

From: James McGrath <macmcgrath@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 12:05 PM
To: McNulty, Liza
Cc: Miller, Roger
Subject: RE: May 7, 2025, Kittelson & Associations Addendum

They will be incorporated by reference and attached to my scoping comments.

On 05/12/2025 11:52 AM PDT McNulty, Liza <lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov> wrote:

Hi Jim,

Thank you for these comments. I am treating these as comments on the Draft Parking Study Addendum, per the subject line. If you would like this email instead treated as Public Scoping comments for the Project EIR, please let me know.

Best,

Liza McNulty, PE

Capital Improvement Program Manager

City of Berkeley Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department

2180 Milvia Street, 3rd Floor

Berkeley, CA 94704

(510) 542-4131 (cell)

From: James McGrath <macmcgrath@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 11, 2025 10:50 AM
To: McNulty, Liza <lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov>

Cc: Andrew Sullivan <a_e_sullivan@yahoo.com>; Paul Kamen <pk@well.com>; Brad Smith <brad_smith@earthlink.net>; Doug Yamamoto <718glazier@gmail.com>; Carla Woodworth <carlawoodworth27@gmail.com>; Kelly Hammargren <kellyhammargren@gmail.com>; Camille Antinori <camilleantinori@gmail.com>; Julie Allen <valepuella@gmail.com>; Claudia Kawczynska <claudia94710@gmail.com>; erindiehm@hotmail.com; Allan Abshez <allanabshez@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: May 7, 2025, Kittelson & Associates Addendum

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

After holding a public scoping meeting on May 5, 2025, the City of Berkeley has issued a new parking report dated May 7, 2025, by Kittelson & Associates. Upon careful reading, it becomes clear that this report anticipates yet another change in the project description for the pier ferry project. The city and Kittelson seem to have changed their conclusion that there is ample parking in the marina for all users, that ferry parkers will be satisfied with 250 spaces, and there will be no usurpation of the limited recreational parking in what the Nelson/Nygaard memorandum of September 11, 2018, calls the central facilities. The revised plan now calls for overflow parking to be directed to the Skates/N lot and the informal parking areas along Marina Boulevard adjacent to McLaughlin Eastshore State Park.

On page 2 of the report, the Kittelson Memorandum concludes that there are “at least 66 spaces in the Skates/N Lot” and 83 spaces along Marina Blvd. The report does not mention the distance to the parking spaces along Marina Blvd, over 2000 feet. The city has prepared various drafts of improvements to establish formal parking areas along Marina Boulevard, and has discussed a shuttle service in public meetings, but neither of those elements are included in the most recent transportation demand study.

The May 7, 2025, draft addendum does not provide the new data that it claims support these conclusions. It states that there are parking counts on 554 days and acknowledges that there are only limited counts apparently among those days at 2 pm and 4 pm. It does not reveal how many counts were taken at those times or reveal that data in a spread

sheet. It does not appear to include the 11 days of counts that were not used in the earlier Kittelson draft memo and makes no attempt to rationalize this new conclusion with previous reports by Kittelson, the city, and Nelson/Nygaard. Thus, there is no way to tell from the issued report how robust the data is. The report does acknowledge that the South Cove West lot reaches peak occupancy between 1 and 3 on weekdays, the time when usurpation of recreational parking has been an ongoing controversy.

It is useful to return to the Nelson/Nygaard Report cited above to see whether this new report meets the substantial evidence test established under CEQA. Several quotes from that report cast doubt on the availability of parking in proximity to the proposed new terminal and the efficacy of city efforts to prevent parking usurpation. On the former issue, Nelson/Nygaard concluded:

Peak parking demand met or exceeded 85% in the Central Parking Lots [and] During weekdays, centrally-located lots, particularly the J & K and L&M Lot, experience as much as 89% and 93% occupancy respectively.

For the South cove lots, they concluded:

The South cove lots have multiple users...resulting in a peak period in which the lots are full. [and that despite city efforts to direct ferry riders to lots like the Marina Boulevard lot] Ferry customers have not heeded recent signage (placed on South Cove, J&K, and L&M Lots) to park on Marina Boulevard instead.

Of course the existing and recent small ferry operations were/are far closer to Marina Boulevard than the 2,000 + feet now claimed as a solution. Without the release of the underlying data, including the city counts mentioned in my March 18, 2025, letter on the earlier Kittelson Report, the public has no way to review the quality of the data underlying the blithe conclusions of city staff and their new parking consultants. City staff has been less than accurate in previous public meetings, assuring the Planning Commission on May 10, 2023, that parking use at those same South Cove lots was only 5%. Remember, the Nelson/Nygaard

report showing “periods in which the [South Cove] lots are full” was provided to the city staff more than 4 ½ years before that presentation—and the presentation with its erroneous conclusion is still posted on the city website. The importance of public review and transparency on this project could not be clearer.

This new change in the apparent project description, and another new proposal to initiate parking charges for the marina , illustrate the need for the city to complete a Waterfront Specific Plan (WSP) before they pursue an EIR for the pier ferry project. Since the city now believes it is necessary to use areas of the waterfront that are subject to changed land use designations in the draft WSP, and to establish parking charges for the whole marina, it can readily be seen that the pier ferry project is not independent of the WSP and these projects cannot be pursued without violating CEQA’s requirement to analyze the whole of a project, including future and related projects.

Jim McGrath