

From: David Fielder <davidfielder@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 1:35 PM
To: McNulty, Liza
Cc: David Fielder; Miller, Roger
Subject: Liza - Re: Waterfront May 5th Focus Zoom

Liza,

Thanks for reply and details/insights.

To keep things simple, please treat my email as a NOP Comment? Don't think there is anything embarrassing/inappropriate therein.

Good luck with ongoing planning.

Thanks again, David

On May 14, 2025, at 12:37 PM, McNulty, Liza <lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov> wrote:

Thanks for this email, David.

We did not record the Focus Group meeting, but I do intend to publish my summary and the meeting notes, I just haven't been able to do so yet. It's high on my list.

Some of the points you bring up here would be best suited to be analyzed in the EIR. Specifically, access constraints during construction, and the larger project alternative of Pier operations within the Marina Basin instead of at a reconstructed Pier. Would you like me to treat this email as an NOP Comment so that those elements are captured as scoping comments? That means the entirety of the email would be treated as NOP scoping comments in the Project record. Alternatively you could submit a separate email with those particular "EIR Scoping" related comments only. Please let me know what you prefer.

I concur that we are, if you'll excuse my pun, between a rock and hard place in this location. The very elements that make it attractive (steep shoreline with lower elevation shorebed and direct access to the wind/open Bay) also create technical challenges for that 'final approach' that we do not as yet have a design solution for (access platform high enough to avoid green slime = too high to avoid a rock scramble). I appreciate the referrals to specific individuals (both in this email and prior) and will reach out to them to get more feedback and ideas for this location.

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: David Fielder <davidfielder@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, May 09, 2025 1:02 PM

To: McNulty, Liza <lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov>

Cc: David Fielder <davidfielder@comcast.net>

Subject: Waterfront May 5th Focus Zoom

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.

Liza,

First, I appreciated the way you ran this meeting, both soliciting input and speaking with candor. I hope that the recording of the meeting, including slides, will be made available - but don't find it at the WSP website yet?

Now that I've had a chance to reflect, I'd like to share some thoughts/suggestions as well as additional concerns.

I believe you heard from many disparate users how important non-motorized launch access at His Lords Cove is and will remain (including swimmers). That cove provides immediate access to deeper parts of the Bay as well as to the usual seasonal Westerlies PM windline. At the same time, I heard you express concern that "risks/legal constraints" might preclude future development and use of that Cove. That, along with the phrase "under consideration" regarding Cove improvements, definitely set off alarms.

The alternative access site you mentioned (just NE of His Lords on South Sailing Basin side - "Option 2"?), while perhaps attractive from terrain and cost considerations, would basically negate the two most important attributes of the Cove (see above). It is one thing to carry gear on ramps/ashore and quite another to swim it westward around the point to access depth and wind, especially if you are trying to get upwind and fighting Mother Nature.

Another critical issue that everyone seemed sensitive to is the "final approach" to actually putting gear and bodies into the water. At present, users must clamber down/up the riprap to access the relatively benign gravel/sand/muck path below. High tide presents even more challenge as users struggle to see where to step under the surface prior to reaching that path. I have decades of experience managing that process at the Cove - almost never pleasant. A solution that doesn't address that will be a major concern.

Some suggestions:

1. I don't know who you are consulting with regarding actual launch improvement design? For the Pt. Isabel project I worked with Kyle MacDonald, the coastal engineer initially via CLE Engineering, which subsequently became Foth/CLE Engineering. I'd suggest early and close involvement of users with actual planners/engineers would be much more likely to produce good outcomes. That was precisely my experience with EBRPD and Foth for the Pt. Isabel project. Prior to final design and construction, I gave rigging/launch demonstrations to involved staff to clarify constraints and access needs, etc.

2. At Pt. Isabel, the "breakthrough" came when we decided on two ramps - an ADA version (5% max grade) and a more immediate/practical steeper version (20%). However, as you will see in photo right below showing my gear and the "meeting pad" of the two ramps, that approach still begs the question of the "final approach" given terrain at His Lords.

<image001.jpg>

Important to note that for this launch we managed to avoid using railings and stairs, both significant impediments to gear access. Also, we have avoided green slime/algae buildup as the base of the ramp has been at least 6 inches above typical high tide levels - a critical safety feature.

3. I also remain concerned about access improvements at the Cove given the uncertainty of the HLS restaurant's future. For example, if it were to be demolished, I expect we'd have much more design freedom.

4. The Cove jetty is definitely "moving" eastward as well as being "eroded" by ongoing wave action. It is a much larger jetty than the one we replaced at Pt. Isabel, thus would be more costly to replace. The His Lords jetty was definitely not built to same standards as the Foth-designed one (which is aging well after 6 years).

5. The SF Bay Water Trail was a "proud supporter" of the Pt. Isabel launch improvement. I'd suggest reaching out for potential funding support from them?

6. Construction staging is a major launch access concern. That was an issue at Pt. Isabel as well - photo here:

<image002.jpg>

In conclusion, I'm pleased to share my experiences at both Pt. Isabel and His Lords - along with extensive photographic and documentary archives (additional items copied below).

I took Ali Endress on a tour of Pt. Isabel several years ago and would be happy to do so again if desired by you and/or your consultants.

Sincerely, David

P.S. Additional thoughts & Project Alternative:

A. We are experiencing increasing “conflict” at the Cove re disparate users. Most recently fisherfolk have placed chairs in the Cove launch path with access impacts including fishing line snaring hazards. Any Cove launch design, at least absent rebuilding of the pier, must address this.

B. You requested “Project Alternatives” during the Focus Zoom. Mine is to more carefully explore siting WETA ferry operations from within the Harbor, as with Genentech operation. Smaller craft could use existing docks (Hornblower, etc), improving timing and decreasing overall project cost. I discussed this at length with WETA’s Michael Gougherty years ago. He said WETA Board wasn’t interested - even for a demonstration/trial approach. It would also separate the pier rebuild decision from ferry operations - a definite plus for most park users as you heard.

xxxxxx

Additional attachments:

This was draft Plan I presented to EBRPD Board back in 2018, resulting in their eventual approval of approx. \$1.5-2 Million for the project.

Point Isabel Water Access and Safety Improvement Project

Existing Launch Access/Safety:

Replace the existing cement steps with a more accessible and stable textured ramp.

Add comparable-sized gravel to launch pathway above and below water line.

Rebuild and stabilize rock jetty to ensure adequate launch protection.

Remove submerged rock launch hazards to a minimum of 4 feet clearance below water surface at low tide in front of the launch gravel pathway.

Add channel markers to delineate launch area at high tide.

Rigging Area

Add 3,600-sf (80’ X 45’) rigging area comprised of ½” pea gravel.

Appropriate rigging area border, such as creosote timber logs around 3 sides, to help contain gravel and delineate rigging area.

Additional Site and Safety Improvements

Add an appropriately surfaced pathway from road to rigging area to launch site.

Add wash-down capability at rigging area (water accessed from existing supply to Park toilets or Radio Bldg).

Remove boulders currently blocking base of Dog Ramp (emergency egress site).

xxxxxxxxx

Condition of the Pt. Isabel launch and jetty prior to project (note crude cement steps, etc):

<image003.jpg>

XXXXXX

Initial Project Construction documents:

<image004.png>

XXXXXXXX

Details of launch area plans - having convinced Staff/Engineers NOT to use steps. Note carefully designed rigging/staging area with red circles representing gear layouts.

<image006.png>

XXXXXXXX