

---

## Public Comment item 5 - SF Marina Renovation Project - April 6 hearing

---

From Bruce Stone <bruce@brucestone.com>

Date Tue 3/31/2026 1:38 PM

To BCDC Public Comment <publiccomment@bcdc.ca.gov>

Cc Yelton, Rowan@BCDC <rowan.yelton@bcdc.ca.gov>

 5 attachments (7 MB)

Testimony by Yomi Agunbiade at RPC regarding West Harbor project.pdf; Dec 1997 Marina Blvd Seawall Geotechnical Report Appendices.pdf; Dec 1997 Marina Blvd Seawall Geotechnical Report by Treadwell & Rollo.pdf; Dec 1997 Marina Blvd Seawall Geotechnical Report Exec Summary.pdf; Draft Layout of Proposed SF Community Boating Center.pdf;

Some people who received this message don't often get email from bruce@brucestone.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**WARNING:** This message is from an external source. Verify the sender and exercise caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear BCDC – While we support the SF Marina Renovation project, we wish to share several concerns.

The first is regarding the proposed extension to the West Harbor jetty using a sheet pile breakwater. It is conjectured to reduce the silting in of the West Harbor entrance, thereby saving on the expensive annual dredging. From the EIR Amendment 3:

The San Francisco Marina West Harbor Maintenance Dredging project operates annually, and it is possible that maintenance dredging could occur concurrently with construction of the modified project. This project includes maintenance dredging of sediment at the entrance to the West Harbor to maintain navigational access. The amount of maintenance dredging at West Harbor is expected to decrease from the current yearly frequency to the first dredge occurring 10 to 15 years after completion of the modified project. Then, dredging would occur every two years with the installation of the sheet pile breakwater off the north jetty.

We're certainly in favor of this effort and hope it works. However, the original design was for a longer breakwater, but some citizens lobbied the Supervisors to protect a purer view of the Bay, causing a successful vote against it. The short extension now planned is a compromise that's better than not having one but would seem to make the 10-15 years goal rather optimistic.

The second issue is RPD's intention to replace the berths east of Golden Gate YC that were destroyed due the silting of the harbor. Millions of dollars have been lost from prior efforts. We believe the new breakwater extension should be in place for at least two years before they invest in replacing those berths. To help visualize the problem, starting on **page 122 of EIR Amendment 3** you can see the anticipated wave modeling from adding this sheet pile breakwater...a modest improvement that may not deliver the desired results.

The next issue is the planned removal of the fuel dock operated by City Yachts inside East Harbor and installation of a fuel dock at the Scott St mole across from GGYC. A few concerns:

1. We might be without fuel for a few years and need to go to Sausalito, a bad option for those of us with slow boats and/or smaller tanks, as it is not worth the trip. If the Hyde St fueling station reopens, it will need accommodations for small boats.
2. Should there be no alternative to Scott St then we're in favor, despite potential conflicts between commercial boats wanting to refuel and boaters transiting that area, especially those without motors.
3. If the harbor entrance shoals even with the new breakwater, then this refueling station might not be accessible to larger boats. Also, a narrow entrance will add to the conflict between commercial boats and sailboats.
4. Assuming the Scott St mole location is chosen, shoreside fuel tanks will be installed underground at the Marina Green parking area that was called out as seismically unstable – see attached reports from 1997 and testimony by the head of RPD. However, **the EIR amendment 3 does not address this**, and in fact states the opposite starting page 61. We do not know whether the box sewer installed nearby and parallel to the James Fair Seawall mitigates the risk. Do you have information on that?

In the RPD presentation: [San Francisco Marina Improvement and Remediation Project - BCDC Design Review Board - April 6, 2026](#) you will note that the fuel dock design and shoreside infrastructure are not shown as yet to be designed. The presentation focuses mainly on shoreside aspects and little on marina aspects and boaters' needs.

As a global observation, we propose a community boating center be installed in the shallower end of East Harbor, rather than squandering this valuable Bayshore access. This would require some dredging but not to the depths required for the larger boats at the northern end of the harbor. **See attachment for the layout and location.**

The mission is to build participation in watersports for SF school children and the general public, expand harbor facilities for smaller boats, and facilitate storage, launching and coaching of Access Dinghies for disabled sailors. There would be a platform with storage racks, classroom and changing facilities, storage for human powered boats like kayaks and dragon boats, lockers for spart parts, sails, oars, lifejackets and so forth as well as a classroom and changing facilities. Financing of construction costs would be sought from private and corporate contributions including the yacht clubs, while rental income from storage racks and lessons would help cover operating cost of dockmaster and maintenance.

Bruce J. Stone  
Berthholder and President, SF Marina Harbor Association  
[bruce@brucestone.com](mailto:bruce@brucestone.com)  
917-822-4060