chair Joan Cox

PC Vice-Chair Bill Werner

Commissioner Susan Cleveland-Knowles

Commissioner Vicki Nichols

Commissioner Morgan Pierce

---

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

1 **Historic Landmarks Board**

2 HLB Chair John McCoy – Absent

3 HLB Secretary Natascha Fraser

4 HLB Board Member Aldo Mercado

5 HLB Board Member Shasha Richardson

6 HLB Board Member Ben Brown

7  
8  
9 CHAIR COX: Good evening, everybody. We're going to get started. Good  
10 evening and welcome to the joint meeting of the Planning Commission and the Historic  
11 Landmarks Board for Wednesday, April 15, 2015. I will call to order the Planning  
12 Commission and ask Danny to call the roll.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 DANNY CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner Pierce.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Present.

20  
21 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

22  
23 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Here.

24  
25 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

26  
27 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Here.

28  
29 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

30  
31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Here.

32  
33 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: Here. And I'll turn it over to Natascha Fraser to call the HLB to  
36 order.  
37  
38

39 SECRETARY FRASER: I call the HLB to order and ask Danny to take the roll,  
40 please.  
41  
42

43  
44 DANNY CASTRO: Yes, thank you. Board Member Brown.

45  
46 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Here.

47  
48 DANNY CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.  
49  
50

1 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Here.

2  
3 DANNY CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

4  
5 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Here.

6  
7 DANNY CASTRO: Secretary Fraser.

8  
9 SECRETARY FRASER: Here.

10  
11 DANNY CASTRO: Chair McCoy. He's absent.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Before we get started I want to go ahead and recognize the  
14  
15 members of the City Council who are here this evening. If you don't mind standing, I  
16  
17 want to acknowledge and thank you for attending this very important meeting. I want to  
18  
19 also ask the members of the public who are here to respect the fact that the City  
20  
21 Council members are here to observe this proceeding this evening, Linda Pfeifer and  
22  
23 Tom Theodores, to observe this evening, and I would ask that you not bombard them  
24  
25 with your views. You'll have an opportunity to be heard by the City Council at the City  
26  
27 Council meeting on May 5<sup>th</sup>.

28  
29  
30 And with that I'll move on to approval of the agenda.

31  
32 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So moved.

33  
34 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Second.

35  
36 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries for the Planning Commission 5-0.

37  
38 SECRETARY FRASER: HLB motion to approve the agenda.

39  
40 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So moved.

41  
42 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.

43  
44 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?

45  
46 CHAIR COX: Motion carries 4-0. Next on our agenda is public comments on  
47  
48 items not on this agenda. This is the opportunity for any member of the public who  
49  
50

1 would like to comment on a topic within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission or  
2 the Historic Landmarks Board that is not on our agenda this evening to come up and  
3 provide us with your thoughts. Would anybody like to speak regarding an item not on  
4 our agenda tonight? Seeing none, I'll move on to approval of minutes.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 The first set of minutes is March 25, 2015. This is the draft action minutes.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'll move for approval.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll second.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 5-0, and that was only for the Planning  
16 Commission. Oh sorry, no, it is for HLB here.  
17  
18

19 SECRETARY FRASER: For the minutes for the March 25<sup>th</sup> joint meeting, is  
20 there a motion to approve the minutes?  
21  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to approve.  
24

25 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.  
26

27 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor? I'll recuse myself, because I wasn't present  
28 at that meeting.  
29  
30

31 CHAIR COX: All right, so the HLB motion carries 3-0, with Board Member Fraser  
32 abstaining. Next on the agenda is approval of the minutes for April 1, 2015, and I want  
33 to thank and acknowledge staff for providing us verbatim minutes. This was  
34 extraordinarily helpful in reviewing these two very important meetings, and we didn't  
35 have to go through and watch the video in order to really recall everything that the  
36 members of the public said, and all of the facts presented by the District, so thank you  
37 to staff for that Herculean effort. May I have a motion?  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to accept.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: I think we'll start with the Planning Commission and then we'll go  
2  
3 to HLB.

4  
5 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Motion to approve.

6  
7 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

8  
9 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 5-0.

10  
11 SECRETARY FRASER: HLB motion to approve minutes first?

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to accept.

14  
15 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.

16  
17 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor? I was not present at that meeting. I did  
18  
19 read the record, so I'm not sure if I'm entitled to...  
20

21  
22 CHAIR COX: I'll let our City Attorney speak to that. You said you read the...

23  
24 SECRETARY FRASER: The record. I've read the staff report, I've read all the  
25  
26 documents, the comments, and everything.

27  
28 COUNSEL WAGNER: It's just an acknowledgement that that's the official action  
29  
30 of the Board, so it's up to your discretion, but you are able to vote on that if you would  
31  
32 like.

33  
34 CHAIR COX: Okay, and in terms of taking action on this topic, because...

35  
36 COUNSEL WAGNER: Yes. Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were still talking about  
37  
38 the minutes. Yes, absolutely if you have read the verbatim transcripts, and we  
39  
40 appreciate that statement for the record.

41  
42 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I'd like to add my compliments to Commissioner  
43  
44 Cox and to the staff for doing a tremendous job on those minutes from April 1<sup>st</sup>. Very,  
45  
46 very helpful.

47  
48 CHAIR COX: Okay, so are you going to include yourself in this?  
49  
50

1 SECRETARY FRASER: Yes.

2  
3 CHAIR COX: So the HLB motion to approve the minutes of April 1<sup>st</sup> carries 4-0.

4  
5 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Can I just make a comment? I was absent for the April  
6  
7 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. I have read these minutes. I did watch the tape. I found it so entertaining I  
8  
9 watched it twice, so I feel comfortable approving this.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: All right, thank you. Next on our agenda is declarations regarding  
12  
13 public contacts. So I'll turn it over to the HLB to declare your public contacts.

14  
15 SECRETARY FRASER: I can speak first. I spoke with just one or two members  
16  
17 of the public.

18  
19 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I also spoke with a few members of the  
20  
21 public. I did not receive any emails.

22  
23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I spoke with several members of the public and  
24  
25 asked them their opinions about the ferry landing proposal.

26  
27 CHAIR COX: Okay, and I'll turn it over to members of the Planning Commission  
28  
29 for their declarations regarding public contacts.

30  
31 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I as well had some general conversations with  
32  
33 members of the public about the project.

34  
35 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I spoke with members of the public. We did not  
36  
37 discuss the merits of the project. And I received some emails.

38  
39 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I spoke too generally to a few  
40  
41 members of the public.

42  
43 VICE CHAIR WERNER: As was the case for the meeting of the 25<sup>th</sup>, I can't  
44  
45 count the number of times I was stopped in the street by people asking about this  
46  
47 project, so I was talked to a good deal.

1 CHAIR COX: I also spoke with numerous members of the public, dozens I would  
2 say, and I also received numerous emails, all of which I forwarded to staff so that they  
3 would be included in our packet, so that all members of the Planning Commission and  
4 the HLB would have the benefit of any correspondence received.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 With that, we will turn to the first and only item on our agenda, which is the Ferry  
10 Landing Project east of the intersection of Bridgeway and Anchor Streets, and I will turn  
11 it over to Lilly.  
12  
13  
14

15 I do want to make a comment before I turn it over to Lilly about timing. This hall  
16 closes at midnight sharp, and the camera crew needs roughly 30 minutes to pack up, so  
17 our goal is to have completed enunciating whatever action we're going to be taking this  
18 evening by 11:30. I don't see any issue with that. Everybody who wanted to comment at  
19 the last meeting had an opportunity to do so, but I am going to try to manage the  
20 manner in which we hear comments very closely so that we don't waste time.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 So I'm collecting speaker slips. If you want to add speaker slips, please take  
29 them over to the staff table and they will provide them to me. I will call folks several  
30 residents in advance so that you know when your turn is coming. If you can queue up  
31 when it's your turn to speak so there is no delay. And tonight more than ever it's really  
32 important that if you can sit quietly and avoid applause and calling out, because it will  
33 allow us to conduct the meeting very efficiently and make sure everybody has an  
34 opportunity to be heard, which is our goal. So thank you for that, and I'm going to turn it  
35 over to Lilly for the staff presentation.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 LILLY SCHINSING: Thank you, Chair Cox and members of the Historic  
45 Landmarks Board, and also the public who is here this evening and watching at home.  
46 My name is Lilly Schinsing and I'm your administrative analyst for the City.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 The purpose of tonight's meeting is the third in a series of four public meetings to  
2 review the design review permit findings on the District's project for the ferry landing.

3  
4  
5 The Council will hold the last meeting on this project on May 5<sup>th</sup>.

6  
7 Tonight the agenda is a presentation from the District first. We'll then have  
8  
9 Planning Commission and HLB questions. There will be a time for public comment. And  
10  
11 then there will be the Planning Commission and HLB discussion, and also a  
12  
13 recommendation.

14  
15 The Planning Commission and HLB this evening is being asked by the City  
16  
17 Council as a part of a public process approved on February 10<sup>th</sup> to make a  
18  
19 recommendation on the design review permit findings, and so we'll ask you to vote on  
20  
21 each finding during your discussion and decision period this evening.

22  
23 Just a reminder of the process, of where we've been and where we're going. In  
24  
25 order to decide whether or not to grant consent for the District's project in accordance  
26  
27 with the lease that the District has with the City the Council did direct this public  
28  
29 process, which includes three public meetings with the Planning Commission and the  
30  
31 Historic Landmarks Board.

32  
33 The first meeting was held on March 11<sup>th</sup>, and that was an informal study session  
34  
35 to receive a detailed description of the project from the District, and also to ask  
36  
37 questions and provide feedback and provide comment on the project.

38  
39 The District then subsequently submitted a formal application on March 24<sup>th</sup>, and  
40  
41 the second meeting was held on April 1<sup>st</sup>, and this was a formal joint hearing with the  
42  
43 Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board members. There was a period  
44  
45 to ask questions and make comment, and also to receive the formal presentation from  
46  
47 the District on the project.  
48  
49  
50



1           Tonight is the third meeting in a series of four where the Planning Commission  
2  
3 and Historic Landmarks Board will make a recommendation to the City Council on  
4  
5 whether or not the design review permit findings can be made.  
6

7           We want to stress that the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board  
8  
9 have not been limited on commenting on the design review permit findings only in the  
10  
11 past, and nor are you this evening. If your bodies would like to make additional  
12  
13 recommendations to the Council, you may do so. We just want to make sure that at a  
14  
15 minimum you provide a recommendation on the design review permit findings as  
16  
17 directed by the City Council.  
18

19           Finally, the last meeting will be on May 5<sup>th</sup>, which is a City Council hearing, and  
20  
21 at this meeting the City Council will make a decision on whether or not to grant consent  
22  
23 for the project in accordance with the lease.  
24

25           Staff has prepared three different tables and labeled them A, B, and C in the staff  
26  
27 report, and those correspond with the three different sections of the Zoning Ordinance  
28  
29 that relate to the design review permit findings for a project that's in an historic district in  
30  
31 Sausalito. We've organized those tables that are in the staff report to the finding itself,  
32  
33 and than a column for staff comment, and there are 24 total findings.  
34  
35

36           Staff has provided support findings for 14 of the 24 findings. We're asking that  
37  
38 the Historic Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission review those findings to  
39  
40 determine if there is a consensus among your groups.  
41

42           We wanted to note that Finding C8 regarding mechanical equipment, a member  
43  
44 of the public has raised the issue of the new transformer in the project, and the Planning  
45  
46 Commission and Historic Landmarks Board should discuss if this finding can be made  
47  
48 or not as a part of your discussion this evening.  
49  
50

1 Ten of the 24 findings we have not provided a support finding for and have  
2 indicated that the Historic Landmarks Board and Planning Commission should discuss  
3 those findings individually to see if the findings can be made or not. And we have  
4 provided questions for discussions following each of those findings, and that's in the  
5 staff report. I also can pull out the staff report so the Planning Commission and Historic  
6 Landmarks Board can see each of those findings individually.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 Then we'll also have the draft resolution that we provided in your packet available  
14 on the screen to edit as you have a discussion about consensus this evening, and we'll  
15 ask you to vote on each of the findings.  
16  
17  
18

19 So with that, staff is recommending that the Planning Commission and HLB  
20 receive a presentation from the District, take public comment, and then make a  
21 recommendation to the City Council on the design review permit findings. The Council  
22 would also like a vote from the Planning Commission and HLB on the overall project as  
23 a whole.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 That concludes our presentation. I'm happy to take questions on the process this  
30 evening. I know the District has a statement presentation that they would like to give,  
31 and so questions regarding the particulars of their project might be better directed to  
32 them as well after their presentation.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 CHAIR COX: Thank you, Lilly. Any questions from HLB members of Lilly? Any  
39 questions by Planning Commission members? Okay, I'll turn it over to the Golden Gate  
40 Bridge District to read your statement. Is this something we're projecting for the public to  
41 be able to see?  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 AVA BOWER: Madam Chair, no.  
47

48 CHAIR COX: Did you bring copies for the public?  
49  
50

1 AVA BOWER: Yes, we do. I'm here to read the statement for the record. So if  
2  
3 you'll tell me, is this okay for me to sit here or just stand up and have a mic?  
4

5 CHAIR COX: The mic needs to be closer to you.  
6

7 AVA BOWER: All right.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: You almost need to kiss the mic while you're talking. But it's fine  
10  
11 for you to sit, of course.  
12

13 AVA BOWER: Okay.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: And where are copies of this for members of the public? Okay, so  
16  
17 do you want to hand them out or... All right, so a member of the staff is going to put  
18  
19 them back on the table in the back, those of you who would like to see a copy.  
20

21 (Pause while members of the public retrieve copies.)  
22

23 CHAIR COX: All right, so we've run out of materials, folks. If you all can try to  
24  
25 share amongst yourselves, I apologize. We did not have this in advance to make copies  
26  
27 for you, and my apologies to you for that. But Ewa Bower is going to read the entire  
28  
29 statement out loud. I'm going to ask her to speak into the mic so that everybody can  
30  
31 hear what she has to say. All right.  
32

33  
34 EWA BOWER: Chair Cox, Secretary Fraser, members of the joint committee,  
35  
36 "My name is Ewa Bower, and I am the chief engineer for the Golden Gate Bridge,  
37  
38 Highway and Transportation District. At tonight's meeting, you have been asked to  
39  
40 make certain recommendations to your City Council regarding the District's proposed  
41  
42 Ferry Terminal Improvement Project.  
43

44 "The Project consists of replacing the existing aging ferry boarding facilities with  
45  
46 new modern facilities. The replacement will improve accessibility for all passengers and  
47  
48 improve ferry operations. The replacement facilities consist of 53-foot-wide by 150-foot-  
49  
50

1 long float, an 18-foot-wide by 90-foot-long gangway, and a 21-foot-wide by 96-foot-long  
2  
3 access pier.

4  
5 “There will be two 8-foot-wide by 18-foot-long gangplanks on the float. This will  
6  
7 allow boarding and disembarking from two 8-foot wide-doors on the vessels. The  
8  
9 gangway will have a clear width of 16 feet and will be supported with the two  
10  
11 rectangular trusses. The trusses will extend approximately 5 feet above the gangway  
12  
13 walking surface. The new access pier will include two 5-foot-wide by approximately 31-  
14  
15 foot-long belvederes. The new access control gate comprised of two double swing  
16  
17 gates will be installed at the end of the new access pier.

18  
19 “I thought it would be helpful if we review the steps that led to this project review  
20  
21 process and where it is likely to proceed from here. As you have heard, the District has  
22  
23 been working on the project since 2009 and we first spoke to the City Council about the  
24  
25 project in 2008. We have provided regular briefings to your Council and, through your  
26  
27 video steaming service, to the entire community.

28  
29 “In 2011 the District presented the plans for the project. This included a 25- foot-  
30  
31 wide access pier, and a gangway with an arched truss which extended at its highest  
32  
33 point approximately 9 feet above the gangway. Those plans received the City Council’s  
34  
35 unanimous consent.

36  
37  
38 “That meeting, on May 3, 2011, may be viewed on the City’s website. Relying on  
39  
40 that concurrence, the District proceeded to construct environmental review of the  
41  
42 project. We did this in full compliance with the law, circulating the document for public  
43  
44 review, and holding a public meeting in the City Council chambers. On October 18,  
45  
46 2012, the City of Sausalito submitted a comment letter, which expressed general  
47  
48 support of the project. The District responded to the comments. In December 2012, the  
49  
50

1 District adopted a Negative Declaration for the project and proceeded with the detailed  
2  
3 design.  
4

5 “In October 2014, the District presented the project to the BCDC Design Review  
6  
7 Board as part of its application for a construction permit from the BCDC. We heard then,  
8  
9 for the first time, that the community has concerns with the project, primarily due to the  
10  
11 recent increase in tourist bicycles in the City.  
12

13 “In several communications and meetings with the City of Sausalito, the District  
14  
15 has asserted its position that the proposed replacement project does not require the  
16  
17 City’s approval under the terms of the lease. Further, even if it was required, such  
18  
19 approval was given at the May 2011 Council meeting. However, in light of the concerns  
20  
21 expressed by the community, and in order to avoid a legal dispute, the District agreed,  
22  
23 without waiving its rights, to participate in this process, as desired by the community.  
24  
25 We did this in hopes that a mutually agreeable solution could be found within the 45-day  
26  
27 review period stated in the lease for the City to provide its reasonable approval of plans.  
28

29 “There have been many comments and suggestions made during this review  
30  
31 process. The District understands the concerns that some residents have regarding the  
32  
33 project. However, the District has a regional responsibility to provide public transit in  
34  
35 order to reduce the number of cars that travel in the Highway 101 corridor, use the  
36  
37 Golden Gate Bridge, and cause traffic impacts in both Marin and San Francisco. That  
38  
39 responsibility transcends the borders of the City of Sausalito. As your City Attorney has  
40  
41 informed you, California law does not permit cities to enforce their zoning regulations  
42  
43 upon regional agencies such as the District.  
44

45 “The District and the City are parties to the existing lease, under which the City,  
46  
47 as a trustee for the public, holds the rights to the waterfront. In order to put some of the  
48  
49  
50

1 opposition to this project in some context, I would like to note that when the ferry  
2 terminal was first proposed in 1970, Sausalito was not a willing participant in its  
3 creation. The District was forced to file an action in eminent domain to acquire the rights  
4 needed to construct the original terminal. The current lease was negotiated decades  
5 later, prior to the construction of the existing facility, superseding the rights acquired by  
6 condemnation.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 “In response to demands that the proposed facility be more ‘historic’ we have  
14 researched and presented pictures of what those historic facilities looked like. I doubt  
15 anyone in this room wants us to build a facility that looks anything like those ‘historic’  
16 terminals. It should be noted that those old facilities were not removed until the District  
17 built its terminal in the late 1990’s. Thus, there was no time, except for the very early  
18 history of Sausalito, when there was not a ferry terminal on its waterfront. We have  
19 carefully looked at current design elements of the proposed Sausalito replacement  
20 facility. We have repeatedly asked for specific suggestions as to how the design of the  
21 facility could be more ‘historic.’ To date, we have received none. And we note that the  
22 vast majority of the proposed facility is located outside of the City’s historic district.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 “We have also heard demands that the facility be smaller and have a lower  
34 profile, and we have responded as best we can. Let me start with this point—there is no  
35 motivation on the part of the District to create a facility that is larger than is necessary,  
36 nor to increase the level of service to Sausalito. The District’s ferry operation does not  
37 make money—it is a subsidized operation intended to relieve traffic congestion on the  
38 Highway 101 corridor and to get cars off the road. No additional ferry service is planned,  
39 as that would cost additional scarce public funds.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           “The existing steel facility is old, rusted and must be replaced. An absolute  
2  
3 controlling factor in that replacement is the need to comply with the current regulations  
4  
5 under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Those regulations stipulate that there  
6  
7 can be no more than a 1 to 12 slope on the boarding facilities. That requirement, and  
8  
9 the need to provide that slope on any vessel that uses the terminal, has mandated the  
10  
11 length of the proposed facility. While there have been a number of suggestions that the  
12  
13 facility be located closer to shore or somehow be made smaller, there is simply no  
14  
15 feasible way to accomplish that.

16  
17           “One commenter suggested that since the very low tides that mandate the length  
18  
19 of the gangway only occur a few times a year, it was acceptable to have the facility be  
20  
21 inaccessible on those days. First, the commenter’s calculations could not be verified  
22  
23 and were artificially limited to a single year. Even taking them at face value, such a view  
24  
25 completely ignores the fact that accessibility is, under the law, a civil right. Part-time  
26  
27 compliance with civil rights is not acceptable. For those who may not be acquainted with  
28  
29 the requirements of accessibility, it might be helpful to put this suggestion in more of a  
30  
31 familiar context. Is it permissible for someone in a wheelchair to be allowed access to a  
32  
33 public elevator only some of the time? In more broad terms, can the right to vote be  
34  
35 denied in some elections? Surely not. The law and the requirements of our funding  
36  
37 mandate full compliance with the ADA and we intend to adhere to that.

38  
39           “It should also be noted that accessibility requirements trump both local zoning  
40  
41 and historic preservation requirements. Thus, in addition to the California law that  
42  
43 exempts the District from local zoning and historic preservation ordinances, federal  
44  
45 accessibility law also requires those rules to give way in order to provide accessible  
46  
47 facilities.  
48  
49  
50

1 "There has been a substantial amount of comment regarding the width of the pier  
2  
3 and the gangway. Particular focus has been placed on the gangway that connects the  
4  
5 pier to the float. We have received many comments regarding the width of the gangway,  
6  
7 some hoping that by reducing its width and perhaps redesigning its structure, the profile  
8  
9 could be reduced further.  
10

11 "As we have explained, we have designed the gangway to be able to comfortably  
12  
13 accommodate the expected passenger loads over the next 20 years. Ridership from  
14  
15 Sausalito is expected to grow 4% a year based on past trends and expected population  
16  
17 growth. Given the expense of the project, it simply does not make sense to construct a  
18  
19 facility that will be inadequate in just a few years. We have provided great detail  
20  
21 regarding the loading and unloading process and why the 16-foot-clear-width is  
22  
23 required. Locking in a flawed design for a facility with a 40-year useful life is simply not a  
24  
25 responsible governmental action.  
26

27 "In response to comments, the District has made modifications to the design of  
28  
29 the gangway. Our original design, reflecting a theme found in a number of locations in  
30  
31 the City, features a curved arch truss, which, while allowing views from the gangway  
32  
33 during the loading process, did increase the overall profile of the gangway. In response  
34  
35 to comments, we not only switched to a flat truss, but lowered the truss in relation to the  
36  
37 walkway, lowering the overall profile. This may impair the views of shorter passengers  
38  
39 while they are loading or unloading from the ferries, but it reduces the profile and its  
40  
41 effect on views from the shore.  
42  
43

44 "There have also been comments suggesting that other structural approaches  
45  
46 are available that will resolve many of the concerns with the gangway design. We have  
47  
48 provided a direct response to the letter from Mr. Versaci to Chair Cox. In it, we note that  
49  
50



1 we have redesigned the gangway in many of the exact ways he suggested, including  
2  
3 using a flat truss and lowering the profile of the truss. Several of his suggestions are  
4  
5 simply not feasible, however. For more specifics, I would ask that you review that  
6  
7 correspondence and consider the comments in our written response.  
8

9       “Another topic of comment is the pier. Many features of the pier were included in  
10  
11 response to requirements for public access from BCDC. Through its permitting  
12  
13 jurisdiction, BCDC can require changes to the project to promote public access.  
14

15       “A major change from the existing facility involves moving the access gate from  
16  
17 the end of the landside pier to the end of the access pier. Doing this allows for the public  
18  
19 to walk out onto the pier and gain more direct access to the bay. This has been a  
20  
21 demand of BCDC staff from the earliest stages of the project.  
22

23       “Another feature is the addition of belvederes that provide some additional  
24  
25 access and benches for the public. These have also been encouraged by BCDC staff  
26  
27 and are expected to be a part of their permit conditions.  
28

29       “We have reduced the width of the pier from 25 feet to 21 feet, but cannot reduce  
30  
31 it further without reducing public access in a way that would likely be unacceptable to  
32  
33 BCDC. We have also received comments from the public and have revised the plans for  
34  
35 the gates to the design that you, the commissioners and board members, preferred.  
36  
37 Given the orientation of the new facilities, however, it is not possible to align the gate  
38  
39 with the shoreline.  
40  
41

42       “In short, the District has listened to the community and has made changes to the  
43  
44 project. However, there are many features, like the ADA and public access components,  
45  
46 that we cannot change any further.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1            “We realize that we will never be able to satisfy all members of the community  
2  
3 and we hope that opponents of the project will not influence the City to act in violation of  
4  
5 its legal obligations under the lease. However, we need to provide for the interests of  
6  
7 our passengers who take 793,000 trips each year. Many of them cannot attend these  
8  
9 hearings, but are Sausalito residents who count on the District’s ferry service to get to  
10  
11 work and home each day.

12  
13            “As demonstrated by their regular patronage, and their recent supportive  
14  
15 signature campaign, they appreciate the quality of the commute experience on the ferry  
16  
17 and want to see the service improved. In addition, there are those who drive on the  
18  
19 Highway 101 corridor who would be impacted by thousands of additional drivers on the  
20  
21 road if we cannot accommodate those passengers on the ferry in the future.

22  
23            “Although it has not been raised in our discussions at these meetings, we have  
24  
25 made it clear to the City that the District has multiple federal grants to fund this project.  
26  
27 We need to be making progress towards construction or that grant funding may be in  
28  
29 jeopardy. There is, therefore, a limited time in which discussions and alternatives can be  
30  
31 considered. While we recognize the sincere concern of many of those who have  
32  
33 participated in these meetings, we have a responsibility to operate the ferry service and  
34  
35 to be a good steward of the grant funds that are available to construct this project. If  
36  
37 those funds are lost, then there may not be any funding to replace the ferry terminal and  
38  
39 everyone will suffer as a result.  
40

41  
42            “We hope that you will provide direction in support of the project to the Council  
43  
44 and in support of the Council’s legal obligations to comply with the terms of the lease.”  
45

46            Thank you for your attention.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Any questions from HLB members of the Golden Gate  
2  
3 Bridge District?  
4

5 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have two questions. After reading the detailed and  
6  
7 somewhat provocative letter from the Golden Gate Bridge District and listening to the  
8  
9 presentation, there were a couple of points which caught my attention.  
10

11 One was that the size of the ferry landing that is proposed is partially due to ADA  
12  
13 standards. We've received public comments to the effect that current federal ADA  
14  
15 standards are in place only for recreational boating facilities and do not apply to  
16  
17 passenger vessels. Those comments state further that ADA standards for passenger  
18  
19 vessels are currently under development, but have not yet been adopted, and could be  
20  
21 modified in the future. So my question is why would the Golden Gate Bridge District feel  
22  
23 bound by ADA standards for passenger vessels that have not yet been adopted and  
24  
25 may be modified prior to adoption?  
26

27 MICHAEL CONNERAN: I can answer that. Michael Conneran, legal counsel for  
28  
29 the District. The ADA regulations are indeed draft regulations. They contain a 1:12 slope  
30  
31 standard that is universal through accessibility standards, and basically the definition is  
32  
33 less than 1:12 is inaccessible. So those who might ask us to provide a steeper slope are  
34  
35 essentially saying that it's okay to have an inaccessible facility. We're making the best  
36  
37 guess we can.  
38

39 Those regulations apply to all sorts of vessels, and the reason there has been a  
40  
41 delay in their finalization is because they also apply to the Princess Cruise Lines and  
42  
43 have things on subjects like miniature golf regulations, so there's a lot of details in there.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 But 1:12 is universal through on land and should be on shore. This is the best  
2  
3 guess. We're not going to build a facility that we know is inaccessible and have to live  
4  
5 with it for 40 years. It's simple, but your point is correct.  
6

7 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have a second question that relates to federal  
8  
9 grant funding. The federal transportation funds which are cited in the presentation, will  
10  
11 all of those funds go to the Golden Gate Bridge District, or would any of them go to the  
12  
13 City of Sausalito, and if so, what percentage?  
14

15 EWA BOWER: Madam Chair, Secretary Fraser, the funds we are referring to in  
16  
17 our letter are the funds that will fund the waterside project only. We are not talking about  
18  
19 the grant fund that will be available, and is available, for the landside. The funding  
20  
21 structure for our waterside project is about 80% FTA and 20% District.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: And your letter said that delay *may* affect the viability of those  
24  
25 funds. What is the cutoff for... Have you sought an extension?  
26

27 EWA BOWER: We sought the extension several times, and we received support  
28  
29 from the FTA, but in a situation where we are right now, if we don't deliver this project  
30  
31 there will be other public agencies with a need for funds, and the funds may be diverted  
32  
33 to them and we will just simply lose funding. It is a very important issue for us. I mean  
34  
35 without this federal support we have none our own money to build this facility.  
36  
37

38 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Let me be more specific. Would any of the funds  
39  
40 that you mention go to the City of Sausalito for landside improvement or other  
41  
42 improvements in the area?  
43

44 EWA BOWER: Once again, what we refer to in our letter are strictly the funds  
45  
46 that would be spent on the waterside project. Now, there is a grant of \$2.4 million  
47  
48 available that will be transferred through the District to the City for the City landside  
49  
50

1 improvements, and we do understand that the City will initiate a separate public process  
2 that will provide for the public comment period and development of the City plan for the  
3 landside improvement.  
4

5  
6  
7 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Thank you.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Other HLB members have questions? Please.  
10

11 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. I have a question about the  
12 reference to plans being presented to the City Council. Were those conceptual or were  
13 they actual drawings similar to this?  
14

15  
16  
17 EWA BOWER: The plans of course were more conceptual than what you see  
18 right now, however, those plans in that time provided the clear dimensions of what is  
19 our intent regarding the width and length of various elements of the new boarding  
20 facility.  
21

22  
23  
24  
25 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you. So did they receive any visual  
26 schematics at the time?  
27

28  
29  
30 EWA BOWER: Yes, there was a handout, and anytime we came for a  
31 presentation we had the visual presentation of the project.  
32

33  
34 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: And we can find that in 2011?  
35

36 MALE: (Inaudible).  
37

38 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Other HLB members?  
41

42 SECRETARY FRASER: I'm sorry; I couldn't hear what was the last thing that  
43 you said. Okay. I have a question. In the letter it talks about many of the features of the  
44 pier that's on page 4 were included in response to the requirements for public access  
45 from the BCDC. A lot of people have expressed, and there are issues with potential  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 privacy concerns from the Sausalito Yacht Club, for example, because there's about the  
2  
3 belvederes. The BCDC requirements of public access; is this a mitigation requirement,  
4  
5 making up for taking additional space, like coverage of the bay or shadowing?  
6

7 EWA BOWER: Normally in projects of this type, BCDC, their mission is to  
8  
9 provide public access to the bay, and they try to maximize that public access any time  
10  
11 any project on the waterfront is brought for their consideration. So belvederes were in a  
12  
13 way to provide more public access, to make the pier accessible to the public at all times,  
14  
15 even during the operations of the ferry. It is necessary to provide the refuge areas for  
16  
17 the public that may be there while the passengers are disembarking and boarding the  
18  
19 ferry. So the whole idea is to reconcile these two situations.  
20

21 Also, the width of the pier, the side of the belvederes that are for the public  
22  
23 access, the width of the pier is also governed by the need to stage passengers next to  
24  
25 the gate. As you can imagine, since we do have to move the access control point to the  
26  
27 end of the access pier we need to bring those passengers who are waiting to board the  
28  
29 ferries next to the gate. Otherwise, we will again end up with basically down time for  
30  
31 people to walk from somewhere on the plaza to board our vessel. So the 21 feet that we  
32  
33 have to have includes the 16-foot wide walkway, but it also includes those additional  
34  
35 feet for staging passengers, which definitely takes them out of the plaza.  
36  
37

38 SECRETARY FRASER: Thank you.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Questions from Planning Commissioners? Morgan? No? Vicki?  
41

42 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Thank you for your letter. I appreciate the letter. I  
43  
44 think there was a lot of information there. As you may imagine, in the community there  
45  
46 is a lot of information swirling around that is incorrect or correct, so I think you clarified a  
47  
48 few points.  
49  
50

1 I'd like to talk about your environmental review, and what I use to talk about that,  
2  
3 I believe, Mr. Jensen, is that you, sir? You're from ESA and you did the environmental  
4  
5 documents? Okay, I'm using the first staff report we got, and I just wanted to ask some  
6  
7 questions.  
8

9 It talks about, again, your process with the City Council, that on May 3, 2011 you  
10  
11 went before the Council. I believe I was at that meeting, and you gave a PowerPoint  
12  
13 presentation and you talked about the project, and there was general consensus. You  
14  
15 came back again, and then in connection with your environmental documents you had,  
16  
17 as is always the process, you reviewed them through the public for, I think, you had a  
18  
19 30-day turnaround. Sometimes it's 45; it looks like you had 30. Again the City was able  
20  
21 to respond and give their concerns along with other people that showed up for a  
22  
23 workshop that you presented in Sausalito, and it looked like the concerns that you  
24  
25 responded to were habitat, piling demolition, and construction concerns.  
26

27  
28 First of all, the environmental review was done on the project that we currently  
29  
30 have, is that correct? The same dimensions? Okay. The only thing that's changed then  
31  
32 has been what we're calling it. Well, before you were saying it was an expansion, now  
33  
34 there was a big push to call it a remodel, but essentially it's the same project, is that  
35  
36 right?  
37

38 MICHAEL CONNERAN: I don't recall ever (inaudible) remodel.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Sir, can you speak into the microphone.  
41

42 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Well, I'll back off that. I mean there's been some  
43  
44 discussion in the community...  
45

46 CHAIR COX: Well, I'd like to hear the answer. He said something, but we  
47  
48 couldn't hear it. What was the answer, sir?  
49  
50

1 MICHAEL CONNERAN: I don't recall ever calling this project a remodel.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Okay, maybe I spoke incorrectly with the  
4 semantics.  
5

6  
7 CHAIR COX: Well, there was a quotation in our March 11<sup>th</sup> staff report.  
8

9 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Can I finish?

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Yeah.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Okay. So then some of the consternation with the  
14 community has been that this is such a large project that it really wasn't a restoration, it  
15 was something else very expansive, to use a lot of quotes that we've heard. But it  
16 sounds to me from your letter that all the agencies that you went before, which are all  
17 the usual suspects: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries, you  
18 went to CDWF, you went to SHPO, you went to Army Corps of Engineers like you have  
19 to do on all of these projects, you followed all the rules, and if you had to do anything as  
20 mitigation, you've incorporated that. For instance, the eelgrass beds, the shadowing,  
21 you're going to use a material that's more translucent to let light through.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 CHAIR COX: Do you have a question?  
33

34 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I do.  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
37

38 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I want to just make sure that what this is. Is this  
39 stating correctly what you've done in terms of the environmental review? Because the  
40 community has now said that they think a new environmental document needs to be  
41 reviewed, but in essence what has been reviewed is the project that you're showing us  
42 now. There's been no increase, there's been no change, is that right?  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 EWA BOWER: This is correct. Let me say that right now we have a narrower  
2 pier than what was considered during the environmental review process. Yes, the  
3 eelgrass was reviewed and we are building the deck that is more translucent and  
4 provides light down into the water. We also are spending funds on doing separate  
5 environmental mitigation regarding eelgrass. We'll do it with, I think, one of the  
6 conservancy groups; they will provide so many acres of the restored eelgrass.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Just to follow up on that, reading from the environmental document  
14 it says that the facilities will include a 19-foot wide steel gangway. Your gangway is not  
15 19 feet now; it's 21 feet?  
16  
17  
18

19 EWA BOWER: Before we made the change to the profile and shape of the truss,  
20 it was 19 feet. Right now it's 19 feet edge-to-edge width.  
21  
22

23 CHAIR COX: What other changes to the dimensions of the project have been  
24 made since the environmental document?  
25  
26

27 EWA BOWER: We have decreased the width of the pier from 25 feet to 21 feet,  
28 and we made of course modifications to the gate to make it less visible and simpler.  
29  
30

31 CHAIR COX: The environmental document estimates that the construction  
32 period will be six months. I saw correspondence; I'll tell you what page that's on. I saw  
33 John shaking his head no. It's on page 1-9. "Construction is estimated to require six  
34 months." As I understand it, the construction schedule is 14 months, is that correct?  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 EWA BOWER: There are two timelines that this project has. Six months refers to  
40 the length of the construction that will take place onsite. This will involve installation of  
41 new piling, bringing in the new float, and constructing the new access pier. But the  
42 project also involves offsite construction work. Namely we have to fabricate the float,  
43 and we'll fabricate the gangway. They will be constructed in specialty shops and they  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 will be hauled to the site. So in the overall project, what drives the overall time of this  
2  
3 project from the contractor perspective is the fabrication of these two elements.  
4

5 In terms of how much time it will take onsite, it is important for us to enter into  
6  
7 construction in water at a very specific time, because there are limitations. There is a so  
8  
9 called environmental time window when we can work in the water. So if we award this  
10  
11 contract just a couple months before the window shuts down, we will be just sitting there  
12  
13 with just partial construction. So if this happens, and it's a great potential that this is  
14  
15 what we're facing right now, this again delays this project by probably a year.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay, other questions, and then I'll... I'm not done. Go ahead,  
18  
19 Susan.  
20

21 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Just while we're on the  
22  
23 environmental review, can I ask a question of staff?  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Please.  
26

27 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Could staff clarify what our role is  
28  
29 vis-a-vis the environmental document? I see that in our proposed resolution there are  
30  
31 findings under CEQA 15162 that there are no new circumstances, but are we being  
32  
33 asked to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, or just find that there is no changed  
34  
35 circumstances?  
36

37 CHAIR COX: CEQA is also referenced in one of our findings, B1.  
38

39 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I was talking about our approval  
40  
41 action right now.  
42

43 CHAIR COX: Do you want us to come back to you, Lilly? Okay, I guess for me  
44  
45 the question would be is our approval in any way connected to the assumption that  
46  
47 CEQA review is complete?  
48  
49  
50

1 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, if I may?  
2

3 CHAIR COX: Yeah.  
4

5 COUNSEL WAGNER: To the extent that the Planning Commission and/or the  
6  
7 HLB are making any findings or CEQA issue discussion, it's a recommendation to the  
8  
9 City Council, because neither the Planning Commission or the HLB are actually taking  
10  
11 action on the project. It's the City Council under the lease that's taking an action, and so  
12  
13 to the extent that there is information that you believe needs to be included in the record  
14  
15 with respect to CEQA, we would ask that you make that clear for us this evening, and  
16  
17 Lilly is looking at your resolution to determine what exactly we're asking you to do with  
18  
19 respect to CEQA.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Okay, appreciate that. Susan, other questions while Lilly is looking  
22  
23 at that?  
24

25 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Yeah, I have a question for the  
26  
27 District just about one of the letters that was in our packet, it's #98 from Transportation  
28  
29 Solutions Defense and Education Fund, Mr. Schonbrunn, and he takes issue with a  
30  
31 statement that was made at one of our hearings about dredging. Could you respond to  
32  
33 that letter, if you're familiar with it?  
34  
35

36 CHAIR COX: I think it was late mail, so I don't know if they have seen it. It came  
37  
38 in today.  
39

40 COUNSEL WAGNER: And Chair Cox, also for the record, all that late mail was  
41  
42 sent to the District. Obviously it was a lot of information coming in with a very short time  
43  
44 to review it, so I can't speak to whether they've actually seen it or not, but I know that it  
45  
46 was posted on the site and provided.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 EWA BOWER: If I may provide some thoughts from the engineering perspective  
2  
3 and being involved in these type of projects before. I don't want to speak on behalf of  
4  
5 the current law, because here is our legal counsel that may speak to that effect.  
6

7 My experience is that any time a project of this type is considered, the very  
8  
9 important element is to avoid dredging any possible way, so we always ask what  
10  
11 alternatives we can present to avoid dredging, because it opens the window for all kinds  
12  
13 of environmental impacts. Knowing that we operate ferries, we know what's involved in  
14  
15 dredging. We have this prescribed navigation channel, but anything towards the shore  
16  
17 is protected. We have our facilities sitting on the edge of the marsh. We have no rights  
18  
19 to enter to on the marsh. So it is a very similar situation here.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Susan?

22 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: That's all.

23 CHAIR COX: Bill?

24 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I actually only had two questions, but now I have four,  
25  
26 and the first one is a comment.  
27

28 It is extraordinarily disingenuous of the District to say that at that 2011 meeting  
29  
30 those plans received the Council's unanimous consent. On May 3, 2011 you were still  
31  
32 referring to this under the terms of the lease as a repair or replacement, which did not  
33  
34 need the consent of the Council. So you didn't get the consent, because you didn't need  
35  
36 it. At that time you believed you were under the terms of the lease immune from that  
37  
38 consent. The consent to deal with the major alteration was required only when the City  
39  
40 Attorney on February 4, 2015 said that this was not a repair or replacement, this was a  
41  
42 major alteration, and you needed consent. There's a big difference in saying that you  
43  
44 received unanimous consent in 2011.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, with due deference I'm going to ask that we ask questions  
2  
3 at this point.

4  
5 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I will ask the next question.

6  
7 CHAIR COX: Okay, thanks.

8  
9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: The next question basically is prefaced by the fact that  
10  
11 your Mitigated Negative Declaration was entitled, "Vessel Boarding Rehabilitation  
12  
13 Project." In that document it is mentioned that you're going to require between 5,000-  
14  
15 8,000 square feet of construction staging area. Where is that going to be?

16  
17 EWA BOWER: We will be working with the contractor. Obviously there is no  
18  
19 laydown area here next to the ferry facilities; it is very common now with projects. We  
20  
21 have the same issues related to our construction jobs on the bridge since we are  
22  
23 surrounded by the parklands. So arrangements are made by the contractor to store the  
24  
25 materials and stage offsite, and it will be for the contractor to make this arrangement. Of  
26  
27 course what we expect is it will influence the cost of the construction since there will be  
28  
29 a lot a trucking and off hauling related to this issue.

30  
31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So you don't know where it's going to be?

32  
33 EWA BOWER: The place will be the contractor's choice, because the contractor  
34  
35 makes arrangements based on the financial circumstances.

36  
37 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Okay. The next question is your drawing E-3.7  
38  
39 identifies a transformer, and the transformer location is in one of the parking stalls near  
40  
41 the entrance to Parking Lot #1. Has that location been confirmed with the City since it's  
42  
43 not in your lease area? Has in fact the City determined how much rent you're going to  
44  
45 pay for that space?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 EWA BOWER: We were in conversations with the City staff and we received  
2 confirmation that this space will be available.  
3

4  
5 VICE CHAIR WERNER: It will be available. Each one of those parking stalls,  
6 according to Chief Tejada's report is worth about \$7,200 a year. That's 12 times what  
7 you're paying for the rent on the property that you're using for the boat. Are you in fact  
8 going to be negotiating a price for that parking stall?  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 EWA BOWER: This issue was never brought to us, and for this reason I cannot  
14 answer your question.  
15

16  
17 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Okay. My last question is that on page 1-6 of your  
18 September 2012 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration you state, "In addition, an  
19 emergency generator for lighting, short hour, and operation of boarding ramps will be  
20 installed." Drawing E-1.1 of your 65% complete construction set identifies a 100  
21 kilowatt, 480 volt, 3-phase, 3-wire generator. Where is that going to go?  
22  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 EWA BOWER: Since that conceptual idea this issue was dropped, because in  
28 detailed design we found out we will not need that generator.  
29

30  
31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So that generator is not part of this project, even though  
32 it's on your drawings?  
33

34  
35  
36 EWA BOWER: I do understand you refer to our environmental document and  
37 the conceptual design?  
38

39  
40 CHAIR COX: No, these are our drawings. It's on our drawings.  
41

42  
43 VICE CHAIR WERNER: It's on your 65% complete construction set. That was  
44 not in the set you gave us; I saw it online.  
45

46  
47 EWA BOWER: But this temporary generator is not included in the set of  
48 drawings that is currently under your consideration.  
49  
50

1 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So that is a change?

2  
3 EWA BOWER: Yes, we removed this element of the project.

4  
5 VICE CHAIR WERNER: So when power goes off, which it does with some  
6  
7 frequency in Sausalito, you're going to be without power to run all of those hydraulic  
8  
9 systems on the floats?

10  
11 EWA BOWER: We have other means to deal with this situation.

12  
13 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: I had a couple of questions. At one of our prior meetings I asked  
16  
17 the District about sharing its landing with other entities, and I was told that the District  
18  
19 had not spoken with any other entity about that, but when I looked at your  
20  
21 environmental document I saw diagrams in which you show vessels on either side of  
22  
23 the landing, one belonging to the District and one belonging to another project. This is  
24  
25 Figure 5-B and Figure 4 in the EIR. So is it true that you intend to share the ferry landing  
26  
27 with other agencies so that we may have two boats docked at the same time, as  
28  
29 depicted in your visual simulation of the proposed project?

30  
31 JAMES SWINDLER: The District does currently share the facility as far as the  
32  
33 ferry operations with Blue & Gold, a private operator. They also operate a schedule. In  
34  
35 addition to that, we do allow private charters to come in and use the facility on occasion.  
36  
37 What we do not allow, we do not allow two vessels at the dock at the same time  
38  
39 simultaneously loading or offloading, it's an unsafe condition. But we do occasionally  
40  
41 have another vessels docked there maybe waiting an hour or so to load, but we do not  
42  
43 do simultaneous loading and offloading.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: We mentioned maintenance of the pier, especially now with the  
2  
3 belvederes and the benches, and I think you said you would be using water or hoses to  
4  
5 maintain that?  
6

7 JAMES SWINDLER: I don't believe we stated that. I don't think we were specific.  
8  
9 We do realize that we'll have more to maintain and keep clean, but we haven't been  
10  
11 specific as to how that will be done.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: What is your plan to maintaining those areas, for cleaning them  
14  
15 and maintaining them?  
16

17 JAMES SWINDLER: Well, I think they would be cleaned like any pier. I mean  
18  
19 typically we would sweep, make sure it's maintained, and make sure there's no trash.  
20  
21 Occasionally, I would think maybe several times a year, you might need to power wash  
22  
23 to clean up any stains and things like that. Obviously you want to keep it in good repair.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: The reason I ask is that your CEQA document says that, "The  
26  
27 proposed project would not require water supply to serve the project," and it seems to  
28  
29 me that is not necessarily a true statement.  
30

31 JAMES SWINDLER: Oh, okay. I think the CEQA document was referencing that  
32  
33 we actually have to take on water for our vessels. We have also a sewage pump in  
34  
35 Larkspur and we take on water for the vessels. We don't need to take on water there,  
36  
37 because all of our vessels are berthed in the evening in Larkspur. So I believe that's  
38  
39 what the document was referencing. It wasn't referencing cleaning or anything like that.  
40  
41

42 CHAIR COX: And finally, your CEQA document says, "The proposed project  
43  
44 would not result in an increase in ferry service at the terminal, therefore there would not  
45  
46 be new noise generating sources resulting from implementation of the project, inclusive  
47  
48 of ferry operations, motor vehicle trip generation to the surrounding roadway network, or  
49  
50



1 stationary sources.” I am at a loss to reconcile that statement with your projections in  
2  
3 terms of levels of the increases in levels of service.  
4

5 JAMES SWINDLER: If I could answer that. Where it refers to noise, we do not  
6  
7 have any plans to increase the frequency of ferry service. Right now in the summertime  
8  
9 we put on a second vessel. We'll continue to do that. We have no plans to increase the  
10  
11 service. Neither does Blue & Gold. I think what we're referencing when we talk about  
12  
13 increasing the volume of passengers and bicycles, obviously with a wider pier, with  
14  
15 something that's more efficient, we'll be able to load more efficiently and we'll be able to  
16  
17 move people out of town, get them on the vessels quicker. But right now, if you look at  
18  
19 our July numbers, which is pretty much the peak season, we're loading a vessel that  
20  
21 takes anywhere from 600-700 people on average with 250-450 people, and the reason  
22  
23 for that is that right now there's a restriction. There are choke points there and we're not  
24  
25 able to efficiently load those vessels.  
26

27  
28 CHAIR COX: Your letter this evening addressed your interest in reducing motor  
29  
30 traffic on Highway 101 as being one of the major reasons for increasing the size of the  
31  
32 ferry terminal so dramatically. My question is have you considered where all of those  
33  
34 vehicles that will now be using the ferry service instead of Highway 101 will be parking,  
35  
36 and the impact that the influx of those additional vehicles will have on the town?  
37

38 EWA BOWER: I believe what the letter states is that if we are not able to replace  
39  
40 this facility; eventually we'll have to close for the safety reasons. We will then not  
41  
42 provide ferry service, and thus, people who are currently using the service will have no  
43  
44 other choice but to use their cars.  
45

46 CHAIR COX: Okay, then my last... Okay guys, I'm going to ask you, please, I  
47  
48 appreciate everybody has opinions, but let's take our turn.  
49  
50

1           Then my last question has to do with a piece of correspondence we received  
2  
3 yesterday from a resident who said that, “The original plan the Golden Gate Bridge  
4  
5 District had when it received \$3.2 million of stimulus money in 2008 was a shovel-ready  
6  
7 project. It has a ramp for bicycles and a ramp for pedestrians. The concept  
8  
9 accommodated the two-door configuration being added to the ferries. This project was  
10  
11 advertised as being achievable for a budget of \$4 million and was supposed to be  
12  
13 completed by 2011.”  
14

15           And my question is why not proceed with that project that was initially conceived  
16  
17 and characterized as a rehabilitation of the existing project? It seems as though you  
18  
19 considered that to be a feasible project in 2011. What other than the bicycle ridership  
20  
21 has changed since 2011 to justify such a huge transformation in your plan?  
22

23           EWA BOWER: We had received a promise for those grant funds, but there were  
24  
25 conditions associated with it. As you noted, it requires a shovel-ready project. After  
26  
27 diving into more details, what would involve developing the plans for such new facility,  
28  
29 we just couldn’t meet the time requirement. This type of funding was truly related to jobs  
30  
31 that were sitting on the shelves ready to go, and we did not have a project like this.  
32

33           CHAIR COX: Okay. Please, Bill.  
34

35           VICE CHAIR WERNER: I have one follow up to your question about water, and  
36  
37 the answer was that there wasn’t any water being used. Why are there on Drawing S-  
38  
39 1.1 four automated hose reels, each with a 75-foot hose on them on the float?  
40  
41

42           JAMES SWINDLER: There is existing water at the facility now. We’re not adding  
43  
44 water.  
45

46           VICE CHAIR WERNER: I see.  
47

48           CHAIR COX: Okay, Vicki.  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Can I just ask and follow up all this information  
2  
3 that was in the extensive staff reports we have? I think I read that the reason that you  
4  
5 have someone sharing the facility with you is because the PUC mandated that you give  
6  
7 them access, and that they set the rent, is that correct?  
8

9 JAMES SWINDLER: That's correct.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Thank you.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I have a question.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Okay, go ahead, Morgan.  
16

17 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Regarding the level of service diagrams we've been  
18  
19 reviewing for the 16-foot wide gangway and the 21-foot wide dock or pier, it's my  
20  
21 experience as you're getting on or off the boat is that yes, once you're on the ramp  
22  
23 there's the ability to move at a greater rate of speed, but getting on and off the boat  
24  
25 does create a bottleneck navigating around other people and the furnishings on the  
26  
27 boat. My question then is is it true that this 16-foot wide gangway is a realistic width,  
28  
29 and could a narrower gangway accommodate, understanding that even though you  
30  
31 have two 8-foot wide doorways you're not going to have 4 feet of people coming out of  
32  
33 each doorway at a time, because they still have to navigate around all the obstructions  
34  
35 in the boat, whether it's unloading or loading?  
36  
37

38 JAMES SWINDLER: So the question again?  
39

40 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: The question has to do with the ramp. The width of  
41  
42 the ramp seems to be predicated on the fact that there are two 8-foot wide openings.  
43  
44 Those of us who ride the ferry daily understand that you can't get four people out those  
45  
46 doors, or however many people can get in that width, moving at a certain rate of speed,  
47  
48 because there are so many obstacles to navigate on the boat. Taking that into  
49  
50

1 consideration, it's conceivable that the gangway could be a bit narrower and still  
2  
3 function highly.

4  
5 JAMES SWINDLER: Well, that may apply to offloading the vessels, because  
6  
7 typically obviously when the vessel is coming in the passenger loads are not that  
8  
9 significant, but the 16-foot wide gangway is necessary to be able to utilize the two doors  
10  
11 that are going to be retrofit on each vessel, so that one side of the gangway can be  
12  
13 utilized for bicycles and the other side can used for passengers as they're going down,  
14  
15 and they can split off and go into two different doorways.

16  
17 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Understood. You will have people moving at a  
18  
19 higher rate of speed on the gangway than you will once they pass the portal into the  
20  
21 boat. As soon as they get into the boat, everything stops and they slow down and look  
22  
23 around and try to decide where they're going, so there's a bottleneck there regardless of  
24  
25 how wide you make that gangway.

26  
27 JAMES SWINDLER: Well, I'm not sure that I agree. I mean I've been down there  
28  
29 enough myself, and I believe with the wide doorways that they were going install—the  
30  
31 San Francisco is the sister ship to the Marin, which is being retrofit as well now with the  
32  
33 dedicated bike racks—we've got vessels there that we think will need that 16 feet to get  
34  
35 the passengers and the bicycles down there and try to do our boarding in a reasonable  
36  
37 time.

38  
39 EWA BOWER: If I may add to it, as part of refurbishment, when we install the  
40  
41 two doors, there is also reshuffling of the interior, because as you can imagine, we will  
42  
43 have to change the location of seats and so on to provide a clearer passage at the  
44  
45 doorway.

46  
47  
48 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I have a follow up question to that.  
2  
3 Again, I think the 16-foot wide gangway has been one of my biggest concerns, not in  
4  
5 the sense of the width of the gangway, but what it leads to in terms of the height of the  
6  
7 truss and the diameter of the supports. But did you take into consideration... Obviously  
8  
9 about physical issues with loading and unloading, but in my experience riding the ferry,  
10  
11 probably equally or more important are the operational issues: the training of the  
12  
13 deckhands, and unfamiliarity with many of the people who are riding the ferry with the  
14  
15 process. It seems like yes, you can increase efficiencies with physical expansion, but  
16  
17 really the more important issue is the operational side: including more foreign  
18  
19 languages, more deckhands or more public relations type people to move people  
20  
21 quickly in and out. So I'm wondering, when you developed the level of service and the  
22  
23 standards, the 85% standard that you used, 4% growth rate, were you also building in  
24  
25 operational efficiencies to that?  
26

27 JAMES SWINDLER: Yes, I think you've actually given me an opportunity to get  
28  
29 on my soapbox here, but let me go back and give you a little history on the development  
30  
31 of some of the passenger increases and the bicycle increases we've seen.  
32

33  
34 If you go back about six years ago, the ferry landing, there was no staff there at  
35  
36 all at the ferry division. We had no staff there; everything was done on the vessel. A  
37  
38 deckhand would come off and pretty much handle everything. So we've gone from that  
39  
40 to this summer. We'll talk about last summer.  
41

42 Last summer we would have anywhere from two to three staff right there on the  
43  
44 terminal. We would have at least one manager, sometimes a manager that would  
45  
46 service four hours there, and we had an additional person. In addition to that, the  
47  
48 Chamber of Commerce hires four to five young folks to manage and queue the bikes up  
49  
50

1 out there. So we're doing a lot of training, we're doing a lot in the area of trying to  
2  
3 become more efficient from an operational standpoint as well.  
4

5 The staffing on the vessel has increased anywhere from five to seven. We have  
6  
7 as many as seven deckhands on there right now. We are somewhat limited with the  
8  
9 qualifications of the deckhands. We do have a union agreement where they come out of  
10  
11 the hall, but we do have training. They come through our operation every year, so we're  
12  
13 heavy on the training.  
14

15 You are correct that the language barrier is an issue, but that's why we have  
16  
17 extra staff there trying to make sure that people are briefed before the vessel arrives.  
18  
19 Not to say that we don't have work to do, but we're working on this every year, not only  
20  
21 with our staff, but with the Chamber's staff as well, and there's a new group in town  
22  
23 that's going to help out with that this year as well.  
24

25 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Right. And I certainly appreciate all  
26  
27 of those upgrades, and I'm sure other commuters do as well, but it definitely seems like  
28  
29 there's a lot more room for operational efficiency. My question was when you were  
30  
31 measuring the need for the increased width of the gangway, did you contemplate that  
32  
33 perhaps your increased efficiency could provide other operational efficiencies that would  
34  
35 reduce the need for the width, if that's clear?  
36  
37

38 JAMES SWINDLER: That's a difficult question. As I said, we're always looking at  
39  
40 improvement of the quality of the staff over there. I don't know that improvements like  
41  
42 that are going to reduce the need for the actual physical space on the gangway. I think  
43  
44 that's based on the fact that we want to be able to load the vessels efficiently, and we  
45  
46 believe we need that space as well as the qualified individuals.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 EWA BOWER: And if I may add something here. As James said, we really try to  
2  
3 improve efficiencies with what we have with the current facility, but there is a point  
4  
5 where adding staff will not change the situation, and we already hit that point. You can  
6  
7 imagine, if there is a wider door, even for people who are first using the ferry, it will be  
8  
9 easier for them to find their way, because people who do not have to stop or look  
10  
11 around will not be completely standing in the way of people who are ready to go. So by  
12  
13 just (inaudible) then by observation, any time you have wide door, that door can  
14  
15 improve efficiency of people passing through the door.  
16

17 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Thank you.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Thank you. And Lilly, did you have any feedback on Susan's prior  
20  
21 question?  
22

23 LILLY SCHINSING: I think, Chair Cox, that you had noted that the Finding B1 is  
24  
25 relevant for environmental review.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Okay, thank you.  
28

29 LILLY SCHINSING: But it's a recommendation from the Planning Commission to  
30  
31 the City Council.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
34

35 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: That wasn't my question, actually.  
36  
37 My question was is the City Council adopting the Negative Declaration?  
38

39 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: That was done.  
40

41 VICE CHAIR WERNER: It's already been done.  
42

43 CHAIR COX: So yeah, it was done in 2012.  
44

45 VICE CHAIR WERNER: 2012.  
46

47 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: By the City Council?  
48  
49  
50

1 VICE CHAIR WERNER: No.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

4  
5 COUNSEL WAGNER: If I may, Chair Cox? The environmental document was  
6  
7 adopted by the Bridge District as the lead agency, then responsible agencies rely on  
8  
9 that document unless there is substantial evidence in light of the whole record that one  
10  
11 of the triggers under the guideline that's outlined in your staff report occur. So if there  
12  
13 were changes to the project that created significant environmental impacts that were not  
14  
15 mitigated under the Negative Declaration, then there would be a need to look at whether  
16  
17 or not additional environmental documentation was required.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay, so that was my question.  
20  
21 We are a responsible agency, and we are making 15162 findings that there are no new  
22  
23 changed circumstances in order to adopt a resolution?  
24

25  
26 COUNSEL WAGNER: We're asking the Planning Commission to tell us whether  
27  
28 or not you agree with staff's determination that there are no triggers under 15162. If you  
29  
30 believe that there are, we would ask you to make that information part of the record that  
31  
32 goes to the City Council.

33  
34 CHAIR COX: Thank you. A couple of announcements.

35  
36 One, staff will post the District's statement that was read aloud tonight tomorrow  
37  
38 morning as late mail, so you'll be able to access that letter online through the staff's  
39  
40 website. And if you've been on the website, you know there are links to every single  
41  
42 meeting that has ever been conducted regarding this project, as well as to all of the  
43  
44 materials, all of the correspondence, and all of the staff reports. So there will be a link to  
45  
46 the District's letter that was read aloud tonight available for you tomorrow morning.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1           So far I have received 26 speaker cards. At three minutes apiece, that's 78  
2  
3 minutes. I'm going to let everybody speak for three minutes, unless there are other  
4  
5 speaker cards I haven't received. If there are other people who want to speak, I request  
6  
7 you give me your speaker cards now so that I can manage the time of this meeting. I  
8  
9 really am going to hold you to these cards, because I want to make sure that the HLB  
10  
11 and the Planning Commission have adequate opportunity to opine on each of the  
12  
13 questions in Sections A, B, and C of the staff report. So if there are other speaker slips,  
14  
15 if other people would like to speak, I would invite you to please fill out a speaker slip  
16  
17 now. Mary, how many more do you have over there?

18  
19           COUNSEL WAGNER: Six.

20  
21           CHAIR COX: All right, so that's going to add another... All right, an hour-and-a-  
22  
23 half. All right, so if we're done by 9:30, that gives us two hours to do our work. I think  
24  
25 that's okay. And not everybody speaks for three minutes, but I'm just taking a  
26  
27 conservative approach. I do want to make sure that we hear everybody's feedback.  
28

29  
30           So I'm going to open the public comment. I'm going to ask that folks line up. I'm  
31  
32 going to call three names at a time. If you'll line up. Where's the microphone, Lilly, for  
33  
34 people? Okay. So we're going to bring a microphone. We're going to have it front and  
35  
36 center. There are some empty chairs up front. Maybe if you want to move up front as  
37  
38 your turn is coming, so that we can be sure that we move along quickly.

39  
40           And I asked you before, and I'm going to ask you again, I really want to ask your  
41  
42 indulgence, and please, no applause, no boos, no opinions. Please save your opinions  
43  
44 for your spoken words at the microphone.

45  
46           We're going to lead off with Emmet Yeazell, then Stafford Keegin, and then  
47  
48 Nancy Osborn. Can I ask staff to move the microphone? As I look at the speaker, I'm  
49  
50

1 looking right into a light. Maybe you could move it a little bit more to the middle? Perfect.  
2  
3 thank you. You're not staff, but I appreciate. Thank you.  
4

5 EMMET YEAZELL: I'll take an honorary. My question is in regard to a comment  
6  
7 the Bridge District made, and I think I'm quoting them correctly. "We have no plans at  
8  
9 this time," and it is in regard to parking of vessels, or berthing of vessels, at the pier  
10  
11 overnight for an extended period of time. What guarantee do we have that "not at this  
12  
13 time" will not become standard?  
14

15 CHAIR COX: We're beyond the point for asking questions, since we're making  
16  
17 recommendations tonight.  
18

19 EMMET YEAZELL: It's my recommendation that you adopt as part of your  
20  
21 finding that it will not be allowed to be used, as the Larkspur Landing, for parking of  
22  
23 vessels overnight, because that would greatly impact our views.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Next is Stafford Keegin, then Nancy Osborn, and then Dave  
26  
27 Borton.  
28

29 STAFFORD KEEGIN: I'll be brief, but I'd like to address the findings that you  
30  
31 have been asked to make. I'm Stafford Keegin; I live here in Sausalito.  
32

33 I would like to say that, just highlighting the principal ones, there are a number of  
34  
35 questions that these findings raise, and that I'm just going to hit on the major ones.  
36

37 First, I think A1, it is clearly virtually impossible to make...  
38

39 CHAIR COX: Lilly, can you put the findings up on the board for us? A1 has to do  
40  
41 with the compatibility with the neighboring area.  
42

43 STAFFORD KEEGIN: Yes, I think a project of this size is clearly incompatible,  
44  
45 and I'm kind of surprised that the mere use of concrete and aluminum will render it  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 compatible. There are lots of things one can do with concrete and aluminum that would  
2  
3 clearly be incompatible and I think this project is one of them.  
4

5 I would also then go to A8, which is whether this project “helps achieve the  
6  
7 purposes of the historic overlay district.” I’m not quite sure how it could possibly do that,  
8  
9 and it is unclear to me that staff has provided any direction in that regard either.  
10

11 I would then go to C2, which is that, “The proposed architecture or site design  
12  
13 complements the surrounding neighborhood and/or district,” and I think it does either by  
14  
15 maintaining design character or by a distinctive and creative solution. It seems to me  
16  
17 that the grossly oversized structural members hardly create a design that is compatible  
18  
19 or complements the neighborhood there, and I think Finding C2 is virtually impossible to  
20  
21 make.  
22

23 And C3, again, “The proposed project is consistent with the general scale of the  
24  
25 structure and buildings.” It’s not consistent with the general scale of the buildings, and  
26  
27 much has been raised before the Commission on the inappropriate sizing of the project  
28  
29 and the fact that it will probably block the views of those people who are walking along  
30  
31 the gangway unless they are exceedingly tall or exceedingly short.  
32

33 Finally, I’d like to just note that the belvederes create problems under Conditions  
34  
35 C9 and C13 and, I think, raises serious questions to whether they are a usable device  
36  
37 for creating public access.  
38

39 And with that, I’m out of here with a minute and three to go. Have a nice evening.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: Thank you, and I really appreciate your focusing on the findings  
42  
43 that we have to make this evening, as did a number of you who wrote correspondence.  
44  
45 It was very helpful. Next is Nancy Osborn, then Dave Borton, and then Cristobal-Jose  
46  
47 Prieto Inarritu.  
48  
49  
50

1 NANCY OSBORN: I'm Nancy Osborn, Sausalito resident, and I'm sorry, I did not  
2  
3 focus on the findings.

4  
5 Sitting here, what I focused on, I came up with a lot of notes and they've only  
6  
7 emphasized it's kind of an intangible, but I feel the relationship between the Bridge  
8  
9 District and the City has not been what it should be, that I think it began with almost a  
10  
11 total ignorance of the Historic District in the design itself.

12  
13 The City has a problem. We could have called it the "tiger under the rug." It's no  
14  
15 longer under the rug. That's the bikers and the biking situation. The fact that we have to  
16  
17 close streets, that we don't have parking for the bikes where they're going, nobody has  
18  
19 addressed where all these people are going to line up if global warming results in the  
20  
21 landside being somewhat underwater in a number of years.

22  
23 It just seems that there are so many other factors besides all these nuts and bolts  
24  
25 that you really have to take into consideration, but I think these outside factors are  
26  
27 enough to base a denial on, and I hope you will do that.

28  
29  
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Please, folks. Next is Dave Borton, then Cristobal-Jose  
31  
32 Prieto, and then Dan Rheiner.

33  
34 DAVE BORTON: I'm Dave Borton; I'm from the Sausalito Yacht Club. Dan  
35  
36 Rheiner is also from the Sausalito Yacht Club. I think it makes more sense for him to go  
37  
38 first, and then I'll follow him.

39  
40 CHAIR COX: Fair enough. Mr. Rheiner.

41  
42 DAN RHEINER: Okay, thank you. Good evening. I'm here both as a resident  
43  
44 and as a chairman of the executive board for the Yacht Club, and I know you've heard  
45  
46 from...

47  
48 CHAIR COX: Lilly, can you put up the findings regarding the... Okay.

1 DAN RHEINER: With me here tonight certainly is the current commodore, as  
2 well as several of our past commodores, and we don't feel that the Yacht Club has been  
3 given due consideration of this as it impacts both our view and members, and also  
4 potential structural damage to the club and the pilings. I say that, because as current  
5 chairman and commodore and some of the past commodores, none of us have been  
6 contacted. So with that, that's a concern.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 I'm glad another member of the audience already brought up the fact that ferries  
14 are parked there, have been parked overnight, and I do hope we get a guarantee that  
15 that won't happen in the future.  
16  
17  
18

19 And having another ferry, which I heard tonight may be sitting there on the dock  
20 for another hour certainly kills our whole view of the City, and it looks like this whole  
21 project is encroaching further toward the Yacht Club by about 15 feet. Also, the height is  
22 increasing as well.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 So those are several of our concerns. Thank you, ma'am.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I'll call back Mr. Borton, and then we'll hear from  
30 Cristobal-Jose Prieto Inarritu, and then we'll hear from Jennifer Gennari.  
31  
32

33 DAVE BORTON: Thank you. I'm Dave Borton; I'm the Commodore of the Yacht  
34 Club, and I want to address the concern we have over the damage to our pilings and to  
35 the bulkhead that are around the club and hold the club up due to dredging of that  
36 space. And there is some dredging that goes on, and I'll get into that in a little bit.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 But we have piles holding up the building, and we also have 150 linear feet of  
43 bulkhead along the shoreline that is accessible to the bay. We had a study in 2005 that  
44 looked at the pilings and there was no damage to them at that time, and the concrete  
45 bulkhead had some damage, which we repaired. So that was ten years ago.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 The ferry project in 2012 did an environmental study. Section 9, pages 237-240,  
2  
3 described the investigation into ten different factors of the environment. Several were on  
4  
5 water quality and groundwater depletion, drainage and runoff water, and flood hazard  
6  
7 considerations. Nothing addressed the dredging process. It was not covered in that part  
8  
9 of the environmental study, and that particular process is what we are concerned about.  
10

11 The way dredging is done today is a catamaran ferry is backed into the ferry  
12  
13 landing and aims the props at the shoreline, and then they run the props for about 30  
14  
15 minutes, just pounding water into the shoreline, stirring up all the mud on the floor of the  
16  
17 bay, and that's the dredging process. We're concerned about that damaging the pilings  
18  
19 and the bulkhead.  
20

21 What we would ask is that we are mitigated for damage in the future to the pilings  
22  
23 and to the bulkhead of the support structure for our club. So that's what we're looking  
24  
25 for.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Next is Cristobal-Jose Prieto Inarritu, then Jennifer  
28  
29 Gennari, then Carol Cotton.  
30

31 CRISTOBAL-JOSE PRIETO INARRITU: Hello, my name is Cristobal-Jose Prieto  
32  
33 and I'm a daily ferry rider, but I'm actually here on behalf of Matt Austin, one of our co-  
34  
35 passengers who isn't here and he asked me to read a letter.  
36  
37

38 He says, "We personally do not share the view that there is something wrong  
39  
40 with the plans to upgrade our ferry service and terminal. In fact, 25-plus years of  
41  
42 standing in the cold wind and rain during the winter months and suffering 30-plus minute  
43  
44 delays waiting in the San Francisco terminal for delayed 5:30 and 6:40pm ferries, which  
45  
46 has gotten worse and worse, means that something has to be done now.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 If federal money from (inaudible) funds is available, it needs to be captured and  
2  
3 used before they put the burden on the fares, which is now already \$11.00 a day round  
4  
5 trip for regular residents, and slated for a 5% increase in July. Speaking for myself, if  
6  
7 they could land two boats at once in Sausalito, this would spin turnaround time and  
8  
9 minimize the ferry lineup at the terminal.

10  
11 Capital improvement permitting, dual level loading and then uploading in San  
12  
13 Francisco are required as well so that bicycles no longer have to be carried up perilous  
14  
15 stairs one at a time. Otherwise, bicycles should be limited to those with a commuter  
16  
17 bicycle pass available to residents.

18  
19 I am not worried about transit hubs. I welcome more service; although I consider  
20  
21 it unlikely this will come about. I'm not worried about the size or the shape of the  
22  
23 entranceway or the size of the float platform. I understand that they modified things  
24  
25 somewhat to take into account the Yacht Club's needs. Fine, as long as the main  
26  
27 objective of the updated structure permitting faster loading and unloading multiple  
28  
29 vessels are maintained, and the federal money is captured and used timely.

30  
31 I agree with widening ramps to become ADA compliant.

32  
33 And may we please get at least an awning or something of minimal size shelter  
34  
35 from the rain? We are all trying to do our part for the environment, and 300 or so of us  
36  
37 ride with great regularity. We are your neighbors, your friends, and together we keep  
38  
39 300 cars off of our streets.

40  
41 And he also submitted a petition with 50 passengers from the ferry signing.

42  
43 Thank you.

44  
45 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Jennifer Gennari, then Carol Cotton, and then Tammy  
46  
47 Blanchard.  
48  
49  
50

1 JENNIFER GENNARI: Hi, I'm Jennifer Gennari and I'm thrilled actually that I'm  
2  
3 not the only person who is here as a daily ferry commuter. I'm also a Sausalito resident,  
4  
5 and I want to say thank you for being forward thinking.  
6

7 They're younger people. I commute into the City and I work for a transportation  
8  
9 planning firm, and there are some statistics that the new generation, the millennial  
10  
11 workers, are driving 40% less than in previous years, and we know that we need to  
12  
13 provide different choices for how people get to work.  
14

15 In fact, it's very hard for us to imagine what it's going to be like 40 years from  
16  
17 now, but I believe we will be driving less and biking and walking more, and so it is  
18  
19 imperative that this ferry terminal gets upgraded and thinking ahead to the future.  
20

21 I also really appreciate you thinking regionally. We live here in Sausalito, but we  
22  
23 also live in the San Francisco Bay Area.  
24

25 Thank you for managing the tourists who will continue to flock to our city and  
26  
27 financially support the City.  
28

29 Thank you for the engineers and the architects for the design. I leave it to you  
30  
31 guys to work out the aesthetics, the details, but as the last speaker just said, please do  
32  
33 not delay this project.  
34

35 Thank you for making the ferry landing safer. I will send you photos. I haven't  
36  
37 done it yet, but I have pictures of all of us trying to cram through this little doorway and  
38  
39 how dangerous that is for us and for the workers, and I'm really looking forward to not  
40  
41 having to carry my bike up and down the stairs, so thank you for that. I believe that it is  
42  
43 going to help us be prepared for whatever emergencies strike this region, the next  
44  
45 earthquake, whatever. We're going to need this ferry landing.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 I'm a little bit pie in the sky, and people laugh at me sometimes for this, because I  
2  
3 can be a little optimistic. But I would like, and I urge, the HLB and the Planning  
4  
5 Commission and the District and the City of Sausalito to work together, to think of this  
6  
7 as a holistic regional plan. We need to be forward thinking about how we are going to  
8  
9 get from one place to the next. Where are those workers going to go? How are they  
10  
11 going to get to work? Some of you are concerned about the parking. They're going to  
12  
13 bike to the ferry terminal, and they're going to take their bikes with them. I think that we  
14  
15 need to think about offering more options and more choices for how people travel in this  
16  
17 community and to be ready for whatever the future may bring, so thank you very much.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Carol Cotton, the Kay Mitzel, and then Leslie Hail.  
20

21 CAROL COTTON: Thank you so much to the Commission and the Board for  
22  
23 making it possible for all of us to be together in a large room. I really appreciate it. I've  
24  
25 been a resident on and off since 1962, and my name is Carol Cotton.  
26

27 I've tried to be objective in approaching these questions and reading everything  
28  
29 that was available online. Thank you for all the information you made available to us.  
30  
31 But I've concluded that our small town of Sausalito is caught in a double bind.  
32

33 I think that we're caught between the increasing numbers of bicycle rental  
34  
35 companies—there are six pages online who advertise—and their increasing numbers of  
36  
37 rental bikes that are being brought into Marin through Sausalito, and returned from here  
38  
39 on the ferry on the one hand.  
40

41 On the other hand, the Golden Gate District, attempting to meet the needs of  
42  
43 rental bikes. I sympathize with commuters. I think that the ferry should be improved, but  
44  
45 I don't believe that the rental bike companies and all of the bikes coming to town should  
46  
47 be dictating how we approach this problem. We are a small town; we have narrow  
48  
49  
50

1 streets trapped between water and hills and a limited capacity to accommodate the  
2  
3 bikes and all the visitors that these ads bring into our town.  
4

5 The Bus and Bike Forum has tried to address these problems over the last five  
6  
7 years and has made some progress, so I'm surprised that the Golden Gate District isn't  
8  
9 aware that our City Council elections and many of our efforts have been around  
10  
11 discussions of the problems that rental bikes are creating in our town for passengers,  
12  
13 for cars, for bike lanes, for crosswalks, etc.  
14

15 What we need to do before the ferry expansion is continued, whether we lose  
16  
17 federal funds or not—and now we're hearing that the Ferry District is planning for 20  
18  
19 years ahead in their plans—is we need to plan for at least the next five years about how  
20  
21 the land impact of these increased numbers of visitors, recreational bicycles and  
22  
23 recreational cars—I'm not talking about the early commuters—will impact our town. How  
24  
25 are we going to handle it on both the streets and the parking issues? Let's make a plan  
26  
27 and then decide how much of a ferry expansion that we need. Thank you.  
28

29  
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Tammy Blanchard, then Kay Mitzel, and then Leslie  
31  
32 Hail.  
33

34 TAMMY BLANCHARD: Hi, I'm Tammy Blanchard, resident of Sausalito.  
35

36 I think I've read every letter and all the minutes. I can say that I agree with many  
37  
38 of the people in this community that we really need to have a plan on land before we  
39  
40 initiate this large scale ferry. It's the cart before the horse. And you know, if we let the  
41  
42 Golden Gate District do what they want, they would have had Highway 101 where  
43  
44 Bridgeway is now. We need to stand up to them and tell them what we want.  
45

46 I was looking at our General Plan, so this speaks to the findings that you are  
47  
48 charged with, and this is the Community Design and Historical Preservation element,  
49  
50

1 and I know you guys all know, but I just wanted to remind you that the main goal here is  
2  
3 to consider the scale and architectural harmony, integrate structures with the natural  
4  
5 environment, preserve the character of the community, enhance public improvements,  
6  
7 address community design concerns through appropriate means, and respect and  
8  
9 maintain the exterior integrity of the historic structures and sites. I want to give this to  
10  
11 you to remind you of that.

12  
13 It also speaks to the private views and the public views. This project, because of  
14  
15 the orientation of the gate, very dramatically affects the public view from the shore. It  
16  
17 runs parallel and it's large and it's tall, so when you're standing near the ferry, you'll be  
18  
19 seeing through bars. That speaks to C4.

20  
21 And then the last thing I'd like to say is that this is from the City of Sausalito's  
22  
23 Strategic Planning Workshop of November 22, 2013 where at that meeting many of the  
24  
25 now Council members put forth a vision for the City. In 15 to 20 years they would have  
26  
27 preserved the magic of Sausalito and maintained the small village character so that it is  
28  
29 still a little funky, and there would not be a significant growth in population and it would  
30  
31 still be a great place to live and work, and we would preserve the beautiful waterfront.

32  
33 So I'd like to hand these to you.

34  
35  
36 CHAIR COX: Thank you. You can give them to staff, and staff will get them to  
37  
38 us. Okay, Kay Mitzel, then Leslie Hail, and then Bill Versaci.

39  
40 KAY MITZEL: Good evening. Thank you, Chair Cox. My name is Kay Mitzel and  
41  
42 I live at 119 Sacramento Avenue, and I have lived in Sausalito since 1976.

43  
44 I'm a little speechless after the presentation, so I'm going to just read what I have  
45  
46 here. They caught me off guard for some of the things that were brought up this  
47  
48 evening. Again, something given to us at the last minute. It's a bit frustrating.

1 Basically I'm just going to state I'm opposed to the planned expansion, and to  
2  
3 avoid repetition I will simply state I concur with the concerns expressed. This doesn't fit  
4  
5 our town and that is why I'm here to ask both of the boards here to deny this permit.  
6

7 As the City Council determined in January, this is not a replacement. I feel we  
8  
9 have been misled by the Bridge District on all aspects of the proposal, and their ability  
10  
11 to manipulate the facts and not provide information on questions submitted is disturbing  
12  
13 and outrageous. I do not feel they are interested in working on solutions. I would like to  
14  
15 have my opinion changed on that.  
16

17 A lot of things have been said about the EIR, which I concur with. I believe the  
18  
19 City Council hears a majority of voters loud and clear, and I'm at least encouraged that  
20  
21 a couple of members are here this evening. I believe they love the beauty and tranquility  
22  
23 of this town as much as we all do. Therefore, again, I ask you to deny this permit. Thank  
24  
25 you.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay guys, I'm going to ask you to hold your applause.  
28  
29 I appreciate it. Leslie Hail is next, then Bill Versaci, and then Bob Wilson.  
30

31 LESLIE HAIL: My family moved here in 1959 and I've been a resident off and on  
32  
33 since. I attended various meetings since 2009 about the improved Sausalito landscape.  
34  
35 The meetings, the information is still not transparent. We are a city, not a private  
36  
37 business. I think we need to see the information, and the effect that it has on the  
38  
39 proposed landing at high tide, and how it will impact our views. These things are still not  
40  
41 being discussed. We are not seeing all of the drawings at various times.  
42

43 It seems that it was quite combative, the letter that was presented tonight by Ms.  
44  
45 Bower, and I found it pretty offensive. It doesn't sound like there is room to discuss  
46  
47 anything.  
48  
49  
50

1           What is the effect of the shoreline on the bay water from fuel and water  
2  
3 movement and thrust of ferries, one or more? We need to look at the effect of more  
4  
5 bikes and tourists in regard to pollution, noise, trash, environment, the effect on  
6  
7 business, and views. Too many people and too many bikes. The people may go  
8  
9 elsewhere and a bit of our downtown business will be impacted by that. We need to look  
10  
11 at the maintenance and repair. Why has this gotten to this point of disrepair? It is not  
12  
13 just materials. This was allowed with public money. Why is the rent so low? Why is  
14  
15 there a sublease to other companies without City oversight? Why are all the drawings  
16  
17 not available? Why was a nod given early on without alerting residents?

18  
19           Where is the safety? Ms. Bower speaks to the safety of those on the ferry. There  
20  
21 is also safety on the landside that needs to be taken into account for commuters, for  
22  
23 residents, for bikers, for vehicles. Why not limit the Sausalito commuters in Marin and  
24  
25 residents to the ferry in Sausalito and have a public facility at Fort Baker for the tourists  
26  
27 and the bikes and bus them in? Again, to speak to safety reasons only with the ferry,  
28  
29 but safety needs to be considered all around. Please deny this. Thank you.

30  
31           CHAIR COX: Thank you. Next is Bill Versaci, and then Bob Wilson, and then  
32  
33 David Suto.

34  
35           BILL VERSACI: Hi, I'm Bill Versaci. I was here before. I think everybody in this  
36  
37 room supports fixing the ferry terminal, and as Ms. Cox will tell you from my card, I'm  
38  
39 not coming down on either side, for or against.

40  
41           I do think that the Planning Commission cannot responsibly approve this project  
42  
43 without a landside plan. I think the District's approach has been shortsighted in terms of  
44  
45 the long term impacts of the plan and the EIR is based on false premises regarding  
46  
47 particularly the landside aspects of the plan.

1 The District's goal is to decrease the terminal turnaround time and they've  
2  
3 designed that for three minutes offloading. However, boarding times, you can see there,  
4  
5 would actually increase, because as you can see from their diagram, more passengers  
6  
7 and passengers with bikes, which are the critical issue, would be lined up farther from  
8  
9 the pier. Increased loads are not insignificant. Applying the District's escalation factors  
10  
11 for 20 years rather than two years, passenger load would increase by almost half. No  
12  
13 additional passengers would be accommodated on the pier. As you can see, they've  
14  
15 doubled the length of the waiting area on the pier, but halved its width. And no  
16  
17 additional passengers could pass through the landside pier any faster, because it's the  
18  
19 same width. The overflow would crowd more public space and obstruct more of the  
20  
21 waterfront access. In addition, there is the issue of contractor parking laydown and field  
22  
23 office.

24  
25 The District's Initial Study for the EIR dismisses these impacts, claiming the  
26  
27 project would have no substantial adverse impacts on open spaces, including  
28  
29 Gabrielson Park, Sausalito Town Square, and seating along the view areas, because  
30  
31 they're not public parks. It says the project would be limited to the terminal and  
32  
33 construction staging would occur in the terminal parking lot. Basically that's to say there  
34  
35 are not landside impacts.

36  
37 But any landside impacts, which are obviously going to happen, they're  
38  
39 discovered after the fact, could trigger reopening the EIR, as Ms. Wagner said. The  
40  
41 waterfront plaza is in a BCDC view easement, subject to its jurisdiction as well as the  
42  
43 City's, and the project would trigger landside ADA compliance to reconfigure the  
44  
45 sidewalk and drop off, which would displace the existing bike lane for the ferry. The City  
46  
47 has no available replacement space nearby, because the remainder is already used for  
48  
49  
50

1 City bike parking. In addition Ordinance 1128 in the General Plan says that Parking Lots  
2  
3 #1, #2, #3, Gabrielson Park, and Vina del Mar shall not be used for any purposes other  
4  
5 than as parking or as a park, cannot be sold or leased, and shall not be changed from  
6  
7 the present existing conditions in 1997 without voter approval. These are property  
8  
9 ownership issues and state and national mandates, not local use regulations, so the  
10  
11 District is not exempt.

12  
13 I can go on, but my point is clear. The City cannot responsibly approve a project  
14  
15 on one piece of City owned property, or will it have undisclosed, unresolved, and  
16  
17 unbudgeted impacts on the adjacent City owned properties and rights-of-way. Thank  
18  
19 you.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Okay, Bob Wilson, David Suto, and Denise Suto.

22  
23 BOB WILSON: Thank you. Bob Wilson, part time resident of Sausalito for the  
24  
25 last 25 or so years. I guess I would simply say I think you have an awesome  
26  
27 responsibility here this evening.  
28

29  
30 What's pretty clear is there is no integrated plan. We're looking at elements of a  
31  
32 plan, which is clearly flawed just on the facts that have been presented this evening.  
33

34  
35 What was really missing is some sort of an integrated plan that does think about  
36  
37 this as a once in four year opportunity to look at the needs not just of the Bridge District,  
38  
39 and not just of the residents here, but of the region, and I think a number of the  
40  
41 speakers made great points there.

42  
43 We clearly have an unsafe situation that's getting worse by the day in Sausalito.  
44  
45 Bikes are a big part of that. Bikes aren't going away, nor should they. We perhaps need  
46  
47 to be thinking about limitation of the tourist bikes driving down the hill playing chicken  
48  
49  
50

1 with the cars as we come through the hills down Alexander and so forth, but the ferry is  
2  
3 going to be here with us.  
4

5 It's clear the ferry is in the wrong place. Now the Bridge District did a great job of  
6  
7 threatening everybody here tonight by repeating some history, saying if we don't get our  
8  
9 way we condemned this once before, well go to the courts and we'll solve this problem.  
10  
11 Let's avoid that. That's just going to cost all of us a tremendous amount of money and  
12  
13 resource.  
14

15 But let's challenge the planners, and you're part of that process, to come up with  
16  
17 a more integrated and more aggressive plan to deal with the ferry and putting the ferry  
18  
19 in a different place. It's clearly in the wrong place.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Guys, we don't have time for all this applause, seriously. We only  
22  
23 have till 11:30 tonight.  
24

25 BOB WILSON: Thirty seconds.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
28

29 BOB WILSON: And no applause, please. There's a problem, and the problem is  
30  
31 each time one of these major opportunities comes along we don't think about these as  
32  
33 an integrated problem, so I would urge you to use whatever powers you have this  
34  
35 evening to reject this plan, to go back to the powers that be, whether it through the  
36  
37 Planning Commission or through the Council, to look for a more integrated plan that  
38  
39 addresses the longer range needs of the community, recognizing that transportation is a  
40  
41 critical part of this region and something we need, but rejecting the ill thought out plans  
42  
43 that have been put forward thus far. Thank you.  
44  
45

46 CHAIR COX: Thank you. David Suto, Denise Suto, and then Susan Shea.  
47  
48  
49  
50



1           DAVID SUTO: Hi, David Suto. I've been living in Sausalito a little over ten years  
2  
3 and commuted on the ferry that whole time.

4  
5           I'm generally in favor of this project, but sometimes the District makes it very hard  
6  
7 to be in favor, just their tone and the amount of information and the flow of information  
8  
9 generally makes it really difficult sometimes to agree with what they're saying.

10  
11           A lot of what Mr. Versaci says, I agree with. I think there are some flaws in the  
12  
13 plan. Hopefully they can be addressed during the construction period. I've seen some  
14  
15 issues tonight about what happens once you are on the ferry, there are constrictions,  
16  
17 and if you go down on a Saturday you can see they get about 75 bikes on a ferry and  
18  
19 then it pretty much stops, and the gangplank doesn't make difference then. And I don't  
20  
21 see anything in the plans about how they're going to get that stream of people onto the  
22  
23 gangplank. Right now, if you watch the tourists using the toll system, there is also a  
24  
25 constriction there. And without any buffer space, I'm not sure how they're going to feed  
26  
27 people efficiently down a gangplank.

28  
29           That said, people are talking about landside improvements, and I think in that  
30  
31 situation it's the City of Sausalito and its residents that have fallen down on the job.  
32  
33 Because of political considerations we have not been updating our General Plan  
34  
35 regarding circulation in the downtown. I think entirely too much of the space downtown  
36  
37 is taken up by cars and car parking. People are saying well the ferry is taking up a big  
38  
39 space, but half the downtown is car parking lot, and I don't think that's really the best  
40  
41 use of that space. I don't think a parking lot is particularly an historic or scenic part of  
42  
43 Sausalito. So maybe we need to as a town consider in our General Plan update what  
44  
45 needs to be done there, and maybe make our town a little less car-centric and a little  
46  
47 more people-centric.  
48  
49  
50

1 Finally, I've heard people talking about Fort Baker, and I've been talking to a few  
2  
3 people who are familiar with that area and the tides and the currents, and their opinion  
4  
5 is that it's not a very feasible place to bring ferries in and out because of the strong tides  
6  
7 and the wave action in that area. That's just what I've heard talking to people this week.  
8

9 Thank you.  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Denise Suto, then Susan Shea, and then Steve Berg.  
12

13 DENISE SUTO: Okay, I'll try to go through this quickly. I will say that I believe  
14  
15 that the ferry is an asset to Sausalito. It's an asset that's not heard very much and adds  
16  
17 to the quality of life in Sausalito. It's a unique component and it is something to be  
18  
19 appreciated.  
20

21 I hope that when we're talking about this as a community that we build  
22  
23 consensus and flex with each other. There are some of these projects that initially I  
24  
25 wasn't concerned about, but after listening to other people you find you give a little bit,  
26  
27 and then you find consensus.  
28

29 The quality of life factor to me, I'm amazed that people are talking and so  
30  
31 concerned about the quality of life, but my question to you is where are you on Sausalito  
32  
33 beautiful days? Are you picking up trash on the street when you're walking your dog,  
34  
35 and are you putting your dog poo away? Because those things aren't happening in the  
36  
37 City of Sausalito, so we should look at this holistically of all of those things.  
38

39 I will say that I was taken aback by the letter. Being scolded like a child, it was  
40  
41 offensive, but don't clap. Stop. And I am supporting the ferry, but to be talked to like that  
42  
43 and given the impression that there's nothing that we can do... Please stop talking while  
44  
45 I'm talking.  
46  
47

48 CHAIR COX: Do you guys want to step outside to chat?  
49  
50

1 DENISE SUTO: The ferry landing needs to be repaired. It's a safety issue and it  
2 has to happen. So looking for those areas of consensus, one of the things I wrote down  
3 is what are all the things that we agree on? We agree that it needs to be repaired. We  
4 agree that there are safety concerns, that we need to have ADA compliance, and that is  
5 just not a question. We agreed on some of the design, the flat panel.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 I'm not sure with the BCDC. I would actually like to know if BCDC has been given  
12 our input, and what is their opinion, and has some of their feedback changed in  
13 response to the City of Sausalito residents' feedback?  
14  
15  
16

17 We must make some adjustments to this plan. The belvederes, I frankly don't  
18 see any reason why the consensus throughout the City is that the belvederes are not  
19 adding to it, and I question whether or not that really improves access. I would actually  
20 say that adding the believes removes access, because it's taking away from people's  
21 views, it's actually taking away water view and you're having to mitigate with the  
22 eelgrass, so I don't think that the cost is worth the benefit.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 I hope that this board will actually take action and make solutions in order to  
30 make an improvement, but to actually make recommendations to make it feasible and  
31 reflect consensus that you've seen from the City. Thank you.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Susan Shea, then Steve Berg, and then Lorna Kriss.

37 SUSAN SHEA: Susan Shea, Sausalito resident.  
38  
39

40 I feel like this has been one of the most fascinating tennis matches I've ever  
41 watched in my life, and I've actually even been to Wimbledon. I feel like the District is in  
42 fact at war with itself. We have decreasing bus transit through Sausalito at a rate that in  
43 the last 30 years is astounding to me, between here and the City. We asked them to  
44 increase that; they say they can't afford that.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           They then come to us with a ferry landing that does not increase the number of  
2  
3 runs for commuters that we could use, because people do go to work earlier and later  
4  
5 than the one or two ferries that we have for commuters, and I have commuted for many  
6  
7 years. We also hear from the Bridge District's other committees that they're trying to  
8  
9 figure out how the hell to keep the bikes off of the bridge from coming down into here.  
10  
11 So it's a ridiculous idea to think that because we're the ones that (inaudible) on the  
12  
13 bottom, we should be the ones that are guinea pigs for a half-baked idea by an  
14  
15 architectural company that's trying to get branding, evidently. Why not start in San  
16  
17 Francisco where the real issue is of people trying to get their bikes from downstairs  
18  
19 upstairs, people tripping over each other, etc. I plead with you. Money is not everything.  
20

21           This project needs to be redone, and it needs to be redone in a manner that  
22  
23 takes the entire enchilada into consideration: landside, waterside, Mill Valley, Muir  
24  
25 Woods, Larkspur, San Francisco, East Bay.  
26

27           And by the way, the District is not the only game in town.  
28

29           CHAIR COX: Thanks, Susan. Okay, Steve Berg, then Lorna Kriss, and then  
30  
31 Wren Herring. Is Steve Berg here? Okay, Lorna Kriss, then Wren Herring, and then  
32  
33 Janeane Moody.  
34

35           LORNA KRISS: I know I'm entitled to three minutes to comment on this whole  
36  
37 situation. I unfortunately am not as well prepared to comment on it as a good many  
38  
39 other people who are here this evening. What I indicated on my slip requesting time was  
40  
41 that I wanted to give my time to someone who knows an awful lot about this whole  
42  
43 situation, has been a resident here and involved with Sausalito and keeping it small and  
44  
45 keeping it a little town the way it was when a good many of us first came here.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Unfortunately, I don't see him here this evening, and so I cannot give him my three  
2  
3 minutes.

4  
5 What I will say though is that this plan does have to be rethought. We could  
6  
7 refurbish that dock without expanding it and we could keep this ferry service the way it  
8  
9 is. This projection of having a 4% increase in population coming over here, first of all,  
10  
11 it's a strange prediction. We don't want to turn this into Disneyland. We don't want to  
12  
13 have a million people coming over here. Somebody pointed out that we have very  
14  
15 narrow streets. We have limited space. We don't even have a downtown for the  
16  
17 residents here. Are we going to turn this into just a commercial endeavor, which seems  
18  
19 to be the direction in which Sausalito has been heading?  
20

21  
22 I, for one, would like to see this project shelved for a time until things have been  
23  
24 investigated more clearly, in addition to which none of us have received enough  
25  
26 information about all this. We get these things at the last minute. What kind of response  
27  
28 can we have to things when we haven't even had time to digest what's being  
29  
30 presented?

31  
32 So I am against this project going through, and I think that the City Council better  
33  
34 think long and hard about the future of Sausalito. We don't want this to be Mickey  
35  
36 Mouse's domain. Thank you.

37  
38 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Wren Herring, Janeane Moody, and then Quito  
39  
40 Karpinski.

41  
42 WREN HERRING: Hi, my name is Wren Herring; I've lived in Sausalito 18 years.  
43  
44 I don't commute on the ferry; I take it to the dentist, and I'd rather be there right now.

45  
46 My concern, along with everyone else, is that there is no integrated plan for the  
47  
48 ferry landing I think on the shore side, landside, and seaside. I think the planning for that  
49  
50

1 has not been addressed, and the improvements to manage the ferry arrivals have to be  
2  
3 presented before either project should be approved.  
4

5 One of the purposes of the gangplanks, we're told, is because with the ferries  
6  
7 that they now have they can offload and onload 700 people per trip, and the issue with  
8  
9 that is we're going to be presented with concrete creep, because after the larger ferry  
10  
11 dock there will be a need to expand the loading area for the increased number of bikes,  
12  
13 tourists, and commuters. Then there will need to be a building for queuing in bad  
14  
15 weather, and then a larger bus loading area in the middle of this historic village of 7,300  
16  
17 people. It will become Pier 39 or another Larkspur transit hub.  
18

19 The bicycle congestion is a significant factor in the commuting and argument  
20  
21 fever of the new ferry landing. The bicycle congestion must be addressed by the City of  
22  
23 Sausalito before any decisions are made with something as long term and permanent a  
24  
25 structure as this ferry landing.  
26

27 The tour bus size, the noise, the congestion from the tour buses coming through  
28  
29 has to be addressed. Having lunch with friends at Poggio on Saturday was like dining at  
30  
31 a transbay terminal. This is not fair to the cafes and hotel that contribute to the charm  
32  
33 that people love about this town. This City Council needs a plan to limit and manage the  
34  
35 current influx in a sustainable manner, like Sea Cliff, where no buses are allowed, and  
36  
37 instead of increasing the capacity to receive more buses, more bikes, more people; that  
38  
39 is not the best choice for Sausalito.  
40

41 Also, I was looking at the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and that was approved  
42  
43 in 2012. There were eight people at the meeting. They received a Mitigated Negative  
44  
45 Declaration. One of the projects they talked about, one of the mitigations, was to have a  
46  
47 qualified geotechnical engineer conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing  
48  
49  
50

1 surfaces and pilings within the area of the building, and pilings within 60 feet of the  
2 building they would have to do an assessment of problems with pile driving to the piers  
3 within 60 feet.  
4

5  
6  
7 And remember, the Sausalito Yacht Club has been in this town for about 50  
8 years. It participates in youth sailing, sailing on the bay, just the tradition of sailing, they  
9 sponsor a high school sailing team, they participate in Master Mariners, and I think that  
10 needs to be addressed, because it will affect the pilings. I know it's a private club, but  
11 still, it does affect the structure, and has there been a geotechnical assessment of that  
12 effect? Thank you.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, Janeane, then Quito, and the Neil Whitelaw.  
20

21 JANEANE MOODY: Janeane Moody, resident of Sausalito 30 years.  
22

23 You have a letter from me already; those are my major thoughts. But I wanted to  
24 speak in case I had addenda, and after listening to things tonight we haven't heard very  
25 much, from the Ferry District at least, about the efficiency of loading bicycles, which  
26 seems to be taking more than ordinary people just walking in and out without bicycles. I  
27 want to make it clear that I'm not talking about commuter bicycles; I'm talking about  
28 rental bicycles. Some small survey of these bicyclists evidently said that they would  
29 prefer to leave their bikes in Sausalito and not take them back on the ferry. That alone,  
30 if there were some idea of someone receiving them from the bike companies here and  
31 taking them back, even if it took them during the night to truck them back if there are  
32 that many, that would greatly reduce the need for the loading time that they've been  
33 talking about.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 The other thing that occurred to me is they were talking about a 40-year facility,  
47 and when asked about the maintenance the major thrust seemed to be sweeping and  
48  
49  
50

1 cleaning. The cement structures require a lot more than just cleaning off the top, and by  
2 the way, if it is using water at all, that goes into the bay, unless there are special  
3 considerations, physical barriers. That's not okay. The cement structures, the hulls,  
4 require maintenance throughout the years. If you've got a 40-year structure, you  
5 definitely need maintenance in the water from the salt water and that sort of thing from  
6 Spaulding, from other kinds of things that happen in cement structures. My husband  
7 builds cement barges, if you don't know already.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Another thing that I thought was they're talking about prefabrication, but I don't  
16 know what it is that's going to be prefabricated. What parts? Where will they be done?  
17 And they talked about trucking them in. Cement structures are huge. They're not going  
18 to fit on trucks. Where are they going to be built? They will probably have to be brought  
19 in by water, or built in place. That's not been addressed at all.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 So those just little addenda, that's all I wanted to add. You have my letter  
27 already, and I will write another to the City Council. Thank you.

28  
29  
30 CHAIR COX: Thank you. All right, Quito, then Neil Whitelaw, and the Willie  
31 McDevitt.

32  
33  
34 QUITO KARPINSKI: Hi, I'm Quito Karpinski; I've been here off an on since about  
35 1973, coming over in 1970 from Berkeley and San Francisco on a regular basis.

36  
37  
38 Needless to say, the bikes, which were just spoken to a moment ago, are a  
39 critical issue in this whole discussion.

40  
41  
42 As far the Golden Gate Bridge District and their arrogance and petulance and  
43 threatening nature, it reminds me of my father sending me off to college with the solemn  
44 words, "Remember, a fraternity needs you more than you need it," and in this case, we  
45 don't need them, because what they've offered is something they've just been putting  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 together on a regular basis for the last five years, six years, or seven years. Since we've  
2  
3 gotten no information, we don't know really anything other than what we get, late, at  
4  
5 every meeting.

6  
7 I feel like at this point the only thing that really needs to be repaired is the dock,  
8  
9 and they can go and build another dock, bring it over by tugboat, replace the one that's  
10  
11 there, we're good to go.

12  
13 The ADA buzzword they keep throwing about, we know and have been told by  
14  
15 other people at the last meeting as well as just using common sense, the ADA issue is  
16  
17 one that can be dealt with easily. Sausalito has had them. Within the town structure  
18  
19 itself it's easy to take care of. It's not a big deal.

20  
21 This project that they're suggesting has not been thought out. It's been based  
22  
23 upon their needs, their wants, and the money is out there for the engineering firm. They  
24  
25 want it, they want to get it, and they don't care about us. This is our town. It's not their  
26  
27 town. It's a beautiful place; it's a fun place.

28  
29 The bicycle situation has got to be dealt with. A truck or two trucks which the  
30  
31 bicycle company can kick down for and pay for, they can become a commercial venture  
32  
33 with the City getting some of the dough, but more importantly getting the bikes out of  
34  
35 here and back over to the City, which would then allow the people who ride here some  
36  
37 time to spend money and enjoy Sausalito. As it stands now, it's just like a point of  
38  
39 destination, and then everybody throws up their hands and wonders what to do.

40  
41  
42 But I love what everybody has been doing and saying, showing up here and  
43  
44 making their feelings felt with regard to this town, and the fact that this project will be a  
45  
46 portent of things to come, none of which will be good. Thank you.

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Neil Whitelaw, and then Willie McDevitt, and then  
2  
3 Richard Conley. And can someone aim the mic down for him? Actually, that arm just  
4  
5 tilts. That's it. Yeah, tilt it down. Yeah, there you go. Thank you.  
6

7 NEIL WHITELAW: I'm Neil Whitelaw. April 1<sup>st</sup> was my 48<sup>th</sup> year here.  
8

9 First, we want our downtown back. We don't have a downtown for people that  
10  
11 live here, for the 7,000 people that work here. I guess for the few people that work  
12  
13 downtown they do.  
14

15 Like I've said before at our meetings, too big, too ugly, too expensive. Here's the  
16  
17 meat of it. Golden Gate came here to fight. Golden Gate, you just don't get it. Eighty  
18  
19 percent of our town don't want this. The opening speeches by you people sound like  
20  
21 blackmail to me. You sound like you've already rolled up your sleeves and want to fight.  
22  
23 Well, you have no clue as to how Sausalito can fight. We've got hundreds of brilliant  
24  
25 lawyers on our team, hundreds of brilliant financial people on our team, dozens and  
26  
27 dozens of architects, of engineers, of big contractors, and if that isn't enough, hundreds  
28  
29 of salty sailors, that will stop you. You have no idea of the strength and willfulness of  
30  
31 this town. You've already lost, so just pack up and go home.  
32

33  
34 One thing I ask all of us that live here to remember, we the people govern  
35  
36 Sausalito. Don't ever forget that. Thank you.  
37

38 CHAIR COX: Thank you. All right, Willie McDevitt, then Rich Conley, and then  
39  
40 Bill Patterson.  
41

42 WILLIE McDEVITT: Hi, my name is Willie McDevitt; I'm one of the owners of Inn  
43  
44 Above Tide, which is right next to the ferry landing.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 First of all, I'd like to thank all of you for volunteering. Not only are you here for  
2 these meetings, but also you've apparently done a heck of a lot of homework, and it's  
3 not easy, and it's very much appreciated.  
4

5  
6  
7 One of your items that you have to find on tonight is number C9, related to  
8 privacy, which is an issue for the inn, essentially related to the temporary dock location.  
9

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Lilly, can you go to C9?  
12

13 WILLIE McDEVITT: It just refers to the privacy at the Yacht Club, and I want to  
14 make the point that that privacy issue, especially with the temporary dock, also applies  
15 to the Inn Above Tide.  
16  
17

18  
19 In order to deal with that we've been proactive. I went and met with marine  
20 construction professionals. We created a conceptual schedule. We know that this is not  
21 going to be the schedule that actually happens, but there are ways we've shown with  
22 this and done through our research—and I have a construction background and have  
23 been doing schedules for the last 30 years—that there are ways to minimize the effects  
24 on the inn and all of downtown, and we hope very much that those means and methods  
25 of construction can be taken into consideration in your deliberations tonight. Thank you.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Rich Conley, then Bill Patterson, and then Pat Zuch.  
34

35 RICH CONLEY: Hi, Rich Conley.  
36  
37

38 One of the things you brought up, and I appreciate it, is the fact that this project  
39 started back with the stimulus initiative. That was a very extraordinary bill. As a country  
40 we took on a trillion dollars worth of debt, and it was supposed to be toward projects  
41 that were shovel-ready, that would employ people, put people to work to avoid the  
42 recession that we were facing.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           And the reason why I get emotional about this issue is that we're not talking  
2  
3 about money that's coming from current revenue. We're talking about money that is  
4  
5 saddling our future generations with debt. And you may think that those old ferry  
6  
7 terminal landings were ugly, but they were done by our grandparents, and they were  
8  
9 done within budget, and they were done in a short, expedient period of time. They've  
10  
11 served us well, they've been replaced with new technology, but I think that the moral  
12  
13 sense of some proper scale and frugality needs to set the tone for these kinds of  
14  
15 projects.

16  
17           The fact that we got \$3.2 million—and I doubt very much you've given that \$3.2  
18  
19 million back to the feds, I think it's still in the budget, and important part of it—but it had  
20  
21 a vision that you proposed that was within a scale of \$4 million dollars with a gangway  
22  
23 for bicycles and one for pedestrians, and the two-door configuration of the new  
24  
25 Spauldings, which suit that quite well.

26  
27           I encourage you, number one, to go back to that original plan. The way that this  
28  
29 thing went sideways is that somehow we allowed the mandate to come down from  
30  
31 BCDC to say that Sausalito, Larkspur, and San Francisco had to be the same design,  
32  
33 and that's where the major flaw in this whole thing is, because it takes no sensitivity to  
34  
35 the difference and the aesthetic value and the importance of this town in the Bay Area.  
36  
37 There is no other Sausalito in the Bay Area. It's not Richmond, it's not Berkeley, and it's  
38  
39 not San Francisco or Larkspur. This is an important, treasured place that a lot of people  
40  
41 like to enjoy.

42  
43           To go ahead and do this ferry landing without integrating it with a landside plan is  
44  
45 like if our grandparents built the Golden Gate Bridge with no landside plan, and there  
46  
47 was no way to get cars on it or cars off it, but that's not the way we did projects. We built  
48  
49  
50

1 the tunnel and the landside plan was integrated with the bridge. The same thing should  
2  
3 happen here.

4  
5 I think this needs to go back for review and a plan come up with that solves the  
6  
7 major issue of dealing with the rented bicycle problem. Thank you very much.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Bill Patterson, then Pat Zuch, and then Craig  
10  
11 Severance.

12  
13 MALE: Bill's stepped out.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: Bill's gone? Okay, Pat. Then Craig Severance, and then Jann  
16  
17 Johnson.

18  
19 PAT ZUCH: I'm going to go off on a side track. I read a letter from the Bridge  
20  
21 District's lawyer, which said that the Bridge District reserves its right after participating in  
22  
23 this process to claim that a) it already received permission from the City, or b) it doesn't  
24  
25 need permission from the City. Obviously depending upon the outcome of these  
26  
27 proceedings, it's clearly a heads I win, tails you lose proposition.  
28

29  
30 Part of the reason they claim this is that there was a meeting on May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011  
31  
32 which discussed the conceptual plans, and that supposedly is the meeting at which the  
33  
34 Bridge District claims it received consent. I looked at that meeting yesterday and  
35  
36 watched it. It was an update. It wasn't an agendaized approval for a project. It wasn't an  
37  
38 agendaized lease consent item. It was simply an update. No staff report was given. A  
39  
40 handout was handed out at the meeting, not before.

41  
42 Mr. Swindler started off by saying, "We have a proposed concept," and then a  
43  
44 representative from Moffatt went through a slideshow. "So," he said, pointing at the  
45  
46 slide, "this is a little graphic that shows what the new float would look like. It's about the  
47  
48 same size as what you have today."  
49  
50

1            Parenthetically, the new float is 72% larger than the one we have today. If you  
2  
3 tell me to look for someone about the same size as you, I will not look for a 200 pound,  
4  
5 8-foot, 7 inch person.  
6

7            And a little graphic is certainly not the same as the detailed plans required by the  
8  
9 lease. City Council members did not act as if it was anything other than an interim report  
10  
11 on a concept. Mr. Leone suggested, “It obviously would be good to get some public  
12  
13 input at some time.” “And you can flesh it out by putting some tape, like story poles,”  
14  
15 said Mr. Kelly. And Mr. Kelly followed on with a question about notice. “Will you notice  
16  
17 the people of Sausalito in some fashion or other, mail or...” and other members chimed  
18  
19 in, “We can help you with that.”  
20

21            Story poles and tape never went up, and I know I never got a card from the  
22  
23 Bridge District or the City notifying me about this project until this spring. If this project  
24  
25 had been properly presented and reviewed, and requests had been asked, I suspect we  
26  
27 wouldn’t be in this place today. I suspect we would be dealing with a different beast.  
28  
29 Unfortunately, we’re not.  
30

31            I’ve given you my comments on the findings. I hope you consider the findings  
32  
33 carefully and not just act to approve something, even if you think it should be approved  
34  
35 because it’s a good idea to update the ferry landing. Those findings are good to look at.  
36  
37 Thanks.  
38

39            CHAIR COX: Thank you. Craig Severance, then Jann Johnson, and then  
40  
41 Shahril Ibrahim.  
42  
43

44            CRAIG SEVERANCE: Good evening, my name is Craig Severance. I wanted to  
45  
46 start out by thanking all of you in front of me for your service, and for those of you  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 behind me, I want to really thank this wonderful community that we all love for coming  
2  
3 out and speaking so emotionally about something so important, to you.  
4

5 Have you ever heard the expression, “Build it and they will come”? The 800  
6  
7 pound gorilla in the room is the fact that the number of tourists visiting southern Marin  
8  
9 County is going to increase. What is needed is a comprehensive plan to effectively deal  
10  
11 with this reality. How do we accommodate tourists while minimizing their effect on the  
12  
13 local populations?  
14

15 This is bigger than an NIMBY issue. Addressing issues such as a proposed  
16  
17 Sausalito ferry terminal expansion, Muir Woods and its effect on weekend traffic  
18  
19 patterns, or the National Park Service entrance in Fort Baker is a piecemeal fashion,  
20  
21 and a piecemeal fashion is shortsighted. It seems to me that using Fort Baker as a  
22  
23 convergence of tourist logistics—call it a tourist hub, a transit hub—has the potential to  
24  
25 make a positive impact.  
26

27 Relocating midday—not commuter ferry, not early morning or late afternoon ferry  
28  
29 service from Sausalito to San Francisco—but relocating midday ferry service from  
30  
31 Sausalito to Fort Baker would eliminate a majority of the tourist bike traffic to our  
32  
33 downtown.  
34

35 These tourists don’t ride across the bridge to come to Sausalito. They have no  
36  
37 interest in coming here. They have an interest in taking the ferry back home. If the ferry  
38  
39 originated in Fort Baker, they would be so happy if we provided some ice cream and  
40  
41 some tee shirts there; they would be the happiest people in the world. They have a  
42  
43 beautiful view of the bridge. They don’t even want to come here. They come here for  
44  
45 only one reason, and expanding, or as I said, building it will and they will come,  
46  
47 expanding ferry service will just bring more of them here.  
48  
49  
50

1 Tourists are a reality and they're not going away, and who can blame them? The  
2  
3 Park Service appears motivated to take action. They stood in front of City Council just a  
4  
5 week-and-a-half ago, and I would suggest that this beautiful expanded ferry terminal not  
6  
7 be built here, build it over there. It's a beautiful ferry terminal; it could accommodate the  
8  
9 bikes really beautifully. If Sausalito and Mill Valley can work with the Park Service to  
10  
11 rationalize the inevitable, the increase and impacts that tourists will have on our  
12  
13 communities, perhaps we can create a win-win solution.  
14

15 What is needed is a comprehensive, holistic solution, not a piecemeal approach.  
16  
17 Just because formulating a comprehensive, holistic solution will be difficult to do doesn't  
18  
19 mean it's not worth doing, and I wish you well. Thank you.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Jann Johnson, then Shahril Ibrahim, and then Mr.  
22  
23 Pennington.  
24

25 JANN JOHNSON: Jann Johnson, here for almost 22 years. I really have to calm  
26  
27 down. I am apoplectic with the manner that the Bridge District has treated us. You, sir,  
28  
29 have been very nice, however, your veiled legal threat that the City Council has to  
30  
31 comply with the terms of the lease, I believe although I am not an attorney, is false. The  
32  
33 contract says any major change requires City Council approval. This is almost a  
34  
35 doubling. That is a major change.  
36  
37

38 And the contract also stated that you're supposed to maintain the floats and the  
39  
40 thing. The fact that you have to change the float after 20 years means that you have not  
41  
42 maintained it properly. Okay, calm down.  
43

44 If you need to ADA change the slant of the little bridge, I'm sure that could be  
45  
46 done in a smaller fashion. I would propose that you ban rental bikes from the ferries  
47  
48 and let them ride back to where they rented the damn things.  
49  
50



1 I live in Old Town. Old Town on the weekends is so boxed in by bicycle and car  
2 traffic that it is physically a dangerous place to live. You cannot access it with  
3 ambulances. You could not get out if there was a fire. This increased tourist traffic into  
4 our town needs to come in a controlled fashion. Bicycling down Alexander Avenue with  
5 a child on a trailer is absolute and total madness, and I don't understand why parents  
6 are allowed to do so; they are putting their children's lives at risk.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 Okay. The backroom politics that preceded the citizen's demand for these  
14 meetings to exist is my opinion absolutely appalling. As a citizen I do not appreciate the  
15 City Manager and one of the City Council members communicating in private with the  
16 Bridge District to try to avoid the very meetings that we are having now, and that  
17 conduct should not have been allowed by the City Council or the City Manager, and it  
18 certainly shouldn't have been considered by the Bridge District to keep us from having  
19 design review.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 I'm sorry for shame on your guys. You're trying to impose this on us, and clearly  
28 the citizens do not want it. You might as well impose on us the 101 freeway through the  
29 bay that you tried years and years ago, which we put down with quite a lot of difficulty.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 I would like to ask two other questions to be answered at some time by City  
35 Council. Has the contract increase in rent, which is abysmally low, been increased per  
36 the contract on a ten-year basis, and if not, why not? And how is the City going to  
37 demand payment for this parking space that you just seem to think you're going to give  
38 away at the cost of \$7,200 a year. I don't think that we can afford that.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 I'm going to take one more second. The bicycles don't bring enough money into  
45 town to pay for the cost of picking up after their trash. Thank you.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Shahril Ibrahim, then Mr. Pennington, and then Chris  
2  
3 Skelton.

4  
5 SHAHRIL IBRIHIM: Hi. You can call me Sha. I am a Sausalito resident and a  
6  
7 ferry commuter. I'm also a designer and an engineer.  
8

9 Unlike some of the other commuters, I'm against the project, because it is not an  
10  
11 integrated plan that considered both landside and waterside use. Basically the project  
12  
13 rankles me because the design choices and the constraints chosen are wrong. They are  
14  
15 trying to solve the wrong problem.  
16

17 A glaring example of this choice is the 21 foot gangplank. San Francisco has a  
18  
19 wider gangplank, but does not use dual loading or exit. Why should they operate both  
20  
21 here?  
22

23 Furthermore, these two hydraulic gangplanks will cause great mechanical issues.  
24  
25 My guess is that one of them will break and only one will be used, and that's the real  
26  
27 reason for having these two hydraulic things to go for dual loading, because one is  
28  
29 bound to break.  
30

31 The Sausalito ferry landing is actually quite efficient today when you think about  
32  
33 it. There are no mechanical parts. You walk down this nice gangplank, you're at the  
34  
35 float, and the bikes go in, believe it or not, exactly at the right level, the bike racks at the  
36  
37 bottom of the boat. The people coming on the boat are at the bottom of the boat. The  
38  
39 bikes just roll on into the place. Have them come upstairs, go downstairs, big problem.  
40  
41

42 Furthermore, with respect to width, in the last ferry meeting they stated that they  
43  
44 are aiming for a loading speed of 700 people every ten minutes. That's 70 per minute,  
45  
46 approximately one per second. The boat and the people cannot handle that speed of  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 loading. I don't know, unless you're all sprinters of course. One bicycle per second  
2  
3 seems unrealistic to me.

4  
5 And in looking at operational efficiency, they could make better use of technology  
6  
7 and use the existing infrastructure. For example, Uber ride sharing allows more efficient  
8  
9 use of cars and roads. What made it happen was the mobile phone. So maybe there is  
10  
11 a better ticketing mechanism or mobile app for ticketing that will improve efficiency.

12  
13 Right now, the ticketing machine and the location is a bit of a mess, so moving the  
14  
15 ticketing machine away would make it easier. And sometimes people can't load on the  
16  
17 boats, because they're trying to figure out the ticketing machine, which is very complex.  
18  
19 Or reduce the number of bikes that get onto the boat.

20  
21  
22 So in short, without landside changes the waterside ferry development makes no  
23  
24 sense. It must be designed for an integrated use case and not designed in isolation.

25  
26 In design there are many constraints to take into account. ADA, loading  
27  
28 efficiency, but in my thinking, I don't think they really took into the account the use that  
29  
30 makes up tourists and commuters, size of the historical town, and my guess is this is  
31  
32 designed for the funds available.

33  
34 That's it. I hope the Council rejects the plan. It's ill conceived without a landside  
35  
36 plan.

37  
38 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, we're almost there. Chris Skelton, then Vince  
39  
40 Maggiora, and then Sonja Hanson.

41  
42 CHRIS SKELTON: Good evening, Commissioners and Board Members. My  
43  
44 name is Chris Skelton and I'm representing a coalition of concerned citizens. Excuse  
45  
46 my voice; I'm just getting over a cold.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 You're in the unenviable position of making findings and recommendation to the  
2  
3 City Council. Thank you for all of your hours of service committed to this project.  
4

5 The breadth and depth of both the oral and written communications that you've  
6  
7 received make it difficult to focus my own comments for this evening, but I think it  
8  
9 speaks to the quality of the project that's before you.  
10

11 Nancy Osborn commented earlier, and to reframe her comments, this has been a  
12  
13 disingenuous process with the City apparently getting bullied into a predetermined  
14  
15 construction project. I think that was evidenced by the District's threat of removing their  
16  
17 service this evening.  
18

19 I mentioned last time, this project appears to be crafted around the extremes.  
20  
21 There is continued uncertainty about the methodology that's being applied. You just  
22  
23 heard from an engineer and designer himself about some of those suspect decisions.  
24

25 Following on Stafford Keegin's comments, trying to focus it on the findings, I think  
26  
27 C3 in my opinion is at the core of this: the scale. There are lots of other findings that are  
28  
29 tied together with this common thread. The scale appears to basically be based on, in  
30  
31 the District's own words, the "ADA and operational goals and efficiency."  
32

33  
34 The City and the District seem to be talking past each other. The City has asked  
35  
36 for visuals and calculations regarding the request for reductions, but the District hasn't  
37  
38 provided any, at least prior to this evening's meeting.  
39

40 The ADA issue is challenging. I don't think anyone would come out and say that  
41  
42 we shouldn't be providing accessibility. Everyone wants accessibility. Sausalito is an  
43  
44 aging community that *needs* to be providing accessibility. But this goes to the extremes.  
45  
46 You wouldn't ask a builder to build for 8-foot head heights under a California building  
47  
48 code that isn't yet codified. That's not good planning, that's not good project  
49  
50

1 management. The ADA requirements that they have said, questions were posed: Are  
2 they crafted in stone? Is it the absolute minimum of 1:12? The District has come back  
3 and said they have to comply with these federal standards. These are not federal  
4 standards. They are draft guidelines that do not apply to passenger vessel  
5 developments like this. So if this is driving the scale of the project, I ask for you to  
6 consider whether or not these extreme positions that they are proposing are necessary.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 In conclusion, please deny the project.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I'm just going to clarify. It's not up to us to approve or  
16 deny this project. We're going to make a recommendation to the City Council. Okay,  
17 Vince Maggiora, then Clayton Smith, and then Sonja Hanson. And Lilly, there's a note  
18 on this about a thumb drive. Do you have a thumb drive?  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 MALE: (Inaudible).  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Okay, okay. Roger.  
26

27 VINCE MAGGIORA: Hi, I'm Vince Maggiora, a resident of Sausalito. I didn't  
28 want to speak tonight, because everything has been said already. But looking at the  
29 correspondence from the Bridge District to you, quote, "In October of 2014, the District  
30 presented a project to the BCDC Design Review Board as a part of its application for a  
31 construction permit from the BCDC. We heard then, for the first time, that the  
32 community had concerns with the project, primarily due to the recent increase in tourist  
33 bikes."  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 I was there that night, and our concerns were the size of the project. The  
43 Planning Review Board told the Bridge District to come up with a better plan. They said  
44 it was too big; the gangway was just out of scale. And they haven't listened to them, and  
45 they haven't listened to us.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1           They talk about dredging. Dredging has been done in all the harbors in Sausalito.  
2  
3 A smaller barge would require no dredging; they can move it in closer, their boats only  
4 draft 7.5 feet. They have plenty of water to move everything in closer.  
5

6  
7           The other thing they said tonight, "We have repeatedly asked for specific  
8 suggestions on how the design of the facility to be more 'historic,' and to date, we have  
9 received none." I have approached the Bridge District a few times, tried to talk to them,  
10 and basically they said we don't want to hear you. They've made up their minds and  
11 that's the way it's going to be.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17           I hope you deny this project. Thank you.  
18

19           CHAIR COX: Thank you. Clayton Smith, and then my last comment is Sonja  
20 Hanson.  
21

22  
23           CLAYTON SMITH: Yes, I want to harp again on the fact that I note again there is  
24 no three dimensional model of this project in sight. And when you consider the  
25 permanence of this thing, the size of it, it's impact on the future aesthetics of Sausalito, I  
26 would hope that you would definitely, I know not approve, but certainly not recommend  
27 this to the City Council, particularly the people on the architectural historical board. Until  
28 an actual three dimensional model of this is made, not just of the structure, but one that  
29 includes the land area properly represented, it will surround this. Because without a  
30 three dimensional model the average person cannot use, as I said at the first meeting,  
31 these cheap photographs and renditions that have been thrown together. These cannot  
32 adequately express the impact this is going to have on the aesthetics of this community,  
33 how it's going to look for the future.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46           It is your responsibility to see to it that whatever is built of this size in this central  
47 location will be fitting to this community. It is a deep responsibility. Architecture goes on  
48  
49  
50

1 forever, and this structure I think is being deceptively presented by these people to this  
2 community, and I want you to do what you can to expose what I think is a deception. I  
3 look at these individuals and the long faces we have here, and I gain absolutely no  
4 sense of confidence in seeing this expression on their faces.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 And as I said, I have harped on this. I would hope that you would insist on this. It  
10 is your duty to the people of this town that if anything is going to be done down there,  
11 that you get it right. Thank you.  
12  
13  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I earlier called Mr. Pennington. Did Mr. Pennington get  
16 to speak? Did I neglect you? I'm so sorry. I wish you had raised your hand. I'm juggling  
17 30 speaker cards up here. I apologize for the oversight. Is there anyone else who  
18 submitted a speaker card that I didn't call? Okay, good. Sorry about that. I did not intend  
19 to leave you out.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 MR. PENNINGTON: Mr. Pennington, resident of Sausalito.  
26

27 In the last year I've been looking at two projects. One is the ferry terminal, and  
28 the other one is the waterfront master plan, and this project here is very problematic in a  
29 lot of ways. We're talking about building, we're talking about codes, we're talking about  
30 the environmental impact, we're talking about a lot of things.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 There's been a lot of lying, a lot of conning, and a lot of deceiving going on.  
37 There have been violations of the Brown Act also. It's hard to follow, and I'm paying  
38 attention, and that's a red flat for me.  
39  
40  
41

42 I've been an investigator for SOS Advocacy Group. It's for the disabled. Since  
43 1990 anything that's been constructed, renovated, or built has to meet that standard. In  
44 2011 there was an update. So it was updated again in 2011. So if you're trying to meet  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 a 1990 standard in 2015 when the new standards are now in place, ten of fifteen years  
2  
3 from now, we're that far down the road.

4  
5 Sausalito is a small town. I come from Santa Barbara; it's a little bit bigger. They  
6  
7 do have their issues over there with the cruise ships now coming in there, and this is  
8  
9 sort of the same; different scenario, but same picture.

10  
11 Now you're getting a mass of people coming in in a small area. Sausalito, as you  
12  
13 know, the sidewalks are not wide enough, and now we've got tables on the sidewalks  
14  
15 taking two-thirds of the sidewalk. We've got planters. You're left with inches to walk  
16  
17 through. And now we're talking about new standards, people with wheelchairs. Now  
18  
19 these new mobility devices are even bigger and bulkier. So I don't know how these  
20  
21 ferries are going to accommodate these people. I don't know how these ramps are  
22  
23 going to accommodate these bigger items. Not my problem. That's for the people in  
24  
25 engineering to do that.

26  
27  
28 There are four ways of dealing with any situation. One, they win, we lose. Two,  
29  
30 we win, they lose. Three, we both lose. Four, we both win. I believe in win-win. That's  
31  
32 what we're looking for ideally, but in the real world we have to compromise.

33  
34 I'm out of time, so to make it simpler, when we make a decision we've excluded  
35  
36 every other possible decision that could have been made in our favor or against us. So  
37  
38 before we make a decision, I ask that staff to think about the pros and cons, the good,  
39  
40 the bad, the ugly, before we even make recommendations. Thank you.

41  
42 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, and Sonja Hansen.

43  
44 SONJA HANSON: Good evening. Thank you all for your time. It's a lot of service  
45  
46 that you put in out there, so thank you very much.



1 I am here to talk about finding C4, and I specifically go to that finding because it  
2  
3 references the story poles. Now, I was not going to bring up story poles, and I don't  
4  
5 know how many people here went to the story poles, but we do refer to them in staff  
6  
7 reports, we refer to them in the District reports, they've been referred as public  
8  
9 outreach. C4, they refer to because how views are impacted; they're saying look at the  
10  
11 story poles. Well, if you were there for the story poles you know that you really couldn't  
12  
13 tell how the view was going to be impacted by the ferry landing. So I'm going to do the  
14  
15 story poles.

16  
17 We've got a couple of floats. Now these floats, you can see the picture up there,  
18  
19 they were out that far for a very limited amount of time, and they're about what, a foot,  
20  
21 maybe two feet off the water? They really don't give you any idea about the impact of  
22  
23 what that float is going to look like. That's when the floats were actually stretched out.  
24  
25 Most of the time floats, because of the way the currents and the water go, were sitting  
26  
27 right against the northeast corner of the existing pier. So these really did not provide any  
28  
29 sense of what this future ferry landing is going to be.

30  
31 The sides, we have two green lines and two yellow lines, or tape. So the yellow  
32  
33 tapes were attached to a pole very like this to show the width of the gangway. Well, of  
34  
35 course yellow tapes sag, they stretch, so mostly what you saw very soon was this. And  
36  
37 then you have the two green lines, which showed the new access pier. I'm just  
38  
39 suggesting that you do not make any findings based on the story poles, because  
40  
41 frankly... Thank you.

42  
43  
44 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Okay, thank you to everybody who commented. I'm  
45  
46 going to close the public comment period. Everyone one provided speaker cards have  
47  
48 commented. A point of order for the HLB and the Planning Commission. We have less  
49  
50

1 than two hours, which means we have ten minutes each to speak, not counting any time  
2  
3 to craft a resolution, and we have numerous findings to make. So I suggest we take a  
4  
5 five minute... Two people have asked me for a five-minute break, but please don't take  
6  
7 more than five minutes. I'm not certain we're going to wrap this up tonight, but we'll get  
8  
9 as far as we can. Well, they're closing the building. We're out of here at 11:30.

10  
11 (INTERMISSION)

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Okay, folks, we're going to get started. We need to try to wrap this  
14  
15 up tonight, so we need to get going again. So throughout the hearing we have been  
16  
17 talking about the findings that are in our Tables A, B and C in our staff report tonight,  
18  
19 and those are the findings that we will giving our opinions about.

20  
21 I want to figure out which ones we have consensus on now so that we can  
22  
23 dispose of those and then move on to the ones that need discussion, so if everybody  
24  
25 would bear with me and just walk through these with me. The staff has said that A4 and  
26  
27 A5 are essentially inapplicable. Anybody have an issue with A4 or A5? Okay.

28  
29 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I just want to go on record with one comment, if I  
30  
31 may, regarding that. Prior to this process when I was on the HLB there was mention of  
32  
33 an historic resource report being done for this site prior to this process that we're going  
34  
35 through. That never occurred, and subsequently I'm having a difficult time actually  
36  
37 focusing on A5, which is whether or not this is treatment of historic property, not  
38  
39 knowing whether or not there ever was any historic substance there. Am I missing  
40  
41 something from an earlier study?

42  
43 CHAIR COX: I recall seeing I thought in our April 1<sup>st</sup> staff report... So in our April  
44  
45 1<sup>st</sup> staff report we had the four or five findings for the... Okay, so it was starting on page  
46  
47 11, the Community Design and Historical Preservation Element, the policies that we  
48  
49  
50

1 were to evaluate. I don't know whether an historic resources report was done. This is  
2  
3 saying that the structure is not historic, and therefore this finding is not applicable.  
4

5 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I think we're all in agreement that this structure was  
6  
7 not historic, but I couldn't find any reference to whether or not there was any historic  
8  
9 fabric of any previous structures there.  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Okay, I am not an HBL member.  
12

13 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I want to speak on that, because I agree with  
14  
15 you. The entire time I've been thinking well wait, there's nothing like a 50-year memo  
16  
17 that I've seen. There was part of the report that was done, and some of the findings, but  
18  
19 from another typical project I feel like there would be more of a detailed presentation  
20  
21 either by one of the members or ideally by some professional that would walk through.  
22  
23 Because yeah, the presumption is this structure was built in the nineties, so there's no  
24  
25 historical significance in that structure itself, but we go into other layers that I don't think  
26  
27 have been reviewed, and there's an assumption that maybe it didn't need to be  
28  
29 reviewed.  
30

31 CHAIR COX: All right, let me just ask staff.  
32

33 DANNY CASTRO: If I may, Chair Cox.  
34

35 CHAIR COX: Danny, thanks.  
36

37 DANNY CASTRO: In this instance, this is not a structure that's 50 years or older  
38  
39 in age.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: Not the current structure, but they're talking about the backdrop.  
42  
43 They're actually talking about the car ferry and the earlier structures.  
44  
45

46 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Well, I mean the structure itself is not, but who  
47  
48 knows what could be underneath it? So to the extent that there's a footprint and there  
49  
50

1 are items below it, we don't know. I think the presumption is that the structure itself  
2  
3 that's being replaced isn't, but—I can only speak for myself—that seems to be an  
4  
5 assumption that there's nothing else there.

6  
7 CHAIR COX: So the question is was there an historic resources report done?  
8

9 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Right. Fair enough, yeah.  
10

11 LILLY SCHINSING: The City did not prepare one. I'd look to the District to ask  
12  
13 that question.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: Well, they told us that they didn't consider the Secretary of the  
16  
17 Interior's historic guidelines in designing this project. Was an historic resources report  
18  
19 prepared by the District?  
20

21 JOHN EBERLE: During our environmental analysis, when we did our  
22  
23 submission to SHPO, we did a background check on the existing site and the  
24  
25 surrounding area for historic resources, ships and other things that you do in those type  
26  
27 of evaluations. That's what you're talking about, I presume. So that analysis was done  
28  
29 during the environmental process, yes.  
30

31 CHAIR COX: Is there a written report that was derived from that analysis? I  
32  
33 didn't see it referenced in the environmental document.  
34

35  
36 JOHN EBERLE: As part of the submission that we did to SHPO, yes, we  
37  
38 submitted that documentation, and we can get that documentation for you.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Go ahead.  
41

42 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Can I just ask for clarification? I think from some  
43  
44 historic photographs you showed us before the previous pilings from the 1970s  
45  
46 structure had been left, and then in the 1990s you took all those out. Did you pretty  
47  
48 much take all that infrastructure out? Are we talking about that here?  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Well, I think there's a question as to what it was and how it was  
2  
3 disposed of, Vicki. I think that's the question.  
4

5 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: The normal due diligence that would occur in  
6  
7 developing a 50-year report was not conducted by the HLB, and we had the impression  
8  
9 that we were going to do it, and it did not occur.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: The reason for the question is at the end of my term  
12  
13 on HLB staff had indicated that they were assigning two members to perform a  
14  
15 memorandum for that project, and I'm asking whether or not that ever occurred.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: So Lilly and Danny.  
18

19 DANNY CASTRO: If I may, Commissioner Pierce is correct. As usual, when a  
20  
21 project comes before the HLB there are two board members who are assigned. It was  
22  
23 determined because the structure itself was not 50 years old or older in age it did not  
24  
25 constitute doing a 50-year memo in this case, so there was no report from the HLB  
26  
27 members.  
28

29 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you, Community Development Director  
30  
31 Castro. I guess that being said, I feel like there is still a missing piece as to  
32  
33 understanding if there is any historic fabric there.  
34  
35

36 CHAIR COX: Okay, so you're not comfortable with Finding A, which, A3 and A4?  
37

38 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Just A5.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: Oh, A5. Okay, so A4 is okay with you. All right. I'm just trying to  
41  
42 find what we have consensus on now. So A4.  
43

44 Next, how about C5, the project is not located on a ridgeline? Any objections to  
45  
46 C5?  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 How about C7, “The design and location of buildings provide adequate light and  
2  
3 air for the project site, adjacent properties, and the general public”?  
4

5 All right, any issue with C11, “The proposed design preserves protected trees  
6  
7 and significant natural features on the site to a reasonable extent and minimizes site  
8  
9 degradation from construction activities...”?  
10

11 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No applicable.  
12

13 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: That’s not applicable.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: That’s what I’m saying. So C11, we can go along with the staff’s  
16  
17 recommendation.  
18

19 C12, “The project site is consistent with the guidelines for heightened review...”  
20  
21 That’s not applicable. This is not subject to heightened review. So anybody have an  
22  
23 issue with those five findings? Okay.  
24

25 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: You skipped some of them.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: I skipped any that I knew there was not consensus on. I’m only  
28  
29 calling out the ones I suspect there is total consensus on.  
30

31 So first A4. “The State Historic Building Code is being applied to minimize  
32  
33 alterations to the original historic structure.”  
34

35 Next is C5, “The proposed project will not result in a prominent building profile  
36  
37 above a ridgeline.”  
38

39 Next is C7, “The design and location of buildings provide adequate light and air  
40  
41 for the project site, adjacent properties, and the general public.”  
42  
43

44 Next is C11, “The proposed design preserves protected trees and significant  
45  
46 natural features on the site to a reasonable extent and minimizes site degradation from  
47  
48 construction activities and other potential impacts.”  
49  
50

1 And C12, "The project site is consistent with the guidelines for heightened  
2 review..." which is inapplicable since this is not subject to heightened review.  
3

4  
5 Does anybody have any issue with those findings? All right, may I have a motion  
6  
7 from the HLB?  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Just one second. Until I heard the answer from the  
10 District about the contractor being responsible for figuring out where the construction  
11 stuff was going to be, 4,000, 5,000 or 8,000 square feet that's listed in the initial study, I  
12 would have been okay, but this says in C11, "...minimizes site degradation from  
13 construction activities..." We don't know that.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Well, this is the project site, the waterside. Since this is not a  
20  
21 landside project, I think this finding focuses on the waterside. Lilly?  
22

23 LILLY SCHINSING: Correct, it's the project.  
24

25 VICE CHAIR WERNER: All right, so it's just the project. We don't care whether  
26  
27 or not they rip up the entire Lot 1?  
28

29 CHAIR COX: We addressed that in other findings, I think.  
30

31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: All right.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: All right, so may I have a motion from the HLB on those five?  
34

35 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I would move to accept those five findings.  
36

37 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I second.  
38

39 CHAIR COX: All right, all in favor from the HLB? That motion carries 4-0. May I  
40  
41 have a motion from the Planning Commission as to those five?  
42

43 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: So moved.  
44

45 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Second.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Motion carries 5-0. So those five are out of the way. I  
2  
3 don't think there is consensus on each of the others. I know that both Bill and Ben have  
4  
5 prepared during this meeting some... Lilly, what is it?  
6

7 LILLY SCHINSING: I apologize. We just found out that we can actually stay later  
8  
9 than 11:30 from the facilities manager, just as long as we keep the noise down,  
10  
11 especially when people leave, to respect the neighbors in the neighborhood.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay. And our AV folks are okay beyond?  
14

15 MALE: (Inaudible.)  
16

17 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Chair Cox, you'll lose one member  
18  
19 of the Planning Commission at 11:45 for child care.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Sorry, same with the HLB.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Okay, so we're going to lose one Planning Commissioner and one  
26  
27 HLB member at 11:30 for child care issues.  
28

29  
30 First of all, I'm going to give each member three minutes to give their overall  
31  
32 thoughts regarding this. Then I'm going to go through and walk through each of the  
33  
34 findings. I'm going to have Mr. Werner give a couple of sentences, I'm going to have an  
35  
36 HLB member give a couple of sentences, and see if we can find consensus in those  
37  
38 findings. If not, we simply will not make those findings.  
39

40 I also would like to gain confirmation from all of us that a) we started this process  
41  
42 with an open mind; and b) we considered all of the written materials, all of the  
43  
44 comments from the public, all of the testimony and plans and writings from the District,  
45  
46 and obviously that we've carefully considered all of these and that we are not getting  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 wrapped up in the hubbub of public comment, but that we're really making objective  
2 findings.  
3

4  
5 Did our City Attorney have anything to say? No, okay. So is that acceptable to  
6 everybody, just in the interest of time?  
7

8  
9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Absolutely.  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Okay, so we all have stipulation as to the statement I just made.  
12 We'll hear from HLB members. If you could confine your initial comments to three  
13 minutes—I know I'm going to have a hard time doing that—and then we'll work on the  
14 specific findings, okay?  
15

16  
17 SECRETARY FRASER: Who would like to go first?  
18

19  
20 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I can go first. Let's see if you can hear me.  
21

22  
23 CHAIR COX: You tilt it down so you can read, Ben. There you go.  
24

25  
26 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. So this is just a summary of my conclusions  
27 after considering the testimony of the District, all of the input from various members of  
28 the public, both written and testimony, and looking at the particular findings, which our  
29 staff wanted us to respond to.  
30  
31

32  
33 The Sausalito ferry terminal upgrades will enable more efficient and comfortable  
34 ferry loading and unloading and will be beneficial to Sausalito tourists, residents, and  
35 businesses alike.  
36  
37

38  
39 However, upgrades and enlargement of the Sausalito ferry terminal will be  
40 compatible with the Sausalito Downtown Historic District only if the following four  
41 conditions are met:  
42  
43

44  
45 One, the overall size of the currently proposed ferry landing redesign is reduced  
46 by at least 20%.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Two, the two belvederes are eliminated from the currently proposed ferry  
2  
3 terminal redesign.

4  
5 Three, an explicit written agreement is executed between the City of Sausalito  
6  
7 and the Golden Gate Bridge District which sets an upper limit on the volume of ferry  
8  
9 operations at the Sausalito ferry terminal.

10  
11 Four, an optimized design for landside modifications adjoining the expanded ferry  
12  
13 terminal is jointly developed by the Golden Gate Bridge District and the City of  
14  
15 Sausalito.

16  
17 That's all I have to say.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Could you repeat number one,  
20  
21 please?

22  
23 CHAIR COX: Can you repeat number one?

24  
25 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Number one is the overall size of the currently  
26  
27 proposed ferry terminal redesign is reduced by at least 20%. My sub-comment is, based  
28  
29 on everything we've heard, size matters.

30  
31 CHAIR COX: Okay, who would like to go next?

32  
33 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I'll go next. A tough act to follow. I'll be brief.

34  
35 I generally appreciate everything that was done. I thought there were great  
36  
37 comments, good feedback, insightful from the public and the presentations as well.

38  
39 Having been in real estate for over ten years I do realize one thing, which is you  
40  
41 don't start a project without a general scheme in mind, and the common theme I've  
42  
43 heard is that there's a focusing only on the project here without sort of the overlay of  
44  
45 what will happen within the rest of the community. And I would agree with that, that's  
46  
47 something I've had a very hard time getting my head wrapped around, because it  
48  
49  
50

1 seems like we're so focused in on just a few items, which are the use of the actual  
2 ferries, and on the landside the bicycles, and I really tried to remove myself and think  
3 about this project from how it's going to apply to the Historic District.  
4  
5

6  
7 My only comment maybe in the first or second meeting was, "Make it smaller,"  
8 and there were some minor tweaks to it. I'm not an engineer, not an architect. I still look  
9 at it, it still seems like it's not really matching the style of what this town wants  
10 downtown, so that's something that generally has been hard for me. But really it's just  
11 been that it's almost a piecemeal, and I don't know why. I also don't think it's my job to  
12 explain what should be done, but I do think it's my job to say there are a lot of gaps in  
13 this that we probably will have to flush out.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 But overall, I do think I appreciate that there was a lot of public comment with  
22 really insightful and great points, so I do appreciate all that.  
23  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Thank you.  
26

27 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I think what my two Commission members  
28 have said are spot on, and I just also want to thank the District for the work that has  
29 gone into this. I can imagine a lot of hours and thought have been put forward.  
30  
31  
32

33 I still grapple with size and the mass in the Historic District, and we have made  
34 requests to reduce the size. We've heard reasons why it can't be. I just would really  
35 request and ask that truly all avenues are explored to address these operational  
36 efficiencies that seem to be driving the size and the mass, and I at this point am not  
37 convinced that truly a lot of these have been explored. At this point the size and the  
38 mass and the positioning of the gate, I still have concerns with.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 CHAIR COX: Thank you.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 SECRETARY FRASER: A lot of people have said tonight that it seems like the  
2 District or the whole process is putting the cart before the horse. We're talking about a  
3 waterside improvement without discussing any of the landside improvements, without  
4 discussing any of the effects of the Muir Woods traffic, of the bike traffic on the rest of  
5 the town, of the traffic that goes to other parts of Marin, and we're not looking at this  
6 holistically. That's not my favorite word, but that's a word that has been used. This has  
7 been looked at piecemeal and I think that's a big problem with this project from what I've  
8 seen so far.

9  
10  
11 It seems as though this project has been driven by the bikes, the tourist bikes in  
12 particular, and the increase we've seen of them over the years needing to take the ferry  
13 back, and while the citizens have seemed to have been looking for a way to reduce the  
14 number of bikes that are coming through the town, and hopefully will be successful to  
15 some degree in managing that, this would solve some of the loading issues and some  
16 of the other issues that the Ferry District is trying to resolve with the bigger structures to  
17 some extent.

18  
19  
20 So without resolving the bike issues and the transportation and traffic issues and  
21 dealing with the landside and loading issues, without looking at this as one single big  
22 project, without looking at all the various components together, I think it's premature at  
23 this time.

24  
25  
26 One question I had forgotten to ask, and I know you can't answer because it's  
27 not timely anymore perhaps, I was wondering about the BCDC and their requirements  
28 for improving access to the shoreline, if it's required to happen right there? Because the  
29 belvederes are so unpopular, if it's required to happen right there at the ferry location, or

1 if the Golden Gate Transportation District can improve access, put their efforts toward  
2 that in other locations in town where perhaps the shoreline access isn't as great?

3  
4  
5 The thing I haven't heard the District talk about at all is the issue of providing  
6 shelter to the ferry riders, the regular commuters. That hasn't been raised at all, and I  
7 know that if the gates, for example, are further out into the bay where people will be  
8 lining up they will be more exposed to the elements, and that hasn't been addressed.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 And again, this is something if this was a project that was being designed in conjunction  
14 with the City and the landside improvements; it's something that we could talk about.

15  
16  
17 Just really that's my overall impression. We can talk about more of it when we go  
18 through the various design elements, but my overall impression is that it's piecemeal  
19 and putting the cart before the horse.  
20  
21

22  
23 CHAIR COX: All right.

24  
25 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll be happy to start, thank you. I would like to thank  
26 everybody for their participation this evening. It's been a long effort, but I think it's an  
27 important one.  
28  
29

30  
31 I will reiterate again, as a bicycle commuter I am interested in having  
32 improvements and I'm thankful that the Ferry District wants to make improvements.  
33

34  
35 That being said, I agree with some of the HLB that it seems like we are putting  
36 the cart before the horse. Without any current comprehensive plan that addresses  
37 bicycles and transportation, whether it's vehicular or pedestrian circulation, it seems like  
38 it's premature for us to make determinations relative to the size of the ferry landing. This  
39 will one of the largest and most significant infrastructure projects we've seen in our  
40 community. It's going to be here for 30 or 40 years. If we don't get it right, we're going to  
41 be kicking ourselves for generations.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 The Ferry District alluded, in their vitriolic letter of today, to us not giving them  
2 any insight as to how to make this thing more historic. We have no interest in having  
3 them make it more historic. The guidelines that we've provided them are to make it  
4 more respectful of the historic context and scale of our little 7,000 person town. I  
5 encourage them to take that under consideration and consider Sausalito to be a unique  
6 place, and not San Francisco and not Larkspur, as they design this project.  
7  
8

9 As I look at it today, it is a mathematical solution to a complex design problem.  
10 That's not what we want and it's not what we can live with here. I know that among that  
11 team they've got the creativity, they've got the wherewithal, to create something that we  
12 can all be proud of. I want us to work together to create the best ferry landing we can  
13 possibly have here that functions well, the we could even bring guests from out of town  
14 and say look at our awesome ferry landing. The Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation  
15 District gave us this. We thank them for that.  
16  
17

18 That being said, all I want is a healthy balance between functional needs and the  
19 quality of life of our community to be realized in this new product. Thank you.  
20  
21

22 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Commissioner Nichols.  
23  
24

25 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Well, I'd like to thank the District. I think contrary to  
26 some of the other expressions, I think they took a beating tonight in terms of what  
27 they've been accused of and how some of our citizens address them. Human nature is  
28 such that you catch a lot more flies with honey than you do vinegar, so I didn't like some  
29 of the dialogue.  
30  
31

32 Anyway, what I wanted to talk about is I think this process, number one, I'm  
33 going to treat this like I would any application I'm reviewing, and that is not speculating  
34 that it has this, and this, and this, and this and this. This came to us as a waterside ferry  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 improvement application, so that's what I've looked at, and I'm probably in the minority  
2 here, but the ferry terminal facilities down there need improvement. I think it makes no  
3 sense.  
4  
5

6  
7 I am concerned about scale, but I think what is driving the scale is the ADA  
8 requirements, and you know what? I've got to take it a face value, because I'm not an  
9 engineer, so I can't say 20%, I don't feel comfortable doing that, but if this is what it  
10 takes to have a design that's going to last and be functional. Someone mentioned it  
11 would change in 20 years. Well, it needs to be current now, and anybody that says we  
12 can mess around with ADA I think is not only not clear on what the law might be, but  
13 maybe not being as considerate as they should be about some of our fellow neighbors  
14 and people that need facilities to be accessible to them.  
15  
16

17  
18 I think this is an anomaly. Morgan and Tom and I helped write the historical  
19 guidelines. There's no preparation or accounting for how you design for a ferry terminal.  
20 I've been frustrated myself. What makes it historic down there? I haven't heard anybody  
21 say a little element like this or that, so I'm frustrated as well.  
22  
23

24  
25 But I think what could happen here is that I'm really feeling discouraged about  
26 the delay. I know that you get into water projects with environmental issues, that you  
27 have deadlines. I work a lot with this end, but I do think in this case, and I think some of  
28 the community's comments were not always factual, but it's clear that there's a lot of  
29 discontent. It seems to me, if it's possible, we have some really talented people in our  
30 community. I know you have talented people. If we could maybe do a couple of design  
31 sessions or something, I think this could be worked out. I don't want to trash the whole  
32 project.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: The tone of some of the meetings  
2  
3 been quite disrespectful, perhaps on both sides. The letter that we got tonight really set  
4  
5 me back. I'm probably one of the more pro-project commissioners here, and I did think  
6  
7 that just an interesting way to start the meeting off tonight. But on the other hand, I do  
8  
9 feel that these dialogues have not been very helpful in the sense that there have been a  
10  
11 lot of members of the public who have a lot of great ideas, but I feel like respect has  
12  
13 been lacking and I feel like that is creating a problem getting to a solution, and I really  
14  
15 would like to get to a solution here.

16  
17 As I have mentioned at past meetings, I cannot emphasize how critical the ferry  
18  
19 landing in the heart of downtown is to me and my feeling about Sausalito, and most of  
20  
21 the people that I know who live in Sausalito, and commute in Sausalito, take their kids  
22  
23 to events in San Francisco on the ferry. It is just an absolutely critical part of our town,  
24  
25 and riding that ferry is one of the things that I love most about living here.

26  
27 But that said, I do not feel like with the feedback about the size and the mass of  
28  
29 this project that we're getting anything back to work with. I am not as opposed to the  
30  
31 mass as many people who have spoken and many people on both of these boards. My  
32  
33 biggest problem, as I mentioned at our last meeting, is the size of the supports, the  
34  
35 circumference of the gangway supports, or the truss supports, at 12 inches, and the  
36  
37 mass of the truss sides.

38  
39 The other aspects, the length of the gangway, I feel is driven by the ADA  
40  
41 requirements. I do not agree that we can compromise on ADA. The 1:12 seems like a  
42  
43 standard ADA factor. I do not think we should deviate from that for any reason.

44  
45 But I would in all of my findings tonight recommend to the City Council that if  
46  
47 there is any way to work with the District to lessen the mass of the truss and the  
48  
49  
50



1 gangway that I would be able to make the findings, but without that, I feel like the mass  
2  
3 is not consistent with what is there now. I feel like it can be improved with operational  
4  
5 efficiencies and with engineering solutions. I will echo what Commissioner Nichols said:  
6  
7 you guys have a great team.  
8

9         In terms of the arguments that have been made about the causal connection of  
10  
11 this project and the bike issue, I do not feel that there is a causal connection between  
12  
13 the bikes and this project. To some extent this project is responding to that issue, but  
14  
15 the Bridge District has emphasized that that's their job, they're a transportation agency.  
16  
17 So I would like to separate that issue, or I separate that issue in my own mind. We do  
18  
19 need to deal with the bikes, but as a separate conversation, and I feel the same way  
20  
21 about the landside improvements.  
22

23         The City has known about this project for many, many years. We could have  
24  
25 been working on the landside improvements. It's our responsibility, and I don't feel like  
26  
27 we should hold the District responsible for the fact that that didn't happen. Thank you.  
28

29         VICE CHAIR WERNER: The nine of us, plus the one that's not here, that are  
30  
31 sitting up here are all volunteers. We're volunteers because this is a really great place to  
32  
33 be, and we are here to represent and speak for the resident citizens of Sausalito, past,  
34  
35 present and future. It's our duty to make choices that will leave this town a safer, more  
36  
37 beautiful, more livable, and more resilient place for ourselves and for those that will  
38  
39 follow us, a place that embraces the character, the heritage, and civility that has drawn  
40  
41 us to live here and keeps us here.  
42

43         It's not our role to bias our judgment with political grudges or to succumb to the  
44  
45 insatiable appetite of those who wish to capitalize on the attraction and charm of  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Sausalito by simply accommodating and encouraging limitless growth that will inevitably  
2  
3 turn it into little more than a theme park.  
4

5 To that end, as I went through these findings I'll tell you that I could not make an  
6  
7 affirmative finding for A1, A2, A3, A6, and A8. I could not make an affirmative finding  
8  
9 even for B1 and B2. I could not make an affirmative finding at all for C1, C2, C3, C4  
10  
11 especially, C8, C9, C10 and C13. None of those do I believe are satisfied in the  
12  
13 affirmative by the project that has been percolating on the part of the District for so  
14  
15 many years in the absence of any attention whatsoever to the town and the location in  
16  
17 which that project was being designed for.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Thank you. I too want to thank the District for its efforts and for  
20  
21 participating in our public process, even if it doesn't believe it has to.  
22

23 I want to state for the record that before this process started I actually appeared  
24  
25 at a City Council meeting and advocated in favor of the process. I really believe that  
26  
27 transparency is important, that public feedback is important.  
28

29 This has been a learning experience for me. I came into this with an open mind. I  
30  
31 actually came into this with a firm belief that the improvements are hugely needed,  
32  
33 because before I took my current job in Oakland I commuted every day to the City on  
34  
35 the ferry. I also still use the ferry on many weekends when I have out of town visitors.  
36  
37 Fortunately, I've never been turned away, nor have I seen anyone else ever turned  
38  
39 away.  
40

41 But I believe that it is of paramount importance that this body responds to the  
42  
43 design review findings. I have not been influenced by the numerosity of the folks against  
44  
45 the Ferry Landing Project; rather, I've been listening to the comments regarding the  
46  
47 merits of the project in connection with the design review findings we have to make. And  
48  
49  
50

1 similarly, from the District I have focused on the ability of the District to meet the design  
2 review findings.  
3

4  
5 That being said, I was disappointed to learn that the District and its designers did  
6 not consider Sausalito's key codes and objectives in designing the project. They didn't  
7 look at Sausalito's General Plan, they didn't consider the Bike Task Force, they didn't  
8 know that the ferry landing was in the City's Historic District, and they didn't consider the  
9 Secretary of the Interior's historic design guidelines.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 Although I do not fault the District for not designing landside improvements, we  
16 take this project as it comes to us. Regardless of who was responsible for doing this,  
17 this project has come to us incomplete in my opinion. This project needs to be a holistic,  
18 integrated waterside and landside project, so while the District was busily designing its  
19 designs, someone should have been also looking at Sausalito's landside improvements  
20 and how the two will meld.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 I don't think the District has considered the cost of the City losing parking spots.  
28 I'm not sure the District is familiar with Ordinance 1128 that doesn't allow major  
29 revisions to that parking lot.  
30  
31  
32

33 I have other thoughts that I will share at the conclusion, after we've discussed the  
34 findings.  
35  
36

37 All right, so with that I'd like to move smartly with the findings, and again, I picked  
38 one person from the HLB, one person from the Planning Commission, but I encourage  
39 other folks to chime in, and staff is going to record our thoughts and then attempt to  
40 craft a resolution for our approval this evening.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 With that said, the first issue that I have is with the resolution itself. The last  
47 whereas I'm not certain that we can make, which is that, "Neither the project nor its  
48  
49  
50

1 surrounding circumstances have changed substantially since the time the District  
2 adopted the 2012 Mitigated Negative Declaration and approved the project, nor has  
3 significant new information which was not nor could not have been known..." et cetera.  
4  
5 We received correspondence this afternoon about the huge change in the number of  
6  
7 bikes and the number of people using the ferry. I haven't had an opportunity to carefully  
8  
9 weigh whether any of the perceived changes in status since the 2012 Mitigated  
10  
11 Negative Declaration was passed arise to the level of a triggering event, but at this point  
12  
13 I'm not certain I can agree with that whereas clause. Go ahead.  
14  
15

16  
17 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I would just like to say that we're talking about  
18  
19 CEQA as related to this project, right? And this project as I understand it, it's been  
20  
21 consistently the same size-wise throughout, and so I don't know what has changed.  
22

23  
24 CHAIR COX: I read earlier in my question period some statements that I believe  
25  
26 are not accurate, or not reflective of the true impact of the project on the town that were  
27  
28 in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. So anyway, unless someone else has a comment  
29  
30 on that issue, let's take a vote.

31  
32 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: This one is on B1?

33  
34 CHAIR COX: This is not B1, this is the whereas clause. But you know what? The  
35  
36 whereas clause doesn't matter if we're going to find against the resolution, so let's just  
37  
38 move on to A1.

39  
40 A1 is, "The proposed new construction or alteration is compatible with the  
41  
42 architectural and historical features of the structure and/or district." Ben, may I hear your  
43  
44 comment on that point?

45  
46 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: The proposed ferry terminal design would not be  
47  
48 compatible with the architectural and historical features unless: One, both belvederes  
49  
50

1 are omitted; two, the overall size of the proposed ferry landing is reduced by at least  
2  
3 20%; and three, a satisfactory design for landside modification adjoining the redesigned  
4  
5 ferry terminal is jointly developed by the District and the City of Sausalito.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Okay, and Bill.  
8

9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Well, my view of that one is that using the existing  
10  
11 structures as a benchmark for assessing the proposed construction is in this context  
12  
13 and unreasonable exercise. The measure should be compatibility with the context and  
14  
15 built fabric of the district. The proposed project reflects a total lack of consideration for  
16  
17 the scale or character present in the general, immediate, and nearby locations. Based  
18  
19 on this criterion an affirmative finding cannot be made.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Any other thoughts from other Commissioners?  
22

23 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I could make this finding, because in our  
24  
25 comments over here it's talking about comparing this, and you're comparing this  
26  
27 structure that isn't historic, so I think there are other places where you get down more  
28  
29 into context with the district.  
30

31 CHAIR COX: It's the structure and/or district.  
32

33 VICE CHAIR WERNER: And/or district.  
34

35 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'm just not agreed, yeah, with the proximity of the  
36  
37 district. This is a water facility, it's an anomaly, and so I could make this finding.  
38  
39

40 CHAIR COX: May I hear from HLB members? I could make the finding, and I  
41  
42 would prefer Ben's enunciation of reasons. How about you? I would vote against the  
43  
44 finding for Ben's reasons.  
45

46 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I cannot make the finding based on  
47  
48 consideration of the district.  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Here's the thing. We have to say yay or nay to the finding, but then  
2  
3 we have to give a reason in our resolution. What I'm trying to do is find out whether we  
4  
5 can reach consensus on not only how we vote, but on the reason, so that's why I've  
6  
7 asked a member of each body to read a proposed reason for not making the finding or  
8  
9 for making the finding, to see if we can weigh in and reach agreement. Did you have  
10  
11 separate reasons that you could not make the finding?  
12

13 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I had (inaudible), yeah.  
14

15 CHAIR COX: All right.  
16

17 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
20

21 SECRETARY FRASER: I would add to it the size of the structure. I wasn't sure if  
22  
23 that was one of the reasons.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Yeah, he said it would need to be reduced by at least 20%. I would  
26  
27 say by at least 50%.  
28

29 SECRETARY FRASER: Yeah, I couldn't pick a number, but I would agree  
30  
31 generally speaking with (inaudible).  
32

33 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I did want to add, I don't know if you have had  
34  
35 materials. The materials, the way they've presented it, the color concepts, the size, but  
36  
37 the materials themselves I don't think especially with the district overlay, so I did want to  
38  
39 add that.  
40

41 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I am also unable to make the findings in  
42  
43 concurrence with Vice Chair Werner's statement.  
44

45 CHAIR COX: All right, and Vicki is she could make the finding. Commissioner  
46  
47 Cleveland-Knowles?  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I just generally prefer to make the  
2  
3 statement we could make the finding if something, and I think my reasons for not being  
4  
5 able to make the finding are quite limited, and I can't agree with a general reduction in  
6  
7 size without a specific direction about what elements. We've been presented with three  
8  
9 very distinct elements for three very distinct purposes: ADA, efficiency, and overall  
10  
11 reduction of 20% or 50% doesn't make any logical sense to me in this context. I mean I  
12  
13 understand the overall massing concept, but it doesn't speak to me, so I will not be able  
14  
15 to agree. But in all of the context I just think that the one element that I've already  
16  
17 described should be revisited.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: I mean the District concedes...

20  
21 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: (Inaudible).  
22

23 CHAIR COX: Okay, so Madam City Attorney, there is not going to be consensus  
24  
25 up here on the reasons for finding no, so we're not going to have a unified resolution, so  
26  
27 I'm not sure how to...  
28

29 LILLY SCHINSING: Just thinking, perhaps you can have two different reasons  
30  
31 why, and you can take a vote separately on those two different reasons.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: So I will entertain a motion from the HLB regarding Ben's  
34  
35 enunciation of reasons. Did staff get that? Can you read it one more time, Ben?  
36  
37

38 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: The proposed ferry terminal design would not be  
39  
40 compatible with the architectural and historical features unless: one, both belvederes  
41  
42 are omitted; two, the overall size of the proposed ferry landing is reduced by at least  
43  
44 20%; and three, a satisfactory design for landside modifications adjoining the  
45  
46 redesigned ferry terminal is jointly developed by the District and the City of Sausalito.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 LILLY SCHINSING: Can you please repeat three, and a little bit slower, please?

2  
3 Thank you.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: And you have to talk a little closer to the mic, Ben.

6  
7 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Number three, a satisfactory design for  
8  
9 landside modification adjoining the redesigned ferry terminal is jointly developed by the  
10  
11 District and the City of Sausalito.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: And Ben, there was a suggestion that another requirement for  
14  
15 change would be the color and materials of the project.

16  
17 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I wouldn't object.

18  
19 CHAIR COX: Okay, so would someone like to make that motion?

20  
21 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: So moved.

22  
23 CHAIR COX: Is there a second?

24  
25 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Second.

26  
27 CHAIR COX: Okay. What is the vote? All in favor? So that motion from HLB  
28  
29 carries 4-0. I would make the same motion on behalf of the Planning Commission.

30  
31 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Seconded.

32  
33 CHAIR COX: Lilly, what is the issue?

34  
35 LILLY SCHINSING: Did you add the materials as well?

36  
37 CHAIR COX: Yes, the color and composition of the proposed materials.

38  
39 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Can I just ask a question? How do we know what  
40  
41 colors we're voting on? We don't. I mean that to me is not relative here. We didn't  
42  
43 decide, because we're saying we're not going to go forward with this. They offered us  
44  
45 colors and we didn't reach consensus on this.

46  
47 CHAIR COX: Right, it's the proposed colors that were unacceptable to me.



1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Nothing? None of them? No, that's what I'm  
2  
3 wondering. So I think that says that to be fair is that nothing that they proposed, color-  
4  
5 wise or anything, was acceptable.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Look, the project as proposed is unacceptable. I want to see a  
8  
9 project. I'd like to see the scale reduced. I'd like to see some willingness to entertain  
10  
11 dialogue. There's been an absolute unwillingness to make any reductions in size and  
12  
13 scale, despite the fact that in 2011 they had a project that was shovel ready that was  
14  
15 much more along the lines that I would find acceptable.  
16

17 Lilly, I'm removing colors from the substance of my motion, on the Planning  
18  
19 Commission's motion. They included colors. I'm removing colors from the Planning  
20  
21 Commission's... from my motion. There may not be consensus for my motion. I have a  
22  
23 second. Will you second my amendment?  
24

25 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll second the amendment.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Comments?  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I have a comment on this, and that is that I can't  
30  
31 support anything that gives a fixed percentage of reduction.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: I said at least 20%.  
34

35 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I don't think it ought to be in there. The use of the  
36  
37 number, I mean it doesn't make any sense. I think it should get smaller, but...  
38  
39

40 CHAIR COX: All right, then I will remove the at least 20%. I will say an  
41  
42 appropriate reduction in scale.  
43

44 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Second.  
45

46 CHAIR COX: Any other comments to the motion?  
47

48 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Can we reframe the motion?  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay. The ferry terminal design, I am moving that in response to  
2  
3 Finding 1 that we find that we cannot make that finding on the basis that the ferry  
4  
5 terminal design wouldn't be compatible with the architectural and historical district  
6  
7 unless: one, the belvederes are removed; two, the overall size is appropriately reduced;  
8  
9 and three, a satisfactory design for landside modifications is adopted.

10  
11 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox?

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Yes?

14  
15 COUNSEL WAGNER: Lilly is working on inputting the information from the HLB  
16  
17 so that you guys can see that. She'll then copy and paste it and make the modifications  
18  
19 for the Planning Commission.

20  
21 CHAIR COX: Okay.

22  
23 COUNSEL WAGNER: There was concern that you be able to see the words. If  
24  
25 you want to see the words tonight, this is the process we have to do.

26  
27 CHAIR COX: No, I saw the words. I'm paraphrasing.

28  
29 COUNSEL WAGNER: They're for the...

30  
31 CHAIR COX: But I'm paraphrasing. I was not reading.

32  
33 COUNSEL WAGNER: Understood. That's the HLB motion.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: I'm clear. I paraphrased it to make it my motion.

36  
37 COUNSEL WAGNER: Understood. And Lilly will then type it as soon as she's  
38  
39 done with the HLB motion.

40  
41 CHAIR COX: Okay.

42  
43 COUNSEL WAGNER: Just wanted to make sure people understood.

44  
45 CHAIR COX: We've taken one hour to get through one finding. We are not going  
46  
47 to wrap up this process tonight if this is how we have to proceed. Alternatively we could  
48  
49  
50

1 make our comments, you could get a transcript, you would provide us with a proposed  
2 resolution for us to approve or deny at a subsequent meeting. Otherwise, I don't think  
3 we're going to get through this tonight.  
4

5  
6  
7 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Can we propose another work session?  
8

9 CHAIR COX: We already have another joint session in two weeks.  
10

11 COUNSEL WAGNER: The only issue with that, Chair Cox, and if that's the  
12 desire of the boards to have a resolution brought back to you, we would request that  
13 you consider a special meeting in order to do that. You've closed public comment,  
14 you've received all the public comment, and it would just be to look at the text of the  
15 resolution. But that meeting, I understand from the Community Development Director,  
16 your next regular meeting is full, and we would suggest also in order to give staff time to  
17 turn this around for the May 5<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting that the sooner that that could  
18 occur, the better, in order to prepare those materials.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 The other option, which I understand from the Chair is not her desired option, but  
28 open it to the full board and commission, is that we are recording this. We can take your  
29 verbatim motions and put them into the resolution, and would not need to return to you if  
30 we had clear direction. We will ask you, if we don't understand, what the direction is, to  
31 please pause for a moment and let us catch up with you.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 But those are the options that I think are on the table.  
39

40 CHAIR COX: My perspective is this is probably one of the most important  
41 hearings that I in seven years have participated in as a planner commissioner. I don't  
42 think we should rush through finding where we all stand on these issues. I think we  
43 would do better to not be belabored by having to wait for staff to catch up with a written  
44 resolution this evening. However, again, because this is so important and because it's  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 really important that we communicate clearly with the District, I am not willing to  
2  
3 abdicate my review of a proposed resolution to staff. I would prefer to have an  
4  
5 opportunity to review the language of the proposed resolution and decide whether I  
6  
7 agree or disagree or want to wordsmith it again. This is too important a project in my  
8  
9 opinion, and the City Council has asked for our guidance, our feedback. So thoughts?  
10

11 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I think that the process that we  
12  
13 were going through was fine if we are comfortable with it not being on the screen. I  
14  
15 understood your motion perfectly, and I also think it will go faster as we go through and  
16  
17 we're not recording it on the screen. I would like to get through this tonight; that would  
18  
19 be my preferred alternative.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Are folks willing to attend a special meeting to approve the  
22  
23 language of the resolution? Yes? Yes? Okay, I am seeing consensus. As we work our  
24  
25 way through, can staff look at when the special meeting might be, so we can see if we  
26  
27 can find a quorum?  
28

29  
30 Okay, so I have made a motion and I re-enunciated it.

31  
32 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Can I ask a question?  
33

34  
35 CHAIR COX: Yes, please.  
36

37 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: When you say that there is a  
38  
39 satisfactory design for landside modifications, does that mean prior to approval under  
40  
41 the lease of the project, or does that mean a process is established moving forward?  
42

43 CHAIR COX: It means that I would want there to at least be, as I said at our first  
44  
45 study session, at least conceptual plans of what that would look like so there can be  
46  
47 certainty that, for example, there's not a bottleneck on the landside that is then abated  
48  
49 on the waterside, or vice-versa.  
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

COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: So an entire plan or process?

CHAIR COX: Not entire. Concept drawings would be adequate for me, but right now there's nothing.

COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: But it would need to be a concept approved by Sausalito?

CHAIR COX: Correct. Okay, Community Development Director Castro, will you call the roll?

LILLY SCHINSING: Can you please repeat your modifications to the HLB's motion?

CHAIR COX: No, it's on tape. You're going to take it from the transcript.

DANNY CASTRO: Is this the Planning Commission I'm taking roll at this point?

CHAIR COX: Yes.

DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Aye.

DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: No.

DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DANNY CASTRO: And Chair Cox.

CHAIR COX: Yes. Motion carries 3-2.

1           Okay, moving on to number two, “The historical context of the original structure  
2  
3 or district has been considered during the development and review of the proposal,” and  
4  
5 once again I’ll turn to Ben.

6  
7           BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I’m sorry, which item?  
8

9           CHAIR COX: It’s Item A2. Did you take issue with A2?  
10

11          BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No.  
12

13          CHAIR COX: Okay. Commissioner Werner.  
14

15          VICE CHAIR WERNER: I did.  
16

17          CHAIR COX: Okay.  
18

19          VICE CHAIR WERNER: I took issue with staff’s comment. I think staff’s  
20  
21 assessment of historical context in the April 1<sup>st</sup> staff report is little more than a catalog of  
22  
23 historical events and it’s not a legitimate basis for judgments on whether the context has  
24  
25 been considered during the development and review of the project itself. The design  
26  
27 before us ignores the context past, present, and future. In fact, the Initial  
28  
29 Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration did not even acknowledge the existence of the  
30  
31 certified local Historic District in which a portion of the ferry landing resides. Therefore, I  
32  
33 can’t make the affirmative finding.  
34

35  
36          CHAIR COX: I have slightly different reasons. I said that I could not make the  
37  
38 finding that the historical context had been considered, because although this was once  
39  
40 a car ferry landing, the City has evolved to a much more gentle aesthetic in conjunction  
41  
42 with other features downtown, and that there has been no consideration of that history.  
43  
44 Instead, the focus has been on operational efficiency and compatibility with Larkspur  
45  
46 and San Francisco rather than compatibility with our historic downtown.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 SECRETARY FRASER: I have a question about the process. So Ben is reading  
2  
3 it off. Are we allowed to comment or add to it? I was trying to do that with the  
4  
5 microphone. Since we're sharing it, I'd like an opportunity to do so.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Yeah, right now Ben didn't have anything to read, so I turned to  
8  
9 him.  
10

11 SECRETARY FRASER: But I have an opinion to add to it.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: What I'm doing is I have designated two folks. We're going to hear  
14  
15 from them, and then we're going to add. I heard from him. I'm adding. You are welcome.  
16  
17 Everyone is welcome to add. Again, this is really truncated from how we would normally  
18  
19 do it.  
20

21 SECRETARY FRASER: I fully understand. I just want to use the microphone  
22  
23 too.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: Absolutely.  
26

27 SECRETARY FRASER: Thank you.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: Maybe I'll share with Vice Chair Werner. Okay. So, Ben, can you  
30  
31 find... Or Natascha, did you want to add your own reasons for A2?  
32

33 SECRETARY FRASER: I believe Ben said that you could agree with the  
34  
35 findings?  
36

37 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.  
38

39 SECRETARY FRASER: Okay, and I cannot agree with the findings, and actually  
40  
41 it was the findings that Bill had stated, that I didn't see anywhere that the District has  
42  
43 considered certainly in the development of the project that this was in the Historic  
44  
45 District, I mean historic setting, and just the history of the town and the concerns of the  
46  
47 town.  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, thank you. Ben, do you agree with Commissioner Werner,  
2  
3 or would you vote in favor of A2?  
4

5 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I've changed my mind. I agree with our other HLB  
6  
7 member on this, that the Historic District was not considered in the development.  
8

9 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
10

11 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yeah, I'll second. I agree.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
14

15 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: The same. I agree.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay, so did you want to simply adopt Commissioner Werner's  
18  
19 reasoning, or did you want to just confine it to what you've said, that the design did not  
20  
21 consider Sausalito's Historic District?  
22

23 SECRETARY FRASER: Actually, if Commissioner Werner could repeat his  
24  
25 reasoning.  
26

27 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Well, I was responding to what staff had written here,  
28  
29 and I think that's what was wrong. I said, "Staff's assessment of historical context in the  
30  
31 April 1<sup>st</sup> staff report is little more than a catalog of historical events. It is not a legitimate  
32  
33 basis for judgments on whether the context has been considered during the  
34  
35 development and review of the project. The design before us ignores the context past,  
36  
37 present, and future. In fact, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration did not even  
38  
39 acknowledge the existence of the certified local Historic District in which a portion of the  
40  
41 ferry landing resides."  
42

43 CHAIR COX: I would like to suggest we take away the commentary on the staff  
44  
45 report and just use the last two sentences of that.  
46  
47

48 VICE CHAIR WERNER: That's fine.  
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.

SECRETARY FRASER: That's acceptable to me.

CHAIR COX: Okay. May I have a motion from HLB?

SECRETARY FRASER: Motion to accept...

CHAIR COX: The last two...

SECRETARY FRASER: ...the last two sentences of Bill's...

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Second.

SECRETARY FRASER: Second. All in favor?

CHAIR COX: Motion carries 4-0.

COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, just to clarify, I believe that begins with  
(inaudible) "The design before us ignores..." is where we would start that?

CHAIR COX: Yes. Okay, is a planning commissioner willing to make the motion?

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll make that motion.

CHAIR COX: Thank you. May I have a second?

VICE CHAIR WERNER: I'll second my own.

CHAIR COX: Okay. Will you call the roll?

DANNY CASTRO: Yes.

CHAIR COX: Is there any discussion on A2? All right, will you call the roll?

DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes or no?

1 CHAIR COX: You are voting on your own motion.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you.

4  
5 DANNY CASTRO: So Commissioner Nichols is no. Commissioner Cleveland-  
6 Knowles.

7  
8  
9 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: No.

10  
11 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

12  
13 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

14  
15 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: Yes. Motion carries 3-2.

18  
19 Okay, A3. Let's see, A3 is, "The criteria for listing the structure or site on the local  
20 register does not apply, or the historic overlay district will not be affected by the new  
21 construction or alterations." Ben, did you agree or disagree with A3?  
22

23  
24  
25 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I agree with (inaudible).

26  
27  
28 CHAIR COX: Okay. Bill, did you agree or disagree with A3?

29  
30 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I disagree with A3. Again, the existing landing  
31 components are not a valid basis for judgment. Clearly, the historic overlay district will  
32 be overwhelmed and negatively impacted by this industrial scale, highly mechanized  
33 terminal structure, which is designed to discharge 600 to 700 passengers into the  
34 downtown in five minutes. I can't make that finding.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 CHAIR COX: All right, any other thoughts from HLB members on whether or not  
41 that finding can be made?  
42

43  
44 SECRETARY FRASER: I'd say the finding cannot be made for the reasons that  
45 the... I like what Bill said, but a lot shorter. I'm trying to think of a way to consolidate  
46 that.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Well, again, what if we simply said, "The historic overlay district will  
2  
3 be overwhelmed and negatively impacted by this industrial scale, highly mechanized  
4  
5 terminal structure, which is designed to discharge 600 to 700 passengers into the  
6  
7 downtown in five minutes"?

8  
9 SECRETARY FRASER: Minus those last few words. Yeah, a little more concise.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: All right, "The historic overlay district will be overwhelmed and  
12  
13 negatively impacted by this industrial scale, highly mechanized terminal structure."  
14

15 SECRETARY FRASER: Right there.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: Okay. May I have a motion from HLB?

18  
19 SECRETARY FRASER: Motion that we cannot make the finding of A3 for the  
20  
21 reason just stated by Chair Cox. All in favor? Or second?  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.

24  
25 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?

26  
27 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Aye.

28  
29 SECRETARY FRASER: Aye.

30  
31 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No.

32  
33 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: Okay, so that's a 2-2, so that's no action on A3 by the HLB. Is  
36  
37 there a motion from the Planning Commission, or is there further discussion?  
38

39  
40 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I would just agree with the staff  
41  
42 finding.  
43

44 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Disagree or agree?

45  
46 CHAIR COX: Agree. Commissioner Pierce.  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: If I have any support for that, I  
2  
3 would make a motion.

4  
5 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'll second it.

6  
7 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: With the staff finding?

8  
9 CHAIR COX: Yeah, they're agreeing with the staff finding on A3. I disagree with  
10  
11 the staff finding on A3. Commissioner Werner disagrees. What about you,  
12  
13 Commissioner Pierce?

14  
15 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I disagree.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: All right. Do you disagree for the reasons that we enunciated?

18  
19 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

20  
21 CHAIR COX: Would you like to so move?

22  
23 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I so move.

24  
25 CHAIR COX: So there is a pending motion, but we're now having a... Robert's  
26  
27 Rules of Order allow us to make a different motion. We will vote on the different motion  
28  
29 first. There's a motion. Is there a second?

30  
31 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Second.

32  
33 CHAIR COX: Will you call the roll?

34  
35 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Pierce.

36  
37 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Aye.

38  
39 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

40  
41 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: What are we voting on?

42  
43 CHAIR COX: The motion is that we cannot make Finding A3 because the  
44  
45 historic overlay district will be overwhelmed and negatively impacted by this industrial  
46  
47 scale, highly mechanized terminal structure.  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

2  
3 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles

4  
5 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: No.

6  
7 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

8  
9 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

10  
11 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Yes. All right, we've already agreed with staff's finding on A4.

14  
15 We're moving to Finding A5. Ben, were you able to make or not make Finding  
16  
17 A5? By the way, Finding A5 is, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment  
18  
19 of Historic Properties have been used to review and consider the new construction and  
20  
21 proposed alterations."  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No, as far as I've heard, those standards were not  
24  
25 consulted for this?  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Correct. Did you have language on that? So staff's reasoning was  
28  
29 that... Okay, so I just heard a comment that this is ridiculous. How would you like to do  
30  
31 the process instead?  
32

33 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I'm sorry. No, it was not about this  
34  
35 particular process. I just have heard absolutely no evidence that the Secretary of the  
36  
37 Interior's Standards apply to this project, presented by anyone during these  
38  
39 proceedings. I'm sorry; I didn't mean to talk out.  
40

41 CHAIR COX: All right, somebody earlier tonight said I proposed a finding in  
42  
43 agreement with staff on A5, but someone earlier here tonight said they could not make  
44  
45 that finding.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: That was me, and that was based on the incomplete  
2  
3 finding as to whether there was any historical fabric there.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: Okay, and I was convinced by that, so for that reason...

6  
7 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: It sounded to me that staff said that  
8  
9 the Historic Landmarks Board voted that their members were not going to look into it,  
10  
11 because there was no evidence that...

12  
13 SECRETARY FRASER: No, that's not...

14  
15 CHAIR COX: There was a change in staff; so prior staff had told the HLB that  
16  
17 they were going to be asked to prepare a historic resources memo. Subsequently there  
18  
19 was a decision by staff that the HLB would not be asked to provide that historic  
20  
21 resources memo. There was apparently a memo submitted by the District to SHPO in  
22  
23 connection with their EIR. We have not seen that. I would like to see that before I am  
24  
25 able to opine that A5, that the structure that was constructed in...before I could make  
26  
27 the finding for A5. So I was convinced by Commissioner Pierce. The City Attorney  
28  
29 would like to weigh in.

30  
31  
32 COUNSEL WAGNER: I just think it's important to clarify what occurred with  
33  
34 respect to the HLB doing or not doing an historic evaluation, and it's my understanding  
35  
36 that staff discussed this with the HLB prior to receiving all the information about when  
37  
38 this structure was constructed, or not having that in front of them.

39  
40 So HLB conducts 50-year reviews of projects that are 50 years old, the structure  
41  
42 is 50 years old. This structure is not 50 years old, so HLB did not conduct the historic  
43  
44 review. I believe that Chair McCoy and Secretary Fraser were the members that were  
45  
46 appointed to that subcommittee and they concurred that that was the process, and as  
47  
48 the members who had been on the longest, concurred that that's the process that they  
49  
50

1 followed with other projects and that it was not applicable to this project. I would look to  
2  
3 Secretary Fraser and to staff who were present at that meeting to indicate if that is not  
4  
5 accurate. I think there is some misunderstanding at the dais there about what actually  
6  
7 transpired. That's my understanding of what occurred with respect to any review by the  
8  
9 HLB.

10  
11 SECRETARY FRASER: That's pretty close.

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: (Inaudible) the resolution, because it states that the  
14  
15 Secretary of the Interior's Standards have been used. That's one question, were they  
16  
17 used or not? And the answer is no. But then the finding is not applicable, it's a separate  
18  
19 issue, and apparently the HLB members who were assigned to this decided it was not  
20  
21 applicable. So I think we're talking about two separate issues.

22  
23 SECRETARY FRASER: If I can just clarify first, and if I can just respond to what  
24  
25 the City Attorney said. I noticed that it was on what Lilly put together, the schedule, that  
26  
27 there would be a 50-year memo. I contacted the City and said this property is not 50  
28  
29 years old, so we need to do the 50-year memo, and my understanding from that, I don't  
30  
31 know what, because I've not spoken with John about this specifically, but from that  
32  
33 determination my understanding is that there was not going to be a 50-year memo.

34  
35 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: It makes sense.

36  
37 CHAIR COX: Okay, as written, what this says is the Secretary of the...these are  
38  
39 the design review findings in the Historic District. This project is, or at least part of it is,  
40  
41 in the Historic District, and the finding that is required to make that is, "The Secretary of  
42  
43 the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties have been used to review  
44  
45 and consider the new construction and proposed alterations." Now, if they were used in  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 such a manner as to determine there is no historical significance, but it's not clear to me  
2  
3 that they were used.

4  
5 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Doesn't this mean that they're used once the  
6  
7 significance has been determined, and we're saying there isn't? Fifty years is the trigger  
8  
9 for a memo (inaudible).

10  
11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: May I clarify my query of earlier? My query of earlier  
12  
13 was it actually precedes this finding. This finding I think you can make, because nobody  
14  
15 has evaluated any structure, because the structure that we're considering is not that  
16  
17 age.

18  
19 CHAIR COX: Right.

20  
21 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: My query regarding the memo being done had  
22  
23 nothing to do with the existing structure that is used presently by the Bridge and  
24  
25 Transportation District, it has to do with the fact that that site has been used for  
26  
27 transportation for 100 years.

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Right.

30  
31 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: There's probably some fabric left there. I don't know  
32  
33 that, but nobody has made that determination to my satisfaction, or at least the  
34  
35 information that I've seen. That's why I asked the question.

36  
37 SECRETARY FRASER: So that sounds like not a 50-year review memo, it  
38  
39 sounds like some other kind of analysis of whether there are some historic features at  
40  
41 that property.

42  
43 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: But usually we use the 50-year if I'm going to start  
44  
45 triggering something like that.

46  
47 SECRETARY FRASER: I understand what you're saying.  
48  
49  
50



1 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: But you would be evaluating at the site, so that is  
2  
3 one of the questions, like what happened there? I can see why you didn't.

4  
5 SECRETARY FRASER: The site is in the water. Okay, go ahead.

6  
7 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: At this point I'm happy for us to move forward with  
8  
9 this finding, analyzing it based on what we know.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Okay. How about HLB? Is there a consensus for this finding?

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I would vote yes on the finding.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: Okay.

16  
17 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I'll second that.

18  
19 CHAIR COX: All right, so there's a motion to adopt the staff's reasoning for A5.  
20  
21 Is there a second?

22  
23 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Second that.

24  
25 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?

26  
27 CHAIR COX: So that HLB motion carries 4-0. May I have a similar motion from  
28  
29 the Planning Commission?

30  
31 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll make the same motion.

32  
33 CHAIR COX: Thank you.

34  
35 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

36  
37 CHAIR COX: Thank you. All in favor? Motion carries 5-0. So there's consensus  
38  
39 for A5.

40  
41 Next is A6. Ben, were you able to make Finding A6?

42  
43 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: And for what reason? Let me read what the finding is, and then  
2  
3 you're going to give us your reason for not making it. A6: "Alternate uses and  
4  
5 configurations have been considered as part of the design review process."  
6

7 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Sufficient alternative design configurations have  
8  
9 not been presented. Sufficient alternative design configurations which are needed but  
10  
11 have not yet been presented include: one, an alternative ferry terminal design with no  
12  
13 belvederes; two, an alternative ferry terminal design with a significant overall size  
14  
15 reduction. That's all.  
16

17 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
18

19 SECRETARY FRASER: I would agree with no, but not with qualifications of what  
20  
21 would turn it into a yes.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: What are your reasons for saying no?  
24

25 SECRETARY FRASER: That it was just the single design that was presented to  
26  
27 us.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: Well, I think that the Golden Gate Bridge District would say that  
30  
31 alternative configurations have been considered. They showed us the sloping slopes,  
32  
33 and they showed us a different gate, and they showed us different colors, so I think if  
34  
35 you can't make that finding, I would urge that it would have to be for some reason other  
36  
37 than that simply no alternative configurations were proposed, because I think they  
38  
39 clearly did give us some proposed alternative configurations.  
40

41 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I would concur with that also, because the District  
42  
43 did give us some alternatives. They reduced the width of one of the structures. They  
44  
45 reduced the height of another structure, they gave us color alternatives, they gave us  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 material alternatives, and they gave us gate alternatives. That's different than sufficient  
2 alternatives.  
3

4  
5 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Or ones you like.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Right.  
8

9 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Can I comment?  
10

11 CHAIR COX: Please.  
12

13 SECRETARY FRASER: Okay, if I can hear more from...  
14

15 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I would agree with Commissioner  
16 Brown's finding, except that I do think we were presented at our first meeting with a  
17 design that showed no belvederes. So I think we saw the design, but your other reason  
18 I would support. I believe it had to do with size.  
19  
20  
21

22 CHAIR COX: Say it again.  
23

24 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I think his other reason... He listed  
25 two reasons, and I think the other reason was significant size reduction, and I would  
26 agree with that.  
27  
28  
29

30 CHAIR COX: Okay. So is there other consensus for Ben's thought? Yes?  
31

32 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I agree.  
33

34 CHAIR COX: All right, may I have a motion from the HLB?  
35

36 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I make a motion that I agree with Ben.  
37

38 CHAIR COX: So there's a motion that you cannot make Finding A6 for the  
39 reasons enunciated by Ben?  
40  
41

42 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.  
43

44 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, for clarification, (inaudible) includes both of  
45 the reasons articulated by Member Brown?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Both.

2  
3 COUNSEL WAGNER: That's how I interpreted that motion.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: I didn't hear you.

6  
7 COUNSEL WAGNER: So Member Brown indicated that there were two bases  
8  
9 for not making that finding, one being the belvederes, the other being no reduction in  
10  
11 size. I just want to clarify that those were included in the motion.

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: Okay. But you guys are going to get a transcript, right, and look at  
16  
17 the transcript?

18  
19 COUNSEL WAGNER: Yeah, sure. But if I don't understand, I want to make sure  
20  
21 that we understand, and my understanding was the HLB motion included both of those  
22  
23 articulated reasons. There was information from a Planning Commissioner that  
24  
25 indicated they did not agree with that, but that didn't affect the HLB motion. I thought it  
26  
27 was important to clarify that.

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Thanks.

30  
31 SECRETARY FRASER: So are we changing it to that we did see an alternative  
32  
33 with no belvederes, correct?

34  
35 CHAIR COX: Can you read your thing again, Ben? I'm sorry, guys.

36  
37 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Sufficient alternative design configurations which  
38  
39 are needed include: one, an alternative ferry terminal design with no belvederes; and  
40  
41 two, an alternative ferry terminal design with an overall size significantly smaller than  
42  
43 current design.

44  
45 CHAIR COX: Okay. Is there a motion to...  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I move that we cannot make this finding for  
2  
3 the reasons Board Member Brown listed.  
4

5 BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Seconded.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: All in favor? Okay, so that motion carries 4-0 from the HLB. Is  
8  
9 there a similar motion... Bill, did you want to read a... Are you in agreement?  
10

11 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I have a slightly different take on this thing. It's probably  
12  
13 too late, but my attitude about it is that the use is obviously not the issue, but the  
14  
15 potential of alternative configurations is the issue. The proposed project is solely an  
16  
17 engineering solution which throughout the design process has been consciously  
18  
19 indifferent to the environment into which the ferry landing components are being  
20  
21 inserted. There has been no consideration given to the possibility of genuine  
22  
23 alternatives short of decorative elements.  
24

25 CHAIR COX: I believe that a lot of what you are making reference to is covered  
26  
27 by Ben's wording that sufficient alternative configurations were not considered.  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: The only thing I'm concerned about is I don't like the  
30  
31 idea of sort of trying to design from the dais here.  
32

33 CHAIR COX: Yeah. Is there any other discussion on Ben's wording?  
34

35 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'm ready to (inaudible).  
36

37 CHAIR COX: Okay.  
38

39 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I would just support a motion  
40  
41 similar to Board Member Brown's, minus the belvederes, and I'd make that motion if  
42  
43 there were any support for it.  
44

45 CHAIR COX: So you don't want to remove the belvederes?  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: No, as I stated, I think we were  
2 presented with a design without the belvederes.  
3

4 CHAIR COX: But if you listen to his motion, what he's saying is that the required  
5 configuration would require removal of the belvederes, not that we were never  
6 presented with that.  
7

8 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Okay. I'm not supportive of that.  
9

10 CHAIR COX: You're not in support of removing the belvederes?  
11

12 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Not in this context, because this  
13 finding says alternative uses and configurations have been considered as part of the  
14 design review process, so I don't see this finding as having a particular instruction  
15 about... I think we've looked at the belvederes extensively, I think we've debated them, I  
16 think people have voiced their opinions, and that that's been vetted.  
17

18 CHAIR COX: Okay. Member Brown, can you read your reason for not being able  
19 to make Finding A6 one more time?  
20

21 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: All the most recent designs which we've been  
22 presented with have included the belvederes, and we've been stonewalled. Whenever  
23 there was a concern about whether or not the belvederes could be included in the  
24 redesign we were told no. I completely disagree with that and I think it's something that  
25 needs to be in this resolution, so I'm going to maintain the resolution as I stated it.  
26

27 CHAIR COX: Right. I'm asking you to restate it, sir, for the record, so that I can  
28 find out whether we have consensus for that on the Planning Commission.  
29

30 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Sufficient alternative design configuration, which is  
31 needed, includes: one, an alternative ferry terminal design omitting the belvederes; and  
32 second, an alternative ferry design with a significant overall size reduction.  
33

1 CHAIR COX: Okay, is there a motion to adopt that reason for not being able to  
2  
3 make Finding A6?  
4

5 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I move that we adopt that reason.  
6

7 CHAIR COX: Is there a second? I'll second. Did you want to make an  
8  
9 amendment?  
10

11 VICE CHAIR WERNER: No.  
12

13 CHAIR COX: Okay, will you call the roll?  
14

15 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.  
16

17 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.  
18

19 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.  
20

21 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.  
22

23 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.  
24

25 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: No.  
26

27 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.  
28

29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.  
30

31 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.  
32

33  
34 CHAIR COX: Yes. The motion carries 3-2. So we have another 15 of these to  
35  
36 get through. I just don't see it finishing tonight. Has staff considered a special meeting  
37  
38 date?  
39

40 SECRETARY FRASER: If I can also add, we have to lose a member.  
41

42 CHAIR COX: We're losing one HLB member now. We're losing our quorum at  
43  
44 11:30 in 25 minutes. We're losing one now. I think we're losing another one at 11:30.  
45

46 SECRETARY FRASER: Who? Are we losing one more at 11:30?  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Can you stick around for one moment while we talk about a new  
2 meeting date?  
3

4 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay.  
5

6 LILLY SCHINSING: We do need to check the room availability, but what you  
7 could do is select some dates that work for you, and then we can go check it against the  
8 room availability and let you know.  
9

10 CHAIR COX: Well, I would suggest that we wait at least one week, because  
11 today is Wednesday; the staff report for a week from today would be due in two days.  
12

13 COUNSEL WAGNER: Well, you've got the staff report. It's exactly what's in front  
14 of you right now. We're not doing a new staff report.  
15

16 CHAIR COX: Okay, so we can just continue on. Okay.  
17

18 COUNSEL WAGNER: Yeah. I mean what unfortunately will have to happen is if  
19 you want to see the resolution, you're going to have to have another special meeting.  
20

21 CHAIR COX: Right. Well, we're going to get as far as we can tonight, but before  
22 everybody leaves I want to make sure we have consensus. What are the available staff  
23 dates? Because you have City Council meetings.  
24

25 COUNSEL WAGNER: We know we have a City Council meeting next Tuesday. I  
26 wanted to also state that it's likely going to be in the Council chambers, because I don't  
27 know that we will be able to get this space again and have the resources to pay for this  
28 space again.  
29

30 CHAIR COX: Right.  
31

32 COUNSEL WAGNER: So it will likely be in the Council chambers. We know we  
33 have a City Council meeting next Tuesday. I don't know about chamber availability  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 otherwise. If you guys can let us know your availability starting I guess Friday. Lilly, I'm  
2  
3 looking at staff.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: I'm not available at all this week. I would be available next week.

6  
7 SECRETARY FRASER: I'm available any time.

8  
9 LILLY SCHINSING: (Inaudible).

10  
11 COUNSEL WAGNER: They want to continue the discussion on the resolution.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: You're not available at all next week?

14  
15 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: (Inaudible) I don't have my phone here.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: So people don't have their calendars. We can't reach consensus  
18  
19 on this tonight. Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles is not available at all next week.

20  
21 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'm not available the last (inaudible).

22  
23 CHAIR COX: We already have a meeting scheduled for the 29<sup>th</sup>. We may just  
24  
25 need to do this on the 29<sup>th</sup> and have a special meeting to cover the other items from the  
26  
27 29<sup>th</sup>.

28  
29 VICE CHAIR WERNER: We could do it Sunday instead of going to church.

30  
31 CHAIR COX: It is a holy experience. And here's the thing, I would notice this as  
32  
33 editing, as aligning on a resolution. We are not going to reopen public comment on the  
34  
35 merits of the project.

36  
37 COUNSEL WAGNER: It's a continued meeting. I mean what we're going to do is  
38  
39 continue this meeting, obviously. You've taken full public comment.

40  
41 CHAIR COX: We're going to take public comment, but...

42  
43 COUNSEL WAGNER: You may not have to. I mean we'll look at the Brown Act  
44  
45 requirements. You've fully taken public comment, and there's a provision in the Brown  
46  
47

1 Act that says when you've fully taken public comment, and closed public comment, you  
2 don't have to take it again.

3  
4 CHAIR COX: Okay. All right.

5  
6 COUNSEL WAGNER: What we would suggest, I mean we can try and do a  
7 quorum check with each body for dates next week and go from there.  
8

9  
10 CHAIR COX: Okay. All right, so Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles, since you  
11 are not available at all next week, are there any particular findings that you feel strongly  
12 about that we should take out of order? Because I really value your feedback.  
13

14  
15 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Chair Cox, I think I've articulated  
16 by reasoning on the scale, so to findings that relate to scale. I would continue to have a  
17 difficult time making the finding related to scale without a proposal that significantly  
18 reduces the mass of the truss.  
19

20  
21 CHAIR COX: All right, then I would say lets turn now to Finding C3.  
22

23  
24 COUNSEL WAGNER: And just for the record, Chair Cox, we want to note that  
25 Board Member Mercado had to leave. I don't know that that was physically said on the  
26 record, that he was leaving, so we know that.  
27

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Yeah, so we now are operating with three members of our Historic  
30 Landmarks Board, and we have 20 minutes with those three members before we lose  
31 our quorum.  
32

33  
34 Finding C3 is, "The proposed project is consistent with the general scale of  
35 structures and buildings in the surrounding neighborhood and/or district." Member  
36 Brown, were you able to make that finding?  
37

38  
39 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No. The proposed ferry terminal would not be  
40 consistent with surrounding structures unless the overall size of the terminal is reduced  
41

1 significantly, both belvederes are omitted, and satisfactory landside modifications are  
2  
3 jointly developed by the District and the City of Sausalito.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: Okay, are there other thoughts by HLB members on that? That's  
6  
7 good with you?

8  
9 SECRETARY FRASER: That's good with me.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Okay, may I have a motion?

12  
13 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I move we cannot make for the finding based  
14  
15 on the reasons listed by Board Member Brown.

16  
17 SECRETARY FRASER: Second. All in favor?

18  
19 CHAIR COX: Okay. Are there thoughts on that wording on the Planning  
20  
21 Commission side? The belvederes for me are not a make it or break it issue, although I  
22  
23 would prefer to see it without belvederes. I think it's a maintenance issue for the City.

24  
25 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I think the belvederes just contribute to the overall  
26  
27 scale, so I think if you say reduction of the overall scale, then they are factored into that.

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Yeah, so I would be okay with that language, omitting the  
30  
31 language about the belvederes.

32  
33 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I'm supportive of that as well.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: Member Brown, I'm sorry to keep hassling you, but can you read it  
36  
37 one more time, but omit the mention of the belvederes. And if you have something  
38  
39 different, please speak up.

40  
41  
42 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: The proposed ferry terminal would not be  
43  
44 consistent with surrounding structures unless the overall size of the terminal is  
45  
46 significantly reduced and satisfactory landside modifications are jointly developed by the  
47  
48 District and the City of Sausalito.

1 CHAIR COX: Any other comments, or may I have a motion?

2  
3 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I'll make that motion.

4  
5 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll second it.

6  
7 CHAIR COX: All right. Could you call the roll, please?

8  
9 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

10  
11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

12  
13 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

14  
15 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

16  
17 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Yes.

20  
21 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

22  
23 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

24  
25 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

26  
27 CHAIR COX: Yes.

28  
29 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: May I make a request to review A8, so we can get  
30 all of Table A done?  
31

32  
33 CHAIR COX: Yes. I can't make A7, but go to A8 next. All right, I assume you  
34 have some language. So the finding for A8 is, "The proposed new construction or  
35 alteration will be compatible with, and help achieve the purposes of, the historic overlay  
36 district."  
37

38  
39 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: The proposed ferry terminal would not be  
40 compatible with the Sausalito Historic District unless there is a written agreement which  
41 limits operational expansion at the enlarged terminal. An enlarged ferry terminal with no  
42 limit for operational expansion lacks adequate safeguards against an excessive  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 increase in tourist bicycle traffic in the downtown Historic District. Such an increase  
2  
3 would not be compatible with the purposes of the Historic District. To ensure  
4  
5 compatibility with the historic overlay district a prior written agreement is needed which  
6  
7 sets an upper limit on the volume of ferry operations from an enlarged Sausalito ferry  
8  
9 terminal. Provisions of such an agreement might include: one, prohibiting two ferries  
10  
11 from docking simultaneously at the enlarged terminal; two, setting a numerical upper  
12  
13 limit on the number of ferries per day permitted to dock at the enlarged terminal; three,  
14  
15 establishing a system for San Francisco bike rental companies to bus their bicycles  
16  
17 back form Sausalito to San Francisco from a site outside of the historic downtown  
18  
19 district instead of transporting return bikes on the ferry; and four, establishing parking  
20  
21 fees for all bicycles in the downtown Historic District.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: I agree with Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles that I don't think we  
24  
25 can tie... I do believe that handling the bicycle issue is separate and apart from the  
26  
27 ferry. I think that the need for such a large ferry dock will disappear when the bike  
28  
29 management issue is addressed by the City, as it should be, separately, and I think it  
30  
31 would be shortsighted of us to adopt plans for a large ferry landing that will not be  
32  
33 needed once that problem or that issue is addressed in a separate manner. But I am not  
34  
35 comfortable with tying our findings on that issue into our reasons that it will not  
36  
37 necessarily be compatible with the historic overlay district.  
38

39 VICE CHAIR WERNER: This so annoyed me that I got a little saucy here, I  
40  
41 think, but this finding could only be made in the affirmative if the ultimate purpose of the  
42  
43 historic overlay district were to become fossilized as a tourist theme park. A design  
44  
45 composition of elements which would be well suited to an oil tanker terminal in the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 Arabian Sea can hardly be called compatible with or help achieve the purposes of the  
2  
3 historic overlay district.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: So I would urge us to find a more simple...

6  
7 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: We can do without the prose.

8  
9 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: (Inaudible).

10  
11 CHAIR COX: I get it. I take seriously what Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles  
12  
13 said earlier. I think we really have to be respectful all the way around in the manner in  
14  
15 which we address this, both of our staff and of the Golden Gate Bridge District. Staff, I  
16  
17 know this has been a long and arduous process.

18  
19 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: May I make a comment?

20  
21 CHAIR COX: Yes.

22  
23 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I think one could shorten this by removing all the  
24  
25 potential provisions of such an agreement and simply limit it to the heart and soul of this  
26  
27 matter, which is limiting operations, having some kind of agreement to limit operations  
28  
29 to a level that is compatible with whatever is appropriate as decided by the City Council.

30  
31 CHAIR COX: I mean I think that not only do operations need to be limited; I think  
32  
33 again, size needs to be limited. It's not just operations. This says, "The proposed new  
34  
35 construction or alteration will be compatible with, and help achieve the purposes of, the  
36  
37 historic overlay district." I think in its current size and scale that is not a finding that can  
38  
39 be made, and I think those issues have to be addressed.

40  
41 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So suppose we restated it to say, "...to set a limit  
42  
43 on both size and operations"?

44  
45 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Can I ask a question of the City  
46  
47 Attorney?  
48  
49  
50

1 CHAIR COX: Please.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I was under the impression that  
4  
5 under the lease the only issue here is whether the physical proposal is acceptable to the  
6  
7 City. Are operational issues something that the City has any jurisdiction over under the  
8  
9 lease at all?

10  
11 CHAIR COX: The operational issues that I think we're talking about are  
12  
13 nighttime parking there, which I think would be an issue with the downtown.

14  
15 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I understood Board Member Brown  
16  
17 to be talking about the number of trips being made by the ferry and other issues, but I  
18  
19 do not understand to be part of the lease, but I haven't read it for that purpose.

20  
21 CHAIR COX: Did the City Attorney want to weigh in on this? So there's an  
22  
23 interest by an HLB board member.

24  
25 COUNSEL WAGNER: I understand. I think that the operational issues are  
26  
27 separate from the design issues and the compatibility with the Historic District. I  
28  
29 understand the points that are being made, and I think it's clear on the record that there  
30  
31 is concern about the operational factors that some people believe are driving the  
32  
33 design.

34  
35  
36 The question that's being posed to the City Council is whether or not they  
37  
38 approve of the proposed major alteration and improvement to the structure itself. There  
39  
40 are other lease provisions that deal with use. I was just trying to look at those to see if  
41  
42 they specifically addressed this issue. They do talk about the District having the right to  
43  
44 determine the schedule of its ferry service, would which kind of include the number of  
45  
46 boats that are operating and the manner in which they operate, and the boat itself.

1 And I'm not sure about the PUC issue with respect to operations as it relates to  
2 the District. I'm seeing their District counsel reacting to that, that it doesn't apply to  
3 them.  
4  
5

6  
7 But in any event, I think that you're being asked to weigh in on the design of the  
8 structure, not necessarily the operational issues. If you feel that the operational issues  
9 are driving the design, then it becomes somewhat circular, but applicable.  
10  
11

12  
13 CHAIR COX: Well, I think by not enunciating what operational issues... I mean  
14 for me operational issues... The District has said repeatedly that they do not intend to  
15 increase the number of trips. Obviously the view impacts to the Downtown District and  
16 the neighbors are affected by the numerosity of the trips and by whether that dock is  
17 used as overnight parking or extended parking for other ships. So those were the two  
18 issues I recall that seem to most concern our residents.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 All right, did you have anything more to add, Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles?  
26

27  
28 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: I just thought the purpose and  
29 intent of the district is laid out in our staff report from April 1<sup>st</sup>, page 4 of 22, and I think  
30 since the finding is about whether the purposes of the Historic District are met, I just  
31 wanted to summarize them.  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 It's to promote the conservation, preservation, and enhancement of the historic or  
37 architecturally significant structures and sites to deter demolition, destruction, alteration,  
38 misuse, or neglect of historic or architecturally significant buildings. To stimulate the  
39 economic health and quality of the community, and stabilize and enhance the value of  
40 property. To encourage development tailored to the character and significance of an  
41 historic district through sign and design review standards. To provide review of projects  
42 located in the historic overlay district by the Historic Landmarks Board. To encourage  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50



1 the protection and reuse of structures, sites and areas that provide significant examples  
2  
3 of the past or that are landmarks. To preserve structures that are unique and  
4  
5 irreplaceable assets to the City and neighborhoods, and to provide appropriate settings  
6  
7 and environments for historic structures.  
8

9 For myself, most of the purposes of the Historic District could be met with an  
10  
11 improved ferry project. I think the one that probably would have the most difficulty here  
12  
13 is the one that refers to the design review.  
14

15 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I also would have issue with the last one that  
16  
17 you read.  
18

19 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Right, number 8, to provide  
20  
21 appropriate settings and environments for historic structures.  
22

23 CHAIR COX: Right. So I think with a reduction in scale. But I think that having  
24  
25 boats... Again, I think perhaps to reach consensus we should leave the operational  
26  
27 issues to the lessor and focus on design, and I believe that Member Brown's wording  
28  
29 concerning design was appropriate for the two reasons that you have enunciated within  
30  
31 the purposes of the historic overlay district.  
32

33 All right, can you read your reasoning, Member Brown, and omit the operational  
34  
35 issues?  
36

37 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So if I were to restate this in the context of what our  
38  
39 discussion has been, I'd have to refer to the wording that I used earlier, that we just  
40  
41 would favor an alternative ferry terminal design of significant overall size reduction, and  
42  
43 leave the operational issues to the City Council to wrestle with separately, although I  
44  
45 personally think that they are key to preserving the character of the downtown. I think  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

1 they're a core issue, but maybe it's not one that we're charged with dealing with, and so  
2  
3 I'm happy to leave it.

4  
5 CHAIR COX: Okay. Is there consensus on HLB for Member Brown's thoughts?

6  
7 SECRETARY FRASER: Is that the phraseology of the...

8  
9 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Just to set appropriate size limits as has been  
10  
11 mentioned previously on the ferry terminal redesign.

12  
13 CHAIR COX: For me, A8 was tied to A3.

14  
15 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: And I'd just like to clarify, I think I  
16  
17 already have, but just in voting for the overall significant size reduction, that's what  
18  
19 they... My comments that I've made earlier about what I believe that entails, which I  
20  
21 think is slightly different from everybody else.

22  
23 CHAIR COX: I think the reason for not being able to make Finding A8 is that the  
24  
25 proposed new construction or alteration is not compatible with, and does not help  
26  
27 achieve, the purposes of the historic overlay district without a significant reduction in  
28  
29 size and scale. Is there a motion?

30  
31 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: (Inaudible).

32  
33 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.

34  
35 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?

36  
37 CHAIR COX: Okay, so that reasoning by the HLB passes 3-0. Is there a similar  
38  
39 motion by the Planning Commission?

40  
41 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I'll make that motion.

42  
43 CHAIR COX: Thank you. Is there a second?

44  
45 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Second.

46  
47 CHAIR COX: Actually, will you call the roll?

1 DANNY CASTRO: Thank you. Commissioner Pierce.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Aye.

4  
5 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

6  
7 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: This is what's significant in here, (inaudible)  
8  
9 percentages?

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Correct. We didn't want to relegate it to a percentage.

12  
13 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No, no.

14  
15 CHAIR COX: Okay.

16  
17 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Yes. Oh, sorry.

18  
19 DANNY CASTRO: Okay, Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

20  
21 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Yes.

22  
23 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

24  
25 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

26  
27 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Yes. All right, so we've done all of the findings in A except A7.  
30  
31 Member Brown, were you able to make the finding for A7?

32  
33 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have no comment on this one.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: And Commissioner Werner?

36  
37 VICE CHAIR WERNER: I have no comment either, because A7 is basically all  
38  
39 covered in Table C.

40  
41 CHAIR COX: So I cannot make Finding A7 for the reasons because I cannot  
42  
43 make the findings in Table C. So is that an adequate statement of reasons, Madam City  
44  
45 Attorney? And we will give specific reasons for Table C.

46  
47 COUNSEL WAGNER: Yes.

1 CHAIR COX: Okay. So we have not yet, but I will entertain a motion from the  
2  
3 HLB that Finding A7 cannot be made for the reasons that various findings in Table C  
4  
5 cannot be made.

6  
7 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox, another alternative is to wait till you do Table  
8  
9 C.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Okay. I was just trying to round up...

12  
13 COUNSEL WAGNER: I understand, but it will flow directly from your  
14  
15 conversation on Table C.

16  
17 CHAIR COX: Well, we've already done C3. All right, we have three minutes left.

18  
19 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: How about C2?

20  
21 CHAIR COX: C2? Okay. "The proposed architecture and site design  
22  
23 complements the surrounding neighborhood and/or district by either: a) maintaining the  
24  
25 prevailing design character of the neighborhood and/or district; or b) introducing a  
26  
27 distinctive and creative solution which takes advantage of the unique characteristics of  
28  
29 the site and contributes to the design diversity of Sausalito."

30  
31  
32 And Member Brown, I'm assuming you could not make that finding, and for what  
33  
34 reason?

35  
36 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No. The large ferry terminal would not complement  
37  
38 the surrounding neighborhood unless: one, both belvederes were omitted; two, there is  
39  
40 a significant reduction in the overall size of the terminal; and three, satisfactory landside  
41  
42 modifications are jointly developed by the District and City of Sausalito.

43  
44 CHAIR COX: Did you have different thoughts?

45  
46 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Mine says the proposed design does not complement  
47  
48 the neighborhood and/or the district in either of the two criteria. It does not maintain the  
49  
50

1 prevailing design character of the location, and it does not present a distinctive solution  
2 which is acceptable. It takes no advantage of the unique characteristics of the site and  
3 detracts mightily from what is generally considered to be the design diversity of  
4 Sausalito.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 CHAIR COX: Okay, I really like that one.  
10

11 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I would concur with Commissioner Werner. I think  
12 we keep the belvederes out of it, and even the landside improvements, out of this part  
13 of the discussion, but I think that captures.  
14  
15

16  
17 CHAIR COX: Okay. Is there consensus on the HLB for Commissioner Werner's  
18 language? All right, may I have a motion?  
19  
20

21 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to accept.  
22

23 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Second.  
24

25 SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?  
26

27 CHAIR COX: All right, so the HLB cannot make Finding C2 for the reason  
28 enunciated by Commissioner Werner. Is there a similar motion by the Planning  
29 Commission?  
30  
31  
32

33 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: So moved.  
34

35 CHAIR COX: Is there a second?  
36

37 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Second.  
38

39 CHAIR COX: Will you call the roll?  
40

41 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.  
42

43 COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.  
44

45 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.  
46  
47

48 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.  
49  
50

1 DANNY CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

2  
3 COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Yes.

4  
5 DANNY CASTRO: Vice Chair Werner.

6  
7 VICE CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

8  
9 DANNY CASTRO: Chair Cox.

10  
11 CHAIR COX: Yes. Okay, and on that consensus note, I think we're going to stop  
12  
13 for the evening, because we're going to lose our HLB members.

14  
15 So thank you to those members of the public who stayed throughout this  
16  
17 marathon session. Go ahead, Lilly.

18  
19 LILLY SCHINSING: We did check on the availability of the chambers, if you are  
20  
21 interested. It's available next Friday the 24<sup>th</sup>, and Tuesday the 28<sup>th</sup>.

22  
23 CHAIR COX: I could do Friday the 24<sup>th</sup>. Okay, you cannot, you cannot, so it  
24  
25 would be up to...

26  
27 LILLY SCHINSING: (Inaudible) after their regular meeting.

28  
29 CHAIR COX: Here's the thing. We have to have more than three, because we're  
30  
31 going to have a 2-1 vote on a lot of these things if it's just three of us.

32  
33 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I think I could do the 28<sup>th</sup>.

34  
35 CHAIR COX: All right, so all of us could do the 28<sup>th</sup>.

36  
37 COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I think that works.

38  
39 CHAIR COX: Oh, that's a Tuesday. You can or cannot?

40  
41 SECRETARY FRASER: I can do both.

42  
43 CHAIR COX: Yes?

44  
45 BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I don't know, I'd have to check.

1 CHAIR COX: Members of the Golden Gate Bridge District, we are considering a  
2  
3 special meeting on Tuesday, April 28<sup>th</sup>. Can members of the District attend that meeting  
4  
5 as we finish our work on the resolution?  
6

7 JOHN EBERLE: What time?  
8

9 CHAIR COX: I assume it would be a 6:30 meeting. Hopefully it would not... We  
10  
11 have closed the public comment period. Assuming that we can treat this as a  
12  
13 continuation of this meeting, we would be able to jump right into our continued  
14  
15 consideration of these factors for the resolution.  
16

17 JOHN EBERLE: We will have a representative available at that time.  
18

19 CHAIR COX: Okay. Okay, so again, before we wrap up I did want to thank  
20  
21 members of the public for staying. I want to thank members of the District for bearing  
22  
23 with us and staying and listening to all of this feedback. I know it has not been easy, just  
24  
25 as it is not easy for us to hear your criticism, so I do appreciate the dialogue greatly.  
26

27 COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Cox.  
28

29 CHAIR COX: Yes.  
30

31 COUNSEL WAGNER: I'm sorry to belabor this. The Community Development  
32  
33 Director has informed me that some of your calendar on the 29<sup>th</sup> has opened up, so let  
34  
35 us work with the two chairs to figure out the availability and the dates and get  
36  
37 consensus and then notice what we get back.  
38

39 CHAIR COX: Okay. Just to complete this agenda, are there any communications  
40  
41 from staff or Planning Commissioners?  
42

43 DANNY CASTRO: No.  
44

45 CHAIR COX: All right, did the HLB want to adjourn?  
46  
47

48 SECRETARY FRASER: Motion to adjourn.  
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

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second.

SECRETARY FRASER: All in favor?

CHAIR COX: Motion carries 3-0. May I have a motion from the Planning Commission?

VICE CHAIR WERNER: Move to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER CLEVELAND-KNOWLES: Second.

CHAIR COX: All in favor? Once again we agree. Motion carries 5-0. Thank you, everybody.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Submitted by  
Danny Castro  
Community Development Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved by  
Joan Cox  
Chair