

From: Paul Kamen <pk@well.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 10:10 AM
To: McNulty, Liza
Subject: Addendum to Pier-Ferry EIR scoping comments
Attachments: Comments on EIR Scope Addendum.docx

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.

Addendum to previously submitted Pier-Ferry Project EIR scoping comments attached.

Paul Kamen, Naval Architect, P.E.
Surface Propulsion Analysis
1224 Campus Drive, Berkeley, California 94708
pk@well.com <http://www.SurfacePropulsion.com>
510-540-7968 510-219-8106 (cell)

“Pier-Ferry” project.

Addendum to Comments on the Scope of the EIR

Submitted to:

Liza McNulty, PE, Project Manager

City of Berkeley Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department

2180 Milvia Street, 3rd Floor, Berkeley, California 94704

lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov

Submitted by:

Paul Kamen, Naval Architect, P.E.

1224 Campus Drive, Berkeley, CA 94708

pk@well.com 510-219-8106

Please add these additional paragraphs to my submission titled “Pier-Ferry” project, Comments on the Scope of the EIR” emailed to Liza McNulty, PE, lmcnulty@berkeleyca.gov on May 16 2025.

Submitted by:

Paul Kamen, Naval Architect, P.E.

1224 Campus Drive, Berkeley, CA 94708

pk@well.com 510-219-8106

Is the project being honestly represented to the public?

The title of “Pier-Ferry Project” implies that reconstructing 500 feet of recreational pier is a major goal of the project, with something approaching parity in terms of the project’s priorities.

After extensive analysis, the City’s parking consultants determined that 389 parking spaces for ferry passengers will be required, and goes to some lengths to explain how these additional parked cars will not significantly affect recreational access to the waterfront. How many parking spaces will be required to serve recreational pier visitors? ZERO, according to the Kittelson parking studies. See the problem here?

Also, the “E” for “Emergency” reduces the credibility of the WETA meme, especially when considered along with electrification. A true emergency ferry system would use vehicle-carrying ferries, capable of transporting

ambulances and fire trucks across the Bay. This could save lives in the first few hours after a disaster event. Passenger-only ferries address the inconvenience of being stuck on the wrong side of the Bay, but do little to protect life and limb.

True emergency ferries need to be agile and versatile enough to load emergency vehicles from any accessible boat ramp – we don't know which terminals or ramps will be cut off due to liquefaction or downed infrastructure.

And finally, electric ferries for emergencies? The shore power grid is likely to be interrupted, and electric ferries need to recharge during dwell time at the terminals. The work-around is fixed diesel-generators and batteries at the terminals, but that essentially doubles the cost of the prime movers.

From Agenda Item 9, Weta Board meeting: December 9, 2021: "...an all-electric ferry fleet may be cited as a milestone for incentivizing a community to come out and support the development of a new ferry terminal."

Without an enforceable statutory requirement for electric ferries on new routes, this reads like a disingenuous bait-and-switch promise designed to calm the opposition.

The scope of the EIR needs to include a rigorous review of WETA's actual commitment to electrification at scale. The EIR also needs to evaluate the efficacy of the ferry system in response to a major earthquake, fire, or widespread infrastructure failure. Would it be more honest to drop the "E?"