



Source: Imagery provided by Roumel Butiong, Robin Chiang & Company, 2026

Berkeley Water Transportation Pier Ferry Project

Scoping Summary Report

prepared for

City of Berkeley

Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront Department

2180 Milvia Street, 3rd Floor

Berkeley, California 94704

Contact: Liza McNulty, PE

prepared by

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

66 Franklin Street, Suite 300

Oakland, California 94607

February 20, 2026

Table of Contents

Table 1-1	EIR Scoping Comments and EIR Location Information	1
-----------	---	---

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 1-1 EIR Scoping Comments and EIR Location Information

Commenter	Comment/Request	Where Addressed in the EIR
Agency Comments		
Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)	Consistency with BCDC jurisdiction, policies, and Bay Plan, including: aesthetics, biological resources, dredging, hydrology and water quality, geologic stability, ferry wake, hazardous materials, recreational use, transportation facilities, cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and alternatives	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> , Chapter 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	- Species that could be present near the project site - Effects of pile driving, dredging, and hydroacoustics - Protected species take consultation - Evaluation of impacts on eelgrass	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4	- Vehicle miles traveled and regional climate and sea level rise planning - Maintaining ADA/bike/pedestrian access	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> and Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> .
California Office of Historic Preservation	Provides contact information	N/A
East Bay Municipal Utility District	- Presence of infrastructure and rights-of-way in project area - Capacity at the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant - Compliance with Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
Native American Heritage Commission	- Identifies requirements for consultation with Native American tribes - Provides recommendations for cultural resource assessments	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> and Section 3.13, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
Native American Tribe Comments		
Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation	Tribal cultural resources consultation	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.13, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
Nototomne Cultural Preservation	- Recommends cultural sensitivity training be provided - States on-site cultural monitor is not necessary	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.13, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
Wilton Rancheria, Department of Cultural Preservation	No comments	N/A
Organization Comments		
Berkeley Waterfront Community Coalition	- Conflicts related to BCDC policies - Cumulative impacts - Shoreline access equity - Use of historical baseline - Recreational fishing impacts - Dredging, noise, and light impacts on fishing, fish habitat, and birds - Fish habitat impact from dredging, turbulence, turbidity, noise, siltation, ship strikes, and light pollution - Alternatives in the marina - Tree removal - Parking concerns - Bird habitat impacts - Economic factors - Description of infrastructure	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2.0, <i>Project Description</i>, Chapter 3.0, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>, Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>, Section 3.7, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i> and Chapter 5.0, <i>Alternatives</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process. Economic factors are not an environmental impact of CEQA. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Citizens for East Shore Parks	Adopts comments submitted by Sierra Club, SPRAWLDEF, and Save the Bay	Please refer to the summaries for the comments made by Sierra Club, SPRAWLDEF, and Save the Bay.
Golden Gate Bird Alliance	- Increased boat traffic, wave action, shading from docks, dredging, and runoff on waterbirds, shorebirds, fish habitat, and adjacent wildlife areas - Native plantings and preserving Monterey cypress trees	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
QT Selkies Gay for the Bay	Reduced access to swimming due to potential reduced parking for swimmers	This comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.

Commenter	Comment/Request	Where Addressed in the EIR
Save the Bay	- Recreation and transportation impacts - Consistency with BCDC Bay Plan - Barriers to shoreline access and disruption of views - Alternatives that avoid recreational land use, dredging, and fill - Stormwater pollution - Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions - Sea level rise - Nature-based shoreline solutions	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> , Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , Section 3.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , on 3.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy</i> , Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i> , Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Sierra Club San Francisco Bay Chapter	- Habitat impacts near McLaughlin Eastshore State Park - Migratory birds - Private ferry use - Opposes Albany ferry terminal and identifies - Ferry-related impacts (wake, emissions, lighting, noise) - Shoreline resilience (sea level rise, liquefaction, groundwater) - Bird-safe design - Utility risks - Traffic risks related to hazards and air quality - Improved multimodal access (including bicycle infrastructure) at the Marina	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , Section 3.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , Section 3.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , Section 3.10, <i>Noise</i> , Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Sustainability, Parks, Recycling, and Wildlife Legal Defense Fund (SPRAWLDEF)	- Habitat impacts near McLaughlin Eastshore State Park - Migratory birds - Private ferry use - Opposes Albany ferry terminal and identifies - Ferry-related impacts (wake, emissions, lighting, noise) - Shoreline resilience (sea level rise, liquefaction, groundwater) - Bird-safe design - Utility risks - Traffic risks related to hazards and air quality	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , Section 3.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , Section 3.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , Section 3.10, <i>Noise</i> , Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Individual Resident/Community Member Comments		
Claudia Kawczynska	- Parking concerns - Recreational impacts - Wave and wake impacts - Traffic safety and impacts on transit - Alternative ferry terminal sites in the Marina	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>, Section 3.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i>, and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Daniel Borgstrom	Reduced parking for those visiting César E. Chávez Park	This comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
David Fielder	- Impacts on non-motorized access at HS Lordships Cove - Recommendations on the design of a non-motorized launch - Consider alternatives in the marina or smaller vessels	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> , Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
David Sheh	- Water access and parking for existing recreational users - Outreach to affected communities	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Please refer to Section 1.2.2, <i>Public Outreach</i> for an overview of public outreach. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.

Commenter	Comment/Request	Where Addressed in the EIR
Erin Diehm (1 of 2)	- Cumulative impacts from ferry vessels on Bay wildlife and vegetation - Whale death due to vessel strikes	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
Erin Diehm (2 of 2)	- Consider the Berkeley Pier Ferry Project and Draft Waterfront Specific Plan as a single project - Alternatives: Pier-only/no ferry option, in-marina terminal, and smaller ferry vessels - Use of historical baseline - Parking concerns - Impacts on biological resources, light pollution, noise, turbidity, and energy use - Recommendations for biological resources analysis methodology	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>, Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>, Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy, Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, Section 3.10, <i>Noise</i>, and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Gordon Stout (1 of 4)	- Loss of control event and storms - Collision risks, wave impacts, and update local wind modeling - Reduce congestion	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> .
Gordon Stout (2 of 4)	- Loss of mechanical control of ferry vessels. - Failure risks, emergency protocols and crew training - Relocating dock to a more sheltered location - Electric system reliability	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy</i> , Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Gordon Stout (3 of 4)	- States that parking is near capacity - Concerns related to paid parking and protecting recreational accesses - States that the Larkspur ferry terminal is an example of a ferry terminal with adequate parking but that it is “ugly”	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Gordon Stout (4 of 4)	- Parking data - States that the Larkspur ferry terminal is an example of a ferry terminal with adequate parking but that it is “ugly”	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Hayley Currier	- Swim access at Berkeley Marina - Recommends infrastructure like locker rooms, hot showers, and safe access points	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i> .
Jack Appleyard	- Access to deep water at Oyster Cove for swimmers and windfoilers - Parking concerns	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Jessica Ma	- Swimmer’s concerns - Parking concerns	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Jim McGrath (1 of 4)	- Parking concerns - Conflicts with BCDC policies - Ridership assumptions - Mode split assumptions - Existing maintenance concerns - Operational costs of the Project	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i>, Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, and Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Jim McGrath (2 of 4)	Parking concerns	This comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process. Economic factors, including costs, are not an environmental impact of CEQA. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.

Commenter	Comment/Request	Where Addressed in the EIR
Jim McGrath (3 of 4)	▪ Parking concerns ▪ Complete the Waterfront Specific Plan before pursuing an EIR for the proposed project	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Jim McGrath (4 of 4)	▪ Project Description ▪ Parking concerns ▪ Existing recreational use ▪ Pricing, fares, and project costs ▪ Historical Baseline ▪ Cumulative Impacts ▪ Consistency with applicable plans and policies ▪ Alternative terminal sites (including within the Marina Basin), ferry sizes, and expansion to other modes of public transit ▪ Wave, wind, and turbulence impacts ▪ Secondary impacts related to parking ▪ Urban blight and urban decay ▪ Carbon emissions from electricity ▪ Dredging and fill	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i>, Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>, Section 3.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, Section 3.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy</i>, Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Section 3.10, <i>Noise</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i>, and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> Although neither urban blight nor urban decay is a potential impact identified in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, this comment is addressed in Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Julie Allen	▪ Parking concerns ▪ Inclusion of recreational users in planning	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Please refer to Section 1.2.2, <i>Public Outreach</i> for an overview of public outreach. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Katherine Calvert	▪ Impacts on recreation and transportation ▪ Bay fill areas should remain recreational ▪ Prioritize maintenance over new development ▪ Parking concerns	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, and Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Kerrily Kitano	▪ Impacts on open-water swimmers ▪ Outreach to open-water swimmers	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Please refer to Section 1.2.2, <i>Public Outreach</i> for an overview of public outreach.
Paul Kamen (1 of 2)	▪ Ferry service build-out details ▪ Parking concerns ▪ Alternative locations for the project ▪ Consistency with BCDC, Measure L, and the Draft Waterfront Specific Plan ▪ Costs associated with the project	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i>, Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i>, Section 3.9, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>, Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process. The cost of a project is not an environmental impact under CEQA. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Paul Kamen (2 of 2)	▪ Parking concerns ▪ Efficacy of ferry system in response to an emergency	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Paul Young	▪ Consider open water swimmers ▪ Parking concerns ▪ Safe swim zone, access, and rinse-off shower	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Susan Schwartz	▪ Safety risks due to limited emergency access ▪ Alternative emergency access routes	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.7, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>.

Commenter	Comment/Request	Where Addressed in the EIR
Virginia Browning	- Alternative to repair the pier - Solid waste impacts - Consider César E. Chávez Park - Respect fishing and walking - Parking concerns - Pedestrians, buses, dog walking, and bicycles. - Provides a link to a letter from Mr. Jim Mcgrath dated March 18, 2025	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i>, Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i>, 3.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, and Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i>. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process. Please refer above to the comments from Mr. Jim Mcgrath.
Scoping Meeting Comments		
Topic	Comment/Request	Where it Was Addressed
Biological Resources	- Migratory birds, marine life, and halibut fishery, including sensitive species - Compare potential impacts to biological resources from diesel and electric ferry impacts and ship strikes - Light pollution effects on insects and ecosystems	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> and Section 3.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> for a discussion of impacts on biological resources.
Construction Impacts	Construction staging, access restrictions, and dredging-related pollution	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> , Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , and Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> .
Cumulative Impacts	Request evaluation of cumulative impacts from other planned Bay Area ferry terminals	Cumulative impacts are analyzed at the end of each resource section of this EIR in Sections 3.1 through 3.14.
Economic Considerations	Balance environmental impacts with potential economic benefits	This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Equity	- Paid parking effect on low-income users -- Concerned paid parking may limit access for low-income users - Equitable access to marina facilities	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 2, <i>Project Description</i> for an overview of project details including access to the pier. Economic factors, including costs, are not an environmental impact of CEQA. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process. Part of this comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Governance and Public Engagement	- Clarify lead agency roles - Greater transparency - Improved public access to meeting materials and transcripts	Please refer to Chapter 1, <i>Introduction</i> for a discussion of the lead, trustee, and responsible agencies for the proposed project. All project materials are provided to the public via the City of Berkeley webpage here: https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/berkeley-pier-ferry-access-project
Historical Baseline	Use of pre-pier and restaurant closure conditions as the baseline for environmental impact analysis	Comments relevant to CEQA baseline are addressed in Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> .
Hydrology and Water Quality	Hydrological changes and water quality impacts from dredging and construction	Comments relevant to CEQA pertaining to impacts from dredging and construction are addressed in Section 3.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
Navigation and Safety	Navigation and marine safety from abandoned pier sections	Comments relevant to CEQA pertaining to project design hazards are addressed in Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> .
Noise	Above- and below-water noise impacts	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> and Section 3.10, <i>Noise</i> .
Parking	- Parking availability during construction - Paid parking effect on low-income users - Alternative parking strategies	This comment is related to potential impacts to parking, which is not a CEQA environmental impact in and of itself. Please refer to Chapter 3, <i>Environmental Impact Analysis</i> for further information. This comment will be considered by the City decision-makers as part of the project approval process.
Project Alternatives	- Include a pier-only alternative without ferry service - Include an alternative for a smaller ferry from the inner harbor	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Chapter 5, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Recreational Access	Impacts on parks, open space, and recreation access during construction and operation	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.11, <i>Recreation</i> .
Safety	- Tsunami and earthquake risk due to site’s location on fill - Emergency access due to one road ingress and egress - Safety of pedestrians and bicyclists on University Avenue	Comments relevant to CEQA are addressed in Section 3.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , Section 3.7, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , and Section 3.12, <i>Transportation</i> .

This page intentionally left blank.