

From: Claudia Kawczynska <claudia94710@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 2:04 PM
To: McNulty, Liza
Subject: Scoping Com Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Berkeley Water Transportation Pier Ferry
Attachments: NOP_Comments_Kawczynska.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.

To: Liza McNulty
From: Claudia Kawczynska
Date: May 19, 2025
Re: Scoping Comments to Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Berkeley Water Transportation Pier Ferry

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to add my comments to the following topics covered by CEQA

Land Use Planning and Recreation

Inadequate Parking Studies and Latent Demand:

This is a very important area for study and is lacking from the current report, as pointed out by various user groups and by the BCDC's DRC. The study's proposed landside improvements, plus a new pier and a hospitality development at 199 Seawall, etc. in and by themselves will attract more users. But it is also well known that these days the popularity of aquatic recreation has soared (especially open water swimming), as have other activities like birdwatching, fishing, kayaking or simply walking along the shoreline. Attention needs to be paid to quantify this.

It is challenging to assess future demand at the waterfront because so many of its popular features have been closed for so long, including the fishing pier, Hs Lordships and more recently the East Dock. The pedestrian trails are in such bad condition that it discourages their use (this is especially relevant for seniors who like to walk along the water's edges for their recreation, it is dangerous for them). All this must be factored in while assessing future parking demand.

More studies and outreach efforts need to be made to target current user groups and mapping their key areas of use (as per the BCDC's DRC).

Asserting that ferry riders would park along Marina Blvd demands further study. It is inconceivable that ferry riders would walk 2400 to 3200 ft, and park their cars in an unpaved lot that provides no safety oversight, even if parking there were free.

As has been pointed out by many others, there are too few data points in your study for prime time usage by recreationists, this needs to be enhanced. And if a TDM program ascertains that paid parking makes management that much easier, it does not account for the impacts it would have on equity and public usage. It might make it "easier" for a transit terminal but it would have deleterious impact on attracting new users to the waterfront, something that both staff and policy makers support.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Traffic and Transportation:

The intersection at University and Frontage Road is dangerous, especially during peak commuter and recreation hours. A ferry with a set schedule will further exacerbate this, with drivers “rushing” to park and then catch the ferry, and upon their return to rush home after work. While adding traffic control devices would be Caltrans’ responsibility, the NOP should recognize the need for improvements and factor this in the analysis.

There have been no reports that reference impacts the ferry would have on other public transit agencies, including BART and AC Transit that have much higher ridership numbers. Or how a Berkeley terminal would affect Oakland’s and Richmond’s ferry service.

Hydrology and Water Quality

More attention needs to be paid to wave action and wake projections in this report.

Alternatives:

There has been no recognition in the EIR process that alternatives can exist beyond a rebuilt pier. These include the docks that the Hornblower ties up, and the D&E docks as well.

Thank you for including my responses and observations.

Claudia Kawczynska
2810 8th St
Berkeley, CA 94710

Claudia
Claudia Kawczynska
2810 8th St. | Berkeley, CA 94710 | 510.821.0044

To: Liza McNulty
From: Claudia Kawczynska
Date: May 19, 2025
Re: Scoping Comments to Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Berkeley Water Transportation Pier Ferry

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to add my comments to the following topics covered by CEQA

Land Use Planning and Recreation

Inadequate Parking Studies and Latent Demand:

This is a very important area for study and is lacking from the current report, as pointed out by various user groups and by the BCDC's DRC. The study's proposed landside improvements, plus a new pier and a hospitality development at 199 Seawall, etc. in and by themselves will attract more users. But it is also well known that these days the popularity of aquatic recreation has soared (especially open water swimming), as have other activities like birdwatching, fishing, kayaking or simply walking along the shoreline. Attention needs to be paid to quantify this.

It is challenging to assess future demand at the waterfront because so many of its popular features have been closed for so long, including the fishing pier, Hs Lordships and more recently the East Dock. The pedestrian trails are in such bad condition that it discourages their use (this is especially relevant for seniors who like to walk along the water's edges for their recreation, it is dangerous for them). All this must be factored in while assessing future parking demand.

More studies and outreach efforts need to be made to target current user groups and mapping their key areas of use (as per the BCDC's DRC).

Asserting that ferry riders would park along Marina Blvd demands further study. It is inconceivable that ferry riders would walk 2400 to 3200 ft, and park their cars in an unpaved lot that provides no safety oversight, even if parking there were free.

As has been pointed out by many others, there are too few data points in your study for prime time usage by recreationists, this needs to be enhanced. And if a TDM program ascertains that paid parking makes management that much easier, it does not account for the impacts it would have on equity and public usage. It might make it "easier" for a transit terminal but it would have deleterious impact on attracting new users to the waterfront, something that both staff and policy makers support.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Traffic and Transportation:

The intersection at University and Frontage Road is dangerous, especially during peak commuter and recreation hours. A ferry with a set schedule will further exacerbate this, with drivers "rushing" to park and then catch the ferry, and upon their return to rush home after work. While adding traffic control devices would be Caltrans' responsibility, the NOP should recognize the need for improvements and factor this in the analysis.

There have been no reports that reference impacts the ferry would have on other public transit agencies, including BART and AC Transit that have much higher ridership numbers. Or how a Berkeley terminal would affect Oakland's and Richmond's ferry service.

Hydrology and Water Quality

More attention needs to be paid to wave action and wake projections in this report.

Alternatives:

There has been no recognition in the EIR process that alternatives can exist beyond a rebuilt pier. These include the docks that the Hornblower ties up, and the D&E docks as well.

Thank you for including my responses and observations.

Claudia Kawczynska
2810 8th St
Berkeley, CA 94710