

## General

- A vote for or against moving forward with the new ferry landing had these results: 9 yes move forward, 3 no don't move forward, 2 did not vote.
- Next steps:
  - City council will meet on Tuesday in a closed session to discuss this topic (as well as other topics)
  - City council will work with the Bridge District to come up with a process for moving forward
  - Make the information from the workshop available to the general public. It will be important to show the original drawings and the latest version of the design. Be as visual as possible.
  - Begin work on the land side design. Form a committee and invite residents to participate in the design process.
  - Continue work on the bike issues, alternative road into Fort Baker, and opening a concession at Fort Baker to transport bikes back to San Francisco.

## Feedback from residents regarding the ferry landing design:

### I LIKE...

- *The newer, lower profile gangway*
- *The renderings much better than we had before*
- *Community engagement*
- *The longer ramp*
- *District's willingness to change*
- *The lower silhouette*
- *The lower profile*
- *Warm spot lights*
- *Warm lights*
- *Warmer lights*
- *Grey color*
- *Better color*
- *No benches*
- *'Should' solve all out concerns*
- *Width for quality flow of passengers with bikes or without bikes*
- *The reduced mass of the main gangway*
- *Lower hand rails*
- *The new rail support system*
- *Potential to work together as a community regarding the belvederes*
- *The design changes that have been made*
- *The soft, warm light*
- *Soft spotted lighting*
- *Every other, down spot, warm light*
- *The lower railings*
- *Galvanized, light grey color*
- *No belvederes*
- *Sunny days on the bay*

## I WISH...

- o Lower the light towers*
- o We can get rid of the belvederes*
- o Color: galvanized*
- o Intermittent, warm lighting*
- o The float mass and projection into the bay needs to be reduced*
- o We could eliminate the access pier entirely to shorten the walk to the ferry*
- o No transportation hub in Sausalito*
- o The district would be responsive to the real observed chokepoint — the bike loading issue onboard*
- o The land side pier would be included in the design*
- o Channel light poles to be compatible with historic district*
- o Lights that are in keeping with the modern design, but lower than the drawings*
- o No belvederes*
- o Tie in the colors of the fenders*
- o The float and gangway were reduced in size*
- o To eliminate the cluttered look of the float*
- o Glass doors*
- o The bicycle traffic would be minimized*
- o We would discuss the land side ramifications before rather than after the ferry landing*
- o Fund the fishing pier*
- o The design process hadn't sprung from a maintenance point of view; instead it should have been part of a comprehensive vision that includes the broader scope of land side, pier location, people/bike/vehicle circulation, and parking*

## MY QUESTION IS...

- o How does the ferry landing design relate to the land side design, bike issues, and future vision of Sausalito?*
- o How will a power outage affect the hydraulics and services?*
- o Can we start this process over?*
- o Can we see the new plans side-by-side with the original plans so we can see the scope of adjustment that have been made? (This is important to share with the broader Sausalito community to get their buy-in.)*
- o Why are the doors opening into the crowd of waiting boarders?*
- o Is this ferry landing design compatible with other providers?*
- o When can we have the new float up and running?*
- o Why not drop down the hydraulics to lower the boarding platform in relation to the float? This would allow a flatter gangway, allowing the float to be narrower.*

---End of notes from November 14, 2015 Workshop---