

APPENDIX A
 RESPONSE TO DRB COMMENTS FOR THE BERKELEY WATERFRONT AND FERRY PIER PROJECT

Key	DRB Comment	Project Proponent Response	Notes
Logistics-01	Vice Chair Strang requested a phasing plan to the extent that one can be put together to illustrate how each project can be brought to completion as standalone.	Exhibit shows how Project construction could be phased. Actual phasing plan will be dependent on Project funding sources and timing.	Exhibit 9
Logistics-02	Vice Chair Strang observed that it's easier to find funding to build new construction than for maintenance of existing facilities. He requested that the project team describe those challenges and how they plan to ensure maintenance will continue as needed.	City is considering a variety of approaches to maintenance of new facilities, including placing maintenance requirements within new lease agreements or MOUs.	
Logistics-03	Chair McCann stated it would be helpful to identify if there are work items that could be covered by the City’s operational budget or resolved through maintenance rather than being included in this project's scope of work.	The Project scope is generally the construction of new recreation and ferry terminal facilities and does not include work items that can be resolved through maintenance. Repair costs for the pier are not feasible given their limited longevity.	
Logistics-04	Board member Hall suggested that if there may be a need for future dredging, the project team should consider that now and do everything to ensure that the system works as planned.	Design team is conducting sedimentation and future dredge need analyses. This information will be presented to Engineering Criteria Review Board.	ECRB meeting tentatively scheduled for January 2026
Program-01	Chair McCann emphasized the need to identify existing and contemplated site users, understanding potential conflict points and safety concerns, and identifying maintenance needs. She emphasized putting effort into mapping user groups, conflict points, and tying back to parking. She suggested exploring an exercise like A Day in the Life: engaging with the site users where and when they’re at the waterfront and using parking spaces. She observed that diagramming these things can really illustrate how the site is used. These are important questions to help clarify the access questions.	See exhibits related to water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups.	Exhibit 3-8
Program-02	Board member Battalio also emphasized the need to clarify access and recreation zones on land and in water to understand the temporal and spatial dynamics of the site. He emphasized the need to consider latent demand for space. He recognized that CEQA typically examines existing conditions but added the City could consider this through public outreach and explore the latent demand for parking and public access.	See exhibits related to water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups. Increased visitation (i.e. realization of latent demand) with improved recreation facilities is both expected and desired. As documented in the Project Parking & Transportation Study, over half of the parking spaces in the Berkeley Waterfront are currently unoccupied during the average weekday. The Parking and Transportation Study identifies specific measures to be implemented in the future to further support parking management as needed.	Exhibits 3-6 Link to Draft Parking and TDM Plan: https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Berkeley-WTPF-Parking-and-TDM-Plan-March-2025-Public-Draft.pdf
Circulation-01	Chair McCann requested that the Bay Trail and other circulation paths are clearly illustrated. For the Bay Trail, a clear diagram showing the width of the trail as proposed as well as a clear and thoughtful diagram on the Bay Trail improvements.	MTC released its updated Bay Trail Design Guideline in July 2025. City is in the process of reviewing and updating the design to reflect the updated guidance. Bay Trail improvements will be presented at the next DRB meeting.	

APPENDIX A
RESPONSE TO DRB COMMENTS FOR THE BERKELEY WATERFRONT AND FERRY PIER PROJECT

Key	DRB Comment	Project Proponent Response	Notes
Circulation-02	Board member Strang observed that overlaying all the different types of means of circulation, recreational bikes, commuter bikes, public transit, cars, would be informative and possibly help find a means of balancing parking demand with demand for open spaces.	See exhibits related to water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups.	Exhibits 3-8
Circulation-03	Board member Hall requested more information on connections to the waterfront, observing ferries and bikes go hand in hand, and emphasized the importance of clearly showing how people are safely getting to and from the waterfront.	See exhibits related to circulation, water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups.	Exhibits 2-6
Circulation-04	Chair McCann requested information on the wayfinding and orientation strategy around the waterfront including clarification on how people will be oriented to waterfront destinations, and how people will know/find where they're supposed to go.	In process.	Exhibit 41
Parking-01	Board member Hall emphasized the importance of tying the parking analysis to the different user groups and their needs. She expanded that understanding the access points and water areas those groups are using may illustrate where conflict is happening, where it's perceived, and where conflict isn't present.	See exhibits related to circulation, water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups.	Exhibits 3-6
Parking-02	Board member Hall suggested further description of parking management strategies that could minimize user conflicts. She suggested that introducing paid parking may facilitate organization of transportation behaviors and balance the needs of all users. Vice Chair Strang added that with regard to paid parking, it is worth exploring providing free parking to Berkeley residents.	See exhibits related to water and land-based user groups and existing and post-project parking spaces for these various user groups.	Exhibits 3-6
Ferry-01	Board member Hall stated it would be helpful to illustrate how the ferry relates to the regional circulation context, noting that she was surprised to hear public concerns about environmental impacts but against a zero-emission transit option. In response, she suggested quantifying and identifying the benefits of the ferry.	See Plan Bay Area 2050+ showing existing and future regional transportation and circulation context.	Link to Plan Bay Area 2050 website: https://planbayarea.org/plan-bay-area-2050-plus-blueprint
Ferry-02	Board member Battalio stated a need to analyze the ferry's wake projections, noting that it can become an issue in the public process. The waves generated by the ferry are not just localized but also relates to the routes and operations so there may need to be restrictions necessary to avoid throwing waves in certain areas. He emphasized that this is an important consideration for WETA and the importance of being responsive to conflicts with existing water dependent uses. Board member Battalio requested an analysis on wave reflection and potential impacts to recreation uses related also to the breakwater design.	Detailed Coastal Analyses, including wake analyses and wave reflection, will be presented to Engineering Criteria Review Board.	ECRB meeting tentatively scheduled for January 2026