SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, March 29, 2016
Draft Verbatim Minutes[1]

FERRY LANDING PROJECT / EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BRIDGEWAY AND ANCHOR STREETS – STUDY SESSION
Applicant: The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District
Owner: City of Sausalito
Staff: Castro

Description: The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District is proposing to demolish the existing passenger boarding systems at the Sausalito ferry landing which is east of the intersection of Bridgeway and Anchor Street (APN 065-073-05) and replace them with new passenger boarding systems. The intent of the project is to replace aging facilities, extend the life of the facilities, and improve vessel loading for all passengers by standardizing boarding operations. The proposal includes a new 145.5-foot long by 53-foot wide concrete float, a new 90-foot long by 16-foot wide steel gangway, and a new 96-foot long by 21-foot-wide pile-supported concrete pier that will extend from the existing landside pier.

Recommendation: Receive the responses to questions from the District, ask questions of City and/or District staff, take public comment and, and consider, deliberate and make recommendations to the City Council on whether the District has satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points given as rationale for the City Council denying consent of the previous project in May of 2015.

Planning Commission
Chair Bill Werner
Vice-Chair Susan Cleveland-Knowles
Commissioner Joan Cox
Commissioner Vicki Nichols
Commissioner Morgan Pierce

Historic Landmarks Board
Chair John McCoy
Board Member Ben Brown
Board Member Nyna LeBaron
Board Member Aldo Mercado
Board Member Shasha Richardson

[1] A video recording of this meeting is available at: http://www.ci.sausalito.ca.us/.

CHAIR WERNER: On behalf of both the Sausalito Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board, I call to order the March 29, 2016 Special Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board. Director Castro, will you call the roll, please?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: For both boards, correct?

CHAIR WERNER: Right.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: For both, yes.

CHAIR WERNER: HLB first.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Okay. Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Present.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Here

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Here.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Here.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: And Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Present.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Planning Commission. Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Present.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Here.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Here.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Here.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: And Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Here.

Once again, I'd like to introduce the members of staff. Mary Wagner, City Attorney; Danny Castro, Community Development Director; and Lilly Whalen, City Clerk and Assistant City Manager.

And Mr. Mulligan, I apologize for not asking you to introduce the folks at your table the last time. Would you care to do it this time?

DENIS MULLIGAN: Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Seated with me is Michael Conneran, who is an attorney for the District; Bo Jensen, who is with Moffatt & Nichol, involved in the design; and Carolina Wallin, one of the engineers with the Bridge District.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

DENIS MULLIGAN: And also behind us is Priya Clemons, who is our Public Affairs Director.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. The approval of the agenda. Does staff or any commissioner or board member have a recommended change to the agenda? Hearing none.

CHAIR McCOY: Could I get a motion to approve the agenda, as written?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Move to approve the agenda as written.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Second.

CHAIR McCOY: All in favor? HLB approves 5-0.

COMMISSIONER COX: Motion to approve agenda.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Second.

CHAIR WERNER: All in favor? Motion passes 5-0 by the Planning Commission.

On behalf again of the Historic Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission, are there any members of the public who wish to speak on a matter not on tonight's agenda?

Seeing none, we'll go straight to the approval of the minutes for the March 16th joint meeting. HLB, are there any corrections?

CHAIR McCOY: No, we found no corrections to the minutes.

CHAIR WERNER: The only thing I would add is that probably somewhere at the top of page three, before line 5, the representatives present for the Bridge District should be identified. I believe they're the same ones that are here today. Just make a joint motion.

CHAIR McCOY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'll move to approve the minutes as recorded.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second.

COMMISSIONER COX: As amended.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yeah, as amended.

CHAIR McCOY: All in favor?

CHAIR WERNER: All in favor, Planning Commission? 5-0 here.

CHAIR McCOY: 5-0 here.

CHAIR WERNER: As was the case last time, there is only one item on tonight's agenda, and that is the continuation of a study session for the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District's Ferry Landing Project east of the intersection of Bridgeway and Anchor.

Once again, if anyone is here to talk about a subject other than the ferry landing, or if you'd rather watch the Warriors/Washington Wizards game, which starts at 7:30, now would be a time to make your exit.

Before we hear the Staff Report, are there any declarations of public contacts made by members of the Historic Landmarks Board or the Planning Commission since our last meeting?

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I've spoken to members of the public about the designs.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: No declaration.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Just casual conversations with members of the community about their revised design.

CHAIR WERNER: Planning Commission?

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I have none.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: None.

COMMISSIONER COX: Further conversations with the community about the project.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I have none.

CHAIR WERNER: I have none.

Once again, for the benefit of the public, before we open the public hearing there are some procedural items I would like to make clear, so that we can work our way through this without stumbling over our own feet.

First, we will hear a report from staff describing the project, and as directed by City Council, tonight's responsibilities for the planning commissioners and the members of the Historic Landmarks Board.

Second, the Bridge District will present their responses to questions and issues raised by the public at the meeting of March 16th.

Third, the Historic Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission will then have the opportunity to ask either staff or the Bridge District representatives questions for clarification.

Fourth, the members of the public will then have an opportunity to address their comments regarding the project to the Commission and the Board. There will be no dialogue between the speakers and the commissioners, board members, staff, the District, or other members of the public.

Questions will be recorded for the record, and may be briefly responded to tonight, but probably not.

Each person who wishes to speak should fill out a speaker card—which are somewhere at the back—with your name and address, printing your name clearly so I can read it, and bring it to the staff table. I'll randomly call three speakers to queue up at the microphone. Before the third speaker speaks, I'll call the next three. Each speaker will have either two or three minutes to speak to address the Commission and HLB, depending on the number of speakers indicated by a show of hands taken before the public comment period is open. Out of fairness to everyone, I will enforce this limitation without exception.

Fifth, we will close the public hearing and begin the deliberations of the Commission and the Board. Each member will be asked to respond to the City Council's eight points of rationale for denying consent to the District under the terms of the lease. After that, with no further discussion, we will have a yes or no vote on each of those

items; a roll call vote first by the Historic Landmarks Board and second by the Planning Commission.

Finally, we'll take a ten-minute break sometime around 8:30, and if we're lucky, we'll be out of here by 10:30.

Director Castro, may we have a staff report?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Yes, thank you. We are working out some technical issues on the monitor. I can go ahead and begin.

Good evening, Planning Commissioners and Historic Landmarks Board Members. This evening is a review of the Ferry Landing Project. The objective for tonight's meeting is I will be providing a staff report, to be followed by the District's. Mr. Denis Mulligan, the General Manager and Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District will also follow me in a response to questions that were provided to the District following the March 16th meeting. There is also a set of additional questions that staff had generated following the March 16th meeting that we have provided to the District, and who have also reviewed those questions and has a response as well. There will also be a period for questions to the District or to staff from the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board, to be followed by public comments. Then finally, the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board will deliberate and provide their recommendations to the City Council.

The direction provided by the City Council at their January 26, 2016 meeting was to conduct two joint Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board meetings, review the District's revised Ferry Landing Project, and provide a recommendation to the City Council on whether the District has satisfactorily revised their plans to address

the eight points given as rationale for the City Council denying consent of the previous project in May 2015, and that was provided in Resolution 5512.

The March 16th was the first of two meetings for the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board. Denis Mulligan, who represents the District, presented the revised project. The District presented its response as to how the project changes address the eight points given by the City Council in their denial of consent of the prior project in May 2015. Public comments were received and questions were recorded from the public, the Planning Commission, and the Board to the District, and tonight they will respond to those questions.

The City Council resolution included eight points of rationale for denial of consent, and these are the list of eight. I'm going to point you to Point 5 in which there was an error in the staff report in the translation of that point. We have since corrected that and provided a revised staff report; it was only to point 5 with the associated discussion as well. I will start with Point 1 and go through each of the points, summarizing staff's discussion in the staff report.

Point 1: The planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem.

The ferry landing improvements are dependent on one or more federal grants with limited period of availability. In September 2012 the City Council reviewed conceptual plans that were focused on enhancing pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and these were concept plans. They included improved circulation paths, and again, were dependent on grants to be passed on through to the City. The majority of the ferry landing alterations is offshore, which includes the access pier, the gangway, and the float. There was one onshore component that is part of the plans, which is the electrical

transformer and equipment located adjacent to the Anchor Street sewer pump station in the parking lot.

Regarding Point 1, landside and waterside improvements are not mutually dependent on each other; they can be done independently. There is no current funding to finance the landside improvements. The District has offered to pass through funds from separate federal grants to financially assist the City with the future landside improvements; then once the funding is received, the City will conduct an extensive public process to develop the landside improvements.

Point 2: The overall size of the project is too large and should be reduced.

Provided in the staff report is a table that compares the existing proposed before the Planning Commission in May 2015 and City Council in May 2015, and what is currently proposed is the very right side column. There are components of the ferry landing that have been reduced. The float in its length has been reduced from 150 feet to 145.5 feet in its length. The width remains the same, as was proposed last year in May. The gangway has been reduced in terms of its width from 18 feet, 3 inches wide to 16 feet, and the height has been reduced about 1.5 feet from its prior height of 8 feet. The access pier does remain the same in its dimensions. Landside pier, there are no changes to that.

In terms of the belvederes, they were originally proposed in May 2015, and this is pursuant to the BCDC recommendation that belvederes be included. At the March 16th meeting the District was willing to ask the BCDC to remove the belvederes and that the District would be willing to provide funding to the City for other public access improvements.

The gate originally proposed was a simple swing gate with steel grating, and current proposal is for a simple transparent swing gate, and colors remain a gray color.

This chart indicates the components of the ferry landing and the District's determination that the ferry size is a combination of Americans with Disabilities Act ADA draft guidelines for ferry landing systems, and operational considerations. And the ADA, Americans with Disabilities Act requirements come from the draft guidelines from the U.S. Access Board, Accessibility Guidelines for Passenger Vessels, and a combination of operational considerations. This table has been provided in your report. I'll go into more detail for each of the components in the following slides.

In terms of the float length, the proposed linear feet of its length is 145.5 feet. In terms of ADA requirements, there is about a 51-foot length for the gangway support, frame, and fixed landing. There are hydrology and mechanical equipment, adjustable boarding platform. So that's the ADA standards.

The operational considerations are use of two ferry doors simultaneously to allow passengers in and to allow passengers out, and there are 15 feet of length for hardware and service of the ferry along the perimeter and the aft of the float.

Here is view of the float in plan view, and you see in this diagram the different components that the District has determined, based on a combination of both ADA and operational considerations, determine the overall 145.5 feet in its overall length.

Here is a rendering of the float, again, showing a perspective of the float, showing the ramp coming in from the gangway, a fixed landing, another ADA ramp that leads to the boarding platform, which I believe it says "Flat Landing" on this diagram, the two gangplanks on each side, which are ADA access ramps that would lead to two ferry doors, and that would be on each side of this float.

In terms of the width of the float, the proposed linear feet of the width are 53 feet. With respect to ADA standards, the District has determined that the 18 feet of distance on both sides of the float is to accommodate the hydraulic gangplanks at a maximum 1:12 slope; that's 1 rise over 12 run to determine the slope.

In terms of its operational considerations, there is a 60-foot wide boarding platform to accommodate passenger flow from each of the two ferry doors, as well as fender supports that push out on each end of the ferry, and those, on the right side of the column are the operational considerations.

Here is a diagram showing the float width, and you can see the center portion where the boarding platform would be; that's 16 feet wide. It's an operational consideration. Then on each side you have the gangplanks that lead to the ferries, both lowered for the Spaulding class type ferry, and the high-speed above, and then the 18 feet of distance that's necessary to achieve the 1:12 slope.

In terms of the gangway, the linear feet are proposed at 90 feet, and 16 feet in width. The 90 feet in length, according to the District, is determined by ADA to achieve the maximum 1:12 slope.

In terms of operational considerations, it's 16 feet of width to facilitate the flow of passengers to and from the ferry using both doors. The minimum would be 36-inches, and 16 feet is an operational consideration to facilitate the flow of pedestrian traffic.

To the bottom left is the existing gangway photograph. It's a 70-foot long gangway; and it's 5 feet, 8 inches, just under 6 feet, in width. The current proposed gangway is 90 feet long, and 16 feet wide.

The access pier just extends from the landside pier, and the proposal is to have a 96-foot long access pier, and 21 feet wide. It does match the existing width of the

landside pier, and the intent there is an operational consideration to facilitate the flow of pedestrian traffic from the landside pier leading into the gangway.

And here's, again, 96 feet wide is the proposed length, and 21 feet in width.

There are no ADA requirements that drive the proposed length or width, but in terms of operational considerations the District has indicated that the length is determined so that the float is pushed out to avoid dredging, and that it does match the length of the existing access pier and the new configuration, and the 21-foot width is to match the existing with the landside pier and facilitates the flow of passengers.

Point 3: The project is not compatible with the Historic District.

In the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board resolution of April of last year—2015-08 is the resolution number—the Planning Commission and Board determined that it's not compatible with architectural historical features unless, number one from the Historic Landmarks Board, both belvederes are omitted; number two, the overall size of the ferry landing is reduced; number three, landside modifications are jointly developed; and number four, that colors and materials are changed.

For the Planning Commission the ferry landing is not compatible with architectural historical features unless, number one, belvederes are removed; number two, that the overall size is reduced; and number three, the landside modifications are adopted.

The proposed project responds to the findings of the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board in the following manner:

One, the District supports the removal of the belvederes. As stated at the last March 16th meeting, Mr. Mulligan did indicate that they would ask the BCDC to not impose those features.

Two, the size of the project has been reduced, as I outlined in a previous point. The landside improvements are not proposed at this time, and they are independent of the ferry landing project.

Three, change the color to gray. I think that change was from its original proposal prior to the decision made in April of last year, and the gangway design changed from an arched-top cord to a flattop cord, and then to a simple steel girder.

Point 4: The proposed belvederes add unnecessarily to the size of the project. The District supports removal of the belvederes and will ask the BCDC to not impose these features. There was also a letter in December 2014 from the City Manager to the BCDC stating reasons that the belvederes are not necessary, as it adds bulk and fill to the pier and outweighs the benefit of additional public access. Most of the time the pier is available for public access, and that public access remains available along the north and south side of the ferry landing.

Point 5: The overall design negatively impacts the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide. The changes to the project size were discussed in Point 2, and the District has presented a total of eight viewpoints that came out of the stakeholder group meetings. They were key viewpoints that it was determined would help see the ferry in its context with the City and the bay. In particular, Viewpoints 3 and 7, which you will see in the following slides, shows a comparison of the existing and the proposed ferry landing in context.

The Planning Commission resolution has specific reference to the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide regarding privacy impacts. The Historic Landmarks Board indicated that the north belvedere substantially reduces privacy for the Yacht Club, and that the south belvedere substantially reduced impacts on privacy for the Inn

Above Tide, and that a reasonable level of privacy would be maintained or achieved by omitting both the belvederes and significantly reducing the overall size of the project. The Planning Commission also indicated the north and south belvederes by removal would substantially reduce privacy, and also indicates that a significant reduction of the overall size of the project, and that the construction of 14 months would impact privacy for the Inn Above Tide. At the March 16th meeting Denis Mulligan from the District stated that the District supports removal of the belvederes and will ask the BCDC to not impose these features.

Here are views from the existing Yacht… These were presented and provided by the District using 3-D graphics simulator technology. This is a view from the southeasterly deck of the Sausalito Yacht Club, and this is the existing ferry landing.

Here's a proposed rendering. This is from the north end at the plaza, but abutting and adjacent to the north end of the Inn Above Tide building, showing the existing view of the ferry landing.

And this view is the proposed rendering of the ferry landing.

Point 6: Improvements are outside of the boundaries of the leased area.

As part of the City Council's review of the project, amendments to the lease between the City and the District can be made as necessary.

Point 7: The City cannot yet determine whether the project has been adequately analyzed pursuant to CEQA's requirements as set forth in Section 3.

There were questions raised regarding whether the proposal presented at the time in May 2015 was adequately analyzed as pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. On December 18, 2012 the District certified its Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project pursuant to CEQA. The City as a

responsible agency is bound by that Mitigated Negative Declaration unless it finds on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record that one of the events triggering a need for subsequent or supplemental MND occurred since the District adopted the MND and approved the project. Those triggering events would be a substantial project change, or change in the circumstances, or that new information has come.

CEQA indicates that should also further limit project activities that are within the City's area of expertise, of which are required to be carried out or approved by the City, or which will be the subject of the exercise of powers by the City, and the City's approval authority under the lease agreement indicates a scope review, includes the potential environmental impacts concerning cultural resources and aesthetics.

Project change is not analyzed in the District's prior MND include various design changes, which are the reduction in the size of several aspects of the project as I described, and it does not include the addition of the belvederes were not included in the original Mitigated Negative Declaration.

With regard to the impact on cultural resources, there do not appear to be any project changes, changes in circumstances or new information that create new significant impacts to any cultural resources, including any historical resources as defined under CEQA Guideline Section 1504.5.

Aesthetic impacts under CEQA include consideration of whether the project would one, have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista; two, substantially change scenic resource; three, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and four, create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views. The lead

agency, a responsible agency, also has the discretion to determine whether to classify an impact as significant depending on the nature of the area affected. Aesthetic impact of a project is often a qualitative judgment rather than quantitative parameters. CEQA is not necessarily judging the individual beauty of a project, but rather the physical elements of the pre-existing environment the project may significantly impact.

Point 8: The project did not consider historic designations and historic context.

The photograph for the aerial to the right shows the District boundaries in red, and the downtown Historic District boundary line runs across a portion of the existing gangway. The ferry float is just outside this boundary line. In the 1990s the ferry landing was rebuilt, and it is not considered historic. The project is located offshore from the downtown area that comprises the downtown Historic District. There are no structures in the immediate vicinity that are listed on the City's local historic register.

In response, the District had provided eight viewpoint renderings.

To recap, the meeting objective this evening is following my staff report will be a response from the District to the questions that were provided; also additional questions that were generated by staff. I should indicate too that the District might have additional clarifications of staff's report, and Mr. Mulligan will have that opportunity to address those clarifications. We will receive public comment this evening, and the Planning Commission and Historic Landmarks Board will then begin their deliberation and recommendation to the City on the eight points.

The final slide is that the question is has the District satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points given as rationale for the City denying consent to the previous project in May 2015? Outlined are four options.

Number one, recommend that the District has satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points.

Number two, recommend that the District has satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points, provided that conditions are accepted or fulfilled.

Number three, recommend that the District has not satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points.

Number four, recommend that the District has not satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points, but if conditions were addressed or accepted, the Council could determine that the eight points are now satisfied.

That concludes my report. I'm available to answer any questions.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. What we'd like to do is hear from the District first, and then have questions of both staff and the District after the District is finished. So Mr. Mulligan.

DENIS MULLIGAN: Thank you. I think we'll have a momentary pause while the AV switches from one source to the other. I believe that clicker is coming around to me.

Good evening, my name is Denis Mulligan; I'm the General Manager for the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, and on behalf of the Bridge District I want to thank the Planning Commission, the HLB, various elected officials, City staff, and members of the public for being here tonight and providing us with the opportunity to make a presentation to you and answer some questions regarding the District's proposed project.

I'm stalling while our slideshow pops up. Perfect. Thank you.

Since we last met two weeks ago we received from City staff in writing the questions from the public. We then provided written responses to those, so tonight

we're here to discuss those responses, plus additionally to provide responses to the questions that we received from City staff yesterday afternoon.

One of the questions was can the float piles be reduced in height and size? It came in through a variety of different ways, and the short answer is unfortunately not. The existing float has 2-foot diameter piles. The piles are the tall, vertical things that hold the float in place, and the existing float as shown on top has two piles coming together with like an inverted V. Those piles are 2-foot diameter, so the top of that is 4 feet wide, and the top elevation of that is 19.5 feet above mean low low water.

The new float has piles that are 5-foot diameter. Those piles are larger piles. They're also socketed into bedrock. The existing piles are not socketed into bedrock. The existing piles do actually move, which is not good in extreme storm events; they can even vibrate and move a little bit when a ferryboat ties up.

The new ferry landing is designed to be much more stationary in place. It has 5-foot diameter piles. Those 5-foot diameter piles, like I said, are socketed into bedrock and they hold it in place. The height of those piles is based on sea level rise, as well as storm conditions. Because we are anticipating sea level rise, we use Bay Conservation Development Commission guidelines for those. The height of the piles that hold the float in place is 18.5 feet above mean low low water, so the 5-foot diameter piles that hold the float in place are about 1.5 feet lower than the existing piles.

I would be remiss though if I didn't also acknowledge that we have what I call "donut piles." On the far right side of the screen you see an isolated pile by itself with a black rubber looking thing next to it. That's a donut pile; it provides a fendering action. That pile is 4.5 feet in diameter, and that pile top is 20 feet above mean low low water. It's 6 inches higher than the existing piling. The reason why those heights are at 18 feet

for the float piles and 20 feet for the donut piles is because during high tides, or extreme storms with global warming, we don't want things to come off the top. If you notice, the float is lower and closer to the water than that black donut for fender is, so the pile for the float can be a little shorter than the pile for the donut. That black rubber material floats in the water and goes up and down, so as the tide goes up, as global warming occurs, or when there are storms, we wouldn't want that to come off the top, so that determines the height of the piles. The piles that hold the float in place are 1.5 feet lower than the existing piles, and then the donut piles are 6 inches taller. The diameter is necessary to hold the float in place. It will have greater loads on it because of extreme storms, but also it's designed not to move, so it's socketed into rock, which increases the forces that are applied to the piling.

Two weeks ago we were also asked can we lower the height of the lights on the float? We are investigating that. We heard clearly you'd like to see them lower. We believe we can get them lower. We can't tell you tonight how much lower, but we think we can knock a little bit of height off those.

The float is different from the access pier. You notice in this slide the access pier has spot downlighting? The access pier has a handrail around the perimeter. That handrail prevents people from accidently falling in the water, so it provides a vehicle to mount lights that then shine down and outward across the surface of the access pier. The float by its function doesn't have a handrail around the outside, because ferryboats come up alongside it and deck hands step off of it, so there's no railing around the outside of the float, nor could we install one, and have deckhands hop on and off it from boats easily.

We don't have an existing structure in place, so we propose having poles. The height of the proposed poles that we presented to you originally were 19 feet, which is about a half a foot lower than the existing piling, but we heard that's too high, so we are investigating lowering it. We'll be able to lower it a little bit; the exact amount is indeterminate. We need to have adequate lighting on the float, and the float is wider than the access pier, so that when workers in the wintertime step off a boat onto the float, or in the case of an emergency, we have adequate lighting for safety purposes, as well as adequate lighting for passenger safety. Also, the float has boarding aprons and boarding platforms that move up and down, so the lighting can't interfere with those while also providing adequate lighting for safety purposes.

There's another light I would like to address directly, and that's the light by the gate. That light looks rather prominent in this photo, and we also heard from you that you did not like that. Prior gate designs that we presented a year ago didn't have that feature, because it had an overhead structure that hid the roll-up door and we had downlighting built into it. Once we removed that and put in these glass door panels, we do need some lighting. We have started looking into this, and we can clearly lower the height of this, and we understand clearly that you want it as low as possible. The width at this location is lower than the width on the float that we have to cast adequate lighting over, so we can bring it down several feet.

Then we heard several members of the public question or testify that parking will be removed. I believe one member of the public said, "We're going to lose a parking spot, and it violates the City ordinance." Another member of the public said that they thought 16 parking spots would be removed. I'm here to tell you tonight that when we construct this, the permanent facility will not result in any loss of parking. The same

number of parking spaces will exist when we finish construction as exist today, so I wish to dispel any myths with respect to the parking going away.

During construction we would very much love to lease or rent a few parking spots from the City to facilitate construction, but we recognize that we don't have any rights or that the City may not wish to do that, but it would facilitate construction to have some small area adjacent to the landing for a short period of time during construction. We'll continue to discuss that with the City, but when the project is done there will be no loss in parking; it will be the same number of spots that you have in the lot right now.

I think the reason those questions arose is because we did talk about some PG&E facilities we need for the project. We will have an electrical panel that includes a meter and a transformer; two boxes on the site. This shows you the site today. This is the site where the City is constructing their new pump station, so that stainless steel cabinet that you see there is a City cabinet.

Where we're proposing to place our two cabinets is not immediately but to the left of that. You see there's no cabinet on the left of that? There is one in this slide. We're proposing to put two cabinets. The cabinet you see is the electrical panel and meter cabinet. There would be a smaller cabinet behind it that would house the transformer, and both of those cabinets would have doors that face each other. The cabinet is not shoved up tight against the City's stainless steel cabinet, because between those two in the ground are a series of vaults where the pump station is, so if we place cabinets on top of that it would preclude access to that vault if repairs need to be done on the pump station. So this is the proposed location, and certainly it would require the City's permission for us to construct it at this location, but this location does not result in any

change in parking; it would be the same number of spots that you have today that you'll have when we complete construction.

The City asked a question yesterday as one of the questions that came in; asking about was their table in the City staff report correct? In general, it is. There are two minor modifications; they're quite minor.

With respect to the length of the float, we propose clarifying, and we have a slide that addresses this question also, the 15 feet on the outward end of the float will hold a utility box, pile collars, and then a safety path for employees to access and work, and I'll talk more about that. So we propose a little more precision with respect to the description and dimension of the utility box.

With respect to the float width, we propose deleting the fenders. The fenders stick out 1 foot, 4 inches wider than the float, and that was depicted in the presentation that I made two weeks ago in several of the slides. In fact, I believe it may be in one of the slides in Director Castro's deck that it shows those sticking out. So for clarity purposes, 53 feet is the width of the float, but that there are fenders that stick out 1 foot, 4 inches on either side of that.

Then I do put one note that with respect to the third bullet in the middle of the page under ADA that will address with respect to what the references are for the applicable regulations on the next slide.

One of the questions yesterday was to supply the adequate references to the applicable requirements and guidance for accessibility on the float, and fortunately the City staff had a web link to the guidelines for passenger vessels, so you can click on those guidelines for that. The guidelines though have a whole variety of sections, and one of the sections is a little bit different, and that is the section that deals with…

Flipping through my slides here. So we meet the 2013 draft accessibility guidelines. The staff report references Section V-405, and the correct references are listed on this slide. The gangplanks, for the purposes of the regulation is the same as a gangway, and so the same section applies with respect to the slope, which is the 1:12, and then the telescoping facet is covered under Section V-410.7 of the same area. But the City's staff report has that web link, so any member of the public can click on the web link, and here we have the right citations as it pertains to the float design.

One of the questions dealt with what happens if we only make one of the doors accessible? The Bridge District chose to make both doors accessible. We feel it's a good design to provide maximum accessibility. We feel it's a universal design. Also, we're not aware of any opportunity in the draft guidelines to be selective about providing accessibility to only one door. We don't read any section of the draft guidelines that provides that latitude, and so it's something that we don't feel we can embrace.

But the related question was if only one of the gangplanks was accessible, could you lose that hydraulic power unit at the outboard end of the float? The answer is no, we would still need the hydraulic unit whether we have one gangplank or two gangplank access in the doors on the vessel.

Another related question was if you dropped both doors basically, does the float get smaller? If we operated a less popular ferry service where we could operate with only one door instead of two doors, the float could be smaller. The two doors do have a significant impact on the size of the float. The two 8-foot doors are associated then with the 16-foot clear dimension you show here with respect to the boarding platform and the boarding apron. If you had only one 8-foot door you wouldn't need 16-foot clear, you would only need 8-foot clear, so the width could be diminished by that amount. Similarly

the length is affected by having two doors. The two doors are set on a 48-foot spacing, which is tied to the framing on the different vessels that tie up here so we can cut doors without cutting through the framing on the ferryboats. It provides 56-foot width outside edge to outside edge of doors. If you had only a single door, obviously you wouldn't need such a long distance and you would have the better part of 50 feet less width needed for the two doors. You would still need some of that length for the size of the ferryboats that tie up here. That having been said, if we had only a single door and a new float, it would be a defective facility for today's operational needs based on the passenger loading that we have today. But with respect to the question, if we had only one door would the float be smaller, the answer is definitely yes.

For perspective, those two 8-foot doors are significantly less than what is operated out of Sausalito historically. Here's a photo of the ferryboat Cazadero, which operated for many decades out of Sausalito between Sausalito and San Francisco. As you can see in this slide, the access opening for people to get on and off the vessel was significantly wider than the 16 feet that we're proposing for the new ferry landing.

The next question was to talk about the operational considerations with respect to having two doors, the positive and negative. Two doors will clearly speed up how quickly people get on and off the ferryboats, and we feel that's a positive thing. We envision having one door for bicyclists and a second door for pedestrians, so there's no conflict between those movements. We will not load and unload boats at the same time. The design is set up to have all people disembark, and then we have to do a security sweep on the ferry vessels, which we do today for Coast Guard safety regulations. Then we have people board. So by Coast Guard regulations people cannot get on and off at the same time, but we do envision having bikes in one door, pedestrians in the other.

We think that by speeding up it will increase the throughput of the vessels, the boats won't leave the dock partially full, and it will reduce crowding on the landside also, because we'll have boats leaving full with the current scheduled service that we have.

The next question is that 15 feet on the outboard end of the float, basically can we make it little bit shorter? What's it for? Three-and-a-half feet of that are for the hydraulic power unit, which is in a cabinet. Five-and-a-half feet of that are for the collars that guide the piles or connect them to the float. Those piles that you see, there are three of them, are 5-foot diameter. They move up and down, but those guide pile collars connect them, and those collars are actually large beams with significant forces on them. When boats tie up, they lean against the float when storms come through there, so they're significant structures. Those collars stick up above the float about 14 inches, so then we propose having a 6-foot clear access path for our workers between the hydraulic power unit and those collars. Those 6 feet would provide for a worker to open the doors on the cabinet. That cabinet has doors that face the piles, and that way a worker could open the cabinet doors and if necessary, when necessary, replace a hydraulic pump or other things. So you would be able to get a cart in there with the requisite equipment and muscle the old pumps in and out, and then do the requisite work. So we feel that 6-foot clear walking access for a worker or dollies is an appropriate dimension, but this explains the basis for those 15 feet on the end of the float.

The next question was what amount of extra length or width is tied to other stuff, and the short answer here is nothing. We disclosed to you that some of the float dimensions are tied to operational issues, and some are tied to accessibility. The length of the apron is based on accessibility. The part that goes up and down, the platform, is

based on having two doors, and if we didn't have two doors it would be shorter, and it would be narrower, and if we didn't have to meet accessibility it would be shorter and narrower. So the operational and accessibility concerns that we've highlighted are the reasons for the dimensions of the float, and there are no other overriding considerations.

The proposed facility will improve operations. It will speed up loading and unloading. It will move passengers more efficiently and faster. The ferries will leave fuller and they'll be able to maintain schedules going back to San Francisco with a full passenger load. Plus, the access pier will provide more areas for staging, and they'll move people off the Sausalito streets.

The design that we're seeking your consideration of, and we're respectfully requesting your approval of, is what we talked about at your meeting two weeks ago, but I'll briefly go through it.

We're seeking approval of a gangway that is what we call the simple girder gangway. It is 16 feet wide as opposed to the original 21-foot width we proposed. The height of the railing is the same as the railing on any pier or building; it's 42 inches high, the minimum for the building code, so it's a pedestrian level scale. When that gangway touches down on the float, the elevation it touches down on when you step off is the same as today; it is 7 feet above the water. So the design before you removes the visual intrusion of our earlier designs, and it doesn't stick up higher.

We propose that we have swing gates that are transparent with glass or similar materials. This shows those gates closed. Here is showing those open. The goal here is to minimize impacts to the views from the shore. Similarly, we're not proposing a bright color like a bright white or blue, or even our favorite color, we're proposing a simple,

subdued gray, something that will blend in, so when people look out from the shore the structure doesn't jump out at them, but it blends in so it doesn't affect the viewshed.

This shows you the float with all the equipment in the down position. This is the standard position when there's no vessel there, and this is the position when we'll have our Spaulding class vessel serve it, which is the vessels that primarily serve it; they're the mono-hulls. Currently it's the MS San Francisco serving it. Those occasions when we do need to use a catamaran in the service, the facility rises up, but it's only raised up when the boat approaches, and then it's lowered once the boat leaves.

We're recommending that, and we're seeking your approval of, the spotlighting with the warm tone. You may recall last time we had two options, one spot and one continuous. We proposed that the spotlighting be the selected alternative, and we prefer the warm tone as opposed to the whiter, more antiseptic white light.

This shows belvederes. Our recommendation to you is that we go arm-in-arm to BCDC and ask that there not be belvederes on the project. We would prefer not to have those, and we would prefer to make a financial contribution to another City project that is providing public access that meets BCDC's requirements.

This shows you that lighting scheme with the doors open at the pedestrian scale. In the wintertime we do offer ferryboat service after the sun goes down, so this is what it would look like. Once service stops, the lights are turned off on the float and on the gangway. Here's what it would look like without the belvederes, which is what we would recommend that we convince BCDC to prevail. The spotlighting with the warm tones we feel is a nice softer touch at this location. All the lighting is directional downward; there's no uplight or light pollution. This shows with the doors open in the wintertime with

service operating. When the service stops, then the gates will be closed, the lights will be turned off on both the float and the gangway, and this is what it would look like.

The proposed design has a float that is 145.5 feet long and 53 feet wide. The gangway that's 90 feet long for accessibility, it's 16 feet wide, and it's 6.7 feet high. Previously we had something that was12 feet high. Previously we had something that had a big pipe next to your head. Previously we had trusses that impaired views. The height of the railing on our proposed gangway is the same height above the water as the railing today.

We are not proposing any change to the City's landside pier. Belvederes, we will include them in the application to BCDC per their staff direction, but the recommendation that they be deleted, and ideally with a City Council resolution supporting that deletion.

We propose a simple transparent swing gate in a muted, subdued gray color.

We did develop renderings based on input from the stakeholders and the community. We have renderings that start from Gabrielson Park in the north end and then go all the way down along Bridgeway. Director Castro showed you some of these.

I direct your attention to the left edge of the slide. This is from the north end of Gabrielson Park. You see how the ferry landing sticks out slightly? Here it extends farther out in the view. The new facility is longer, both the gangway and the float, so where the San Francisco landform touches down to the water, it does extend farther out. However, of note, the width doesn't affect the view from most locations. The width of the gangway arguably is not an aesthetic issue.

Here's the middle of Gabrielson Park. This is the view today where the Yacht Club blocks the existing facility, and this is the view we'll see if we're successful in

constructing this project. There is no change, because the Yacht Club blocks the view from the middle of Gabrielson Park.

This is the view from the Yacht Club. Director Castro already showed you that. Here's the view from the Yacht Club parking area with the Yacht Club balcony on the left, and the ferry landing on the right. Here it extends a little farther out, but once again, you don't see the width of the gangway from most locations. What you notice is that the facility is longer and that the gangway is longer. But the height is virtually the same, and you don't see things.

This is the one view where you will see the width. This is the north end of the existing plaza, so you're looking straight down through the facility. The float determines the dimensions of what you see, and the new float is slightly wider. Also, the image will shift to your left in this view. This is today, and this is the after. I'll do that again. So it shifts farther to the left.

This is the view from the mid plaza, and you'll see Angel Island in the background. Extends a little farther out towards Angel Island, but once again, from this location you don't notice the width as part of the view; what you notice is that it extends farther out, the length of the facility.

Here's the south end of the plaza, this is existing, and once again, it extends a little farther out.

This is the view from Bridgeway. You can see the blue piling. The bright color blue does stand out somewhat, so it stands out against the background of the belvedere and you'll notice that it extends a little farther out. Once again, this is today, and that's tomorrow. Where the landform touches the water, it's obscured for a little bit more, but the facility is no taller than what's out there today.

With that, we do seek your favorable consideration of our proposal and we're available to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIR WERNER: I'm sorry; if there's a question we'll have the public talking later, not from the floor now.

All right, does the HLB have any questions of either staff or the applicant?

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you for the presentation, and again, I think that there is a marked improvement with the gangway and the reduction in the size there, so thank you to the engineering team for doing that. I think you heard the community on that.

One of the questions that I had last time that I was hoping you could share had to deal with the plans. You said that you're going to be upgrading three of the facilities at Larkspur, Sausalito, and San Francisco and I would like to know more about the plans for offloading and onloading bicycles in San Francisco. Right now they are carried up and down the stairs on the ferry, and I think that that's a pretty significant contributor to the operational efficiencies that are driving the plans for Sausalito, so I'd like to know more about that.

DENIS MULLIGAN: Certainly. The District plans to replace the ferry landings in all the facilities. We plan to go to a similar system that we have here, which is main deck boarding. We'll have two 8-foot doors and they'll board and offload on the same level at all facilities. We're in the draft environmental phase with the San Francisco work. San Francisco is different though in that it will have two floats, because it's a significantly larger facility; it carries a lot more people.

The floats will be similar design. One of the floats will be a little bit longer than the float here, so the concessions we're making here we prefer not to make there for

operational reasons. One of the floats may be a little bit narrower because access is only provided on one side based on its proximity to the shore, but it is a much larger facility with two floats.

San Francisco will be the next one done, which solves the Sausalito problem in terms of offloading, and Larkspur will be the last facility we do. Larkspur is quite complicated because the beloved ferry terminal, which has a triangular structure, you actually rise up to it from the parking lot, but with the main deck loading you want to rise down, and so we're looking at some preliminary designs on how to achieve that there. But in all likelihood, San Francisco will be approximately a year to 18 months behind Sausalito with respect to construction.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Would you consider, and I'm sure there have been discussions about this and I'm new to this, but would you consider moving forward with San Francisco to give Sausalito time to deal with the landside improvements to match the traffic that could be driven by the changes in the ferry landing?

DENIS MULLIGAN: We want to proceed with Sausalito first, because of the state of the existing float. San Francisco doesn't have floats today, so we have more latitude with respect to that facility and Larkspur in terms of not proceeding as quickly, so that's why we did Sausalito first. We don't believe we have the latitude to postpone this, plus also we have grant funds that we obtained for this facility that do have some timelines associated with them.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Just one other quick question. Have you already begun talks with BCDC about removing the belvederes?

DENIS MULLIGAN: We've had some very preliminary discussions with them, but we believe that this is something that will be accomplished at the Commission level as opposed to the staff level. I believe we have one BCDC commissioner actually in the audience with us here, but I think it's something that the Commission is in a position to overrule staff if there's a consensus from all the stakeholder groups that that is the best design, and so we feel reasonably confident that we'll prevail.

CHAIR WERNER: Anyone on the Planning Commission have questions of either staff or the Bridge District?

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes, thank you. My first one is for staff regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration. As the lead agent, what was the threshold that we're using to determine whether or not this project exceeds the substantial change I guess that would cause that to be reconsidered?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: In terms of thresholds, there isn't an established particular threshold in review of this project, because staff has not undergone a further review of the project as determined by its MND. So there hasn't been an established threshold, although again, the test is whether the change from the prior project that was studied in the MND to the current project. That is a delta of change that would be reviewed should there be further of that.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: That would be reviewed by staff? I'm pointing specifically to the belvederes, and apparently they weren't part of the (inaudible)?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: You're correct, the belvederes were not included, and the test would be to determine whether the addition of belvederes make a substantial impact of change.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: So that happened subsequent to this?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: That did happen subsequent, yes.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Understood, understood. And again, this may be a question for staff or for the applicant. The origin of the belvederes, they weren't in the 2013 application, which I assume came to the City after BCDC, is that correct?

DENIS MULLIGAN: BCDC staff suggested the belvederes as public access that they thought would be appropriate and fruitful, so when we presented it to the City Council in 2014, we did include the belvederes, but when we did the environmental document, we did not, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Okay, thank you. I did have another question, and this one is for the District. If there were another mechanism for evacuating rental bicycles from downtown Sausalito, would we be looking at a 16-foot wide facility, or would the District be looking at something a little bit more modest?

DENIS MULLIGAN: We carry a lot of folks even without bikes at Sausalito. Ridership has grown, not just bicycle ridership, and so we believe that that is the appropriate size facility. We're aware of many plans that folks have to try to see if there are ways to intercept bicycles before Sausalito, and we support those plans. Some of those involve the Bridge District and the Park Service with respect to Vista Point Road, and ultimately the Park Service with respect to down by the Discovery Museum. But we would support those endeavors, and we have advocated to the Park Service that Vista Point Road be paved and made a bike/pedestrian facility.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you. I have one final question for the District. It's regarding the lighting on the float. I know we have rail-mounted lighting throughout the gangway and access pier. Is there a scenario where lighting could be mounted to the various rail systems on the float? When they're raised they would seem much

higher. Above the ground level they'd provide much more light than the existing float does, which I believe has none.

DENIS MULLIGAN: The existing float has problematic lighting, and we don't want to replicate that. We did look at putting lighting on the railings, but most of the time everything is in the down position, and the most common vessel that comes in there is the Spaulding, and so it didn't seem to work well. Having some pole-mounted lighting seemed to be something that provides the least number of fixtures in a not aesthetically clumsy way, that (inaudible) safety hazards, but we recognize that we can lower them a little bit, and so we're working on that.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thank you, that's all I have.

CHAIR WERNER: Other questions?

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan and your team.

I have a quick question that sort of relates to our staff report. On page two of our staff report, which you've seen, it's just a quick sentence, it's a simple question. "The District has offered to pass through the funds for the landside improvements," and we've been talking about that, that you've offered to pass through to the City $2 million in funding that you've received through a grant. And then the next sentence in the staff report said, "The City has not received the funds."

I'm just curious, are there timeframes on this? Does the project have to be started? Does there have to be a plan approved? What's the timeline on the City being able to get this funding?

DENIS MULLIGAN: There are two timeless. One is when can we get the money? The other is how quickly do we have to spend it? The second one starts when the first one is finalized. Our staff is in the process of finalizing a funding agreement with

the Federal Transit Administration. Jonathon Goldman, the City Public Works Director, and Gayle Prior, our grants manager, have been in conversations and exchanging the requisite wording for the finalizing before it's signed, but we envision signing it in the next couple of weeks. We've been working very closely with the Federal Transit Administration on that.

Once it's signed it starts a clock on how quickly they have to spend it, but you'd be starting the clock anew then, and it's a couple-year clock.

CHAIR WERNER: Any other questions?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yeah, I have a procedural question for staff, and perhaps for Chair Werner as well.

First of all, thank you to staff for a thorough staff report, and thank you to the District for the work in answering the public and the Commission's questions.

My question is the eight items from the City Council are primarily phrased in the negative. They were rejecting the proposal as incompatible with the lease, or not a reasonable modification under the lease. Maybe, Director Castro, you could go back to your options for this evening slide, but your questions were whether the District had satisfactorily revised plans. I'm just wondering as a procedural matter so we can all be prepared with our remarks and with our votes, whether we would be voting yes if we thought that they had satisfactorily revised their plans to meet the concern expressed by the City Council, or whether a yes vote would in fact be a not vote for the project? So that we're all kind of on the same page, that was a question.

My second question, while you're thinking about that, is the recommendations from the staff report stated that one of the options was to state that the District had satisfactorily revised the plans, but perhaps proposed some conditions, but if we are

only going to have one vote on each question, I'm wondering when is the appropriate time to discuss conditions?

The third issue is the District has changed their proposal in regard to the belvedere, and I would propose that we vote yes or no on whether the City and the District would move forward, recommending that the belvederes be removed and that the District contribute to other public access improvements. But again, I'd just like to be clear on whether we can vote on that we are voting on the City Council's point as stated.

So those are questions that I'd like to just pose and resolve before we have our time to comment and vote.

COMMISSIONER COX: It was my understanding that the District is not removing the belvederes from the application it seeks for us recommend approval for this evening, that it is recommending to the BCDC the removal of the belvederes, is that correct?

DENIS MULLIGAN: We feel that we have to as part of the application include the belvederes, but as part of our application we'd like to say that we included the belvederes, but arguably under duress, and that we'd prefer not to have the belvederes, and that we've adjoined with the City Council in opposition to the belvederes, and we would like to propose an alternate public access by providing funding to the City for another project.

COMMISSIONER COX: But essentially you're seeking to have us recommend approval of this project with the belvederes.

DENIS MULLIGAN: No, without. Well, it's whatever your pleasure is. I would anticipate that you'll approve it without the belvederes, and that we would take that to BCDC.

COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Werner, if I may?

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

COUNSEL WAGNER: One option for the Board and the Commission to consider, first of all, you're making your recommendation to the City Council on whether or not they should consent to the revised project that's been submitted by the District.

One option with respect to the belvederes that you could consider is a recommendation for consent, for example, but that doesn't include the belvederes, so that the project that would be approved would not include the belvederes. The District could then take that to BCDC.

CHAIR WERNER: And I, in response to Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles' question, you're right about the way the points are stated. My view of that is to turn them all into questions?

The first one: The planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem. I would ask the question: Has the planning for waterside and landside improvements been pursued in tandem? It's a yes or no question now.

The second one is: The overall size of the project is too large and should be reduced. Has the overall size of the project been appreciably reduced? It's a yes or no question.

The project is not compatible with the Historic District. Has the project been made more compatible with the Historic District?

I pursue it that way, because that way we can give a logical response.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Great, thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Is that fair?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Mmm-hmm.

CHAIR WERNER: Are there any other questions of staff or the District?

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Mr. Mulligan, I know you've answered this before, if you wouldn't mind just elaborating again. The ferries could be operated with one door, but it's a preference to operate the two for operational efficiencies?

DENIS MULLIGAN: We don't want to build a defective facility. Whatever we build will be out there for several decades, and so we are not proposing a single-door facility; that's what we have today and we all suffer the consequences of that today with boats leaving half full to meet a schedule with bikes and pedestrians backed up all around the ferry landing. So our proposal is to have two doors, but we did provide an answer to a question that if we had only door, would it make the float smaller? The answer to that is clearly yes, but it would also provide something that operationally would not work well.

CHAIR WERNER: All right, any further questions of staff or the District?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes, I have a further question. I would like to pursue the issue which Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles raised, because I think a yes or a no vote at this point is not the same as having the four options that were presented by staff previously. The reason I say that is since the critical element seems to be the belvederes, which involves at least four of the items on this list, we need to have an option to vote on something which includes the condition of removing the belvederes or not, because it would alter whether or not we vote yes or no.

COUNSEL WAGNER: Chair Werner, that's certainly one of the conditions that the Board and/or the Commission could include in their recommendation to the Council.

CHAIR WERNER: We can probably address that during our deliberations.

COUNSEL WAGNER: Great.

CHAIR WERNER: All right, if there are no further questions, then I will open the floor to public comment.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner, if I may? We have a staff member standing, the tall gentleman there. He has speaker slips. If people still wish to speak and having filled out a speaker slip, please do so and provide it to Milan, who is in the aisle.

CHAIR WERNER: I have 14 speaker slips here. Sixteen. Are there more? All right, I have 17 here. If this got to 20, I was going to limit the speakers to two minutes. At this point, we will allow three minutes for each speaker. If in fact you have spoken before, please don't repeat what you said the last time at the last meeting, and if you have comments that are similar to the person that is just before you, just say you agree with them. I will call three speakers randomly. Would you please queue up at the microphone, and before the third speaker speaks, I will call the next three names.

The first is Adam Krivatsy, Tammy Blanchard, and Sam Chase.

ADAM KRIVATSY: Good evening, I'm Adam Krivatsy, 840 Olima Street.

I would like to ask the question from everyone. Are we here to meet eight criteria, or are we here to figure out how to accommodate ferry connection between Sausalito and San Francisco? The physical dimensions are too big. They are determined by functional requirements, so the too big is a very subjective observation.

We can talk about the Historic District. The Historic District kept changing. We had trains, we had trucks, and we had railroad cars. Now we have only bicycles. I think the dimensions have changed.

I would like to urge honorable members of the Commission and Board to consider the fact that Sausalito wants to be part of the San Francisco Bay region in terms of good transportation connections, and we should figure out how to accommodate the functional requirements of a well functioning ferry system. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Tammy Blanchard.

TAMMY BLANCHARD: Hi. I am going to repeat my question from last week, because it was not answered tonight. So again, I ask the District if they would be willing to in writing agree to not being able to disembark two ferries at the same time, or park two ferries at the same time except in an extreme emergency? And if they would also agree in writing not to be parking or docking ferries overnight, ever, except in an extreme emergency situation?

Also, I'd like you to consider that the overall size of the project is about 4.5 feet smaller than it was the last time we looked at it, and that is not a significant reduction. It looks a lot nicer. I would like to say that that's a positive thing and I'm happy about that, but there are 5-foot diameter pilings that are 20 feet high. Who's going to live on top of those? If you look at the Spinnaker restaurant right now, it is full of bird droppings. That same thing is going to happen on this ferry; it's huge. Thanks again.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Sam, just before you start, the next three are Denise Suto, David Suto, and Peter Van Meter. Thank you, Sam.

SAM CHASE: I'd like to suggest that the Planning Commission and HLB consider what Ms. Richardson brought up, the idea of asking the Golden Gate Bridge

District to de-bottleneck the worst problem in the system, or in the round trip if you will, in San Francisco, and it's ability to main deck offload bicycles there. Fixing it in Sausalito is not going to improve the round trip. If you've ever waited for the ferry in San Francisco to offload, you know this. Additional widths and doors in Sausalito is no going to do any good until you fix San Francisco.

Also, the existing landing has never been looked at properly. It's never been nondestructive tested, which is the only way you determine the integrity of steel. It's not with water brushes, and it's not how much rust it's got on it, even though it's been horribly neglected. A 30-45 day dry-docking of the existing facility would allow us to get in ADA compliance for Spaulding class vessels, and would also allow us to improve the existing gangway to give us a 1:12 slope on the main gangway.

I think we also need, since this is our gateway to Sausalito, a concurrent landside/seaside review of this entire project. And I emphasize concurrent. If we do San Francisco first, there's time to do both the landside and seaside concurrently and come up with a winning project for everybody. There are a lot of concepts out there that were never given due consideration in our working committee during October and November and August, and those alternatives should be given some more due consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Denise Suto.

DENISE SUTO: Hi, I'm Denise Suto; I live in Sausalito.

I wanted to thank the District for the work that they've done. The visual impact has been significantly changed; it's dramatic. I frankly was not surprised, because I didn't think that the City of Sausalito would allow anything different, so I'm glad to see that that happened. I think that it's beyond gracious and I appreciate the tone the District

has taken with regard to the presentation, and with regard to answering all the questions. The changes have shown a responsiveness to all of the concerns, and the fact that they are going to give $2 million to take care of something that the City should be taking care of I think is extra; no one anticipated that.

I'm part of the growing ridership. Before, when I was last here, I was not a rider, and I am a rider, and there are more people who are riding. There is a sentiment of the ferry commuters that this is going to be passed, because why wouldn't it be passed? When I talk to people outside of Sausalito and I explain that I'm here tonight to ask the ferry to be built, they don't understand why I have to take time out of my evening to basically beg for the City to pass a ferry that's safe, because the fact of the matter is that ferry is not safe right now. I'm 4 foot, 11 inches, I'm 102 pounds, and I feel squeezed going to the ferry. I've been going in good weather, and I can feel the ramp moving up and down and I watch my feet as I'm walking.

The fact of the matter is that the visual impact has been addressed, and that the length and the width addresses safety issues. Safety issues. I think it would be a wonderful thing for a mother to be able to take her baby carriage onto the ferry and feel safe, and to have a little room next to them to walk with their children down to the ferry; it would be a beautiful thing.

I actually wasn't for the belvederes, and I'm disappointed that we're going to remove the belvederes, because I think it would be beautiful, but if that's what has to be sacrificed to pass the ferry, I'm okay with that.

Part of the history of Sausalito is the ferry. It's been a part of the history since 1908. It's part of my own personal history. We've made all our friends on the ferry; those

were our first friends. And what a first world problem, and how God blessed you are if your only issue is whether or not it's 16 feet wide versus 10 feet wide.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. David Suto.

DAVID SUTO: Hi, David Suto, 411 Locust. I thought I'd bring up a few things that we haven't really talked about too much. We were talking about planning and whether we should be doing this project or not, so I went and looked at our circulation plan, and I found some interesting policies that no one has brought up here.

We have a circulation plan that we have 3.2.1, which asks for improved ferry service, better passenger service, and more efficient loading areas. 3.2.3, better bus and ferry connections, improving connection points and time. Then under the existing bicycle master plan, paragraph C, we want to maximize multimodal connections to the system, and paragraph I, bicycle friendly destination, creating a Sausalito that is a bicycle friendly destination.

These improvements we're doing address all of those issues, and as the Planning Commission and HLB we should be looking at our master plan when we're deciding on important infrastructure projects.

My point about landside improvements is we've had almost a year-and-a-half of discussion and we have yet to agendize in the Planning Commission or the City Council beginning to even talk about landside improvements, and I don't think we should hold up the Bridge District in improving the ferry landing and keeping it operational while we decide whether or not we're going to start talking about it. We should be talking about it; it's important. There are obviously deficiencies out there right now. We've got a lot of temporary structures that should be made permanent somehow, maybe it would

increase the uses of our space rather than having giant planters that are 3-4 feet wide taking up valuable parking area space.

We just need to get this done. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Peter, just a moment. The next three, Diane Brockob, 416 Bee Street; Emmet Yeazell on Miller Avenue; and Mary Westwater on Marion. Thank you, Peter.

PETER VAN METER: Thank you. This has really been an extraordinary process extending over a considerable period of time with massive amounts of public input. Tonight you heard a very comprehensive report from City staff addressing in intricate detail all the issues involved here, and I think giving a complete rationale for the decision that is being faced by these boards this evening. You heard answers to a number of questions from the Bridge District that I think were effective in the way they responded to those public concerns and gave the rationale for why the project should proceed as proposed.

I think this makes your decision quite simple. To really move ahead, you're not going to be able to reach "perfection," whatever that might be in any individual's mind, but you have gotten as close to that as possible going through this process, so I think your choice is pretty simple in my mind. You select option one; you vote to move this project forward for consideration by the City Council. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Diane Brockob.

DIANE BROCKOB: Diane Brockob, thank you. Good evening, Commissioners and Committee members.

I'm here representing some folks who are supporters who couldn't be here tonight, didn't have the opportunity to express themselves. I've been asking a lot of

friends and supporters what they think, and I thought I would just reiterate some of those sentiments.

There is one from Mark Kriss that says, “The proposed improvements are now aesthetically pleasing and appropriately scaled.”

There’s one from Daniel Greening that says, “I ride the ferry frequently. It adds to the charm of Sausalito, brings revenue to City merchants, and our government helps San Francisco workers find peace and quiet by residing in Sausalito. It increases the value of our homes. I really support the renovation of the ferry dock, because of all the reasons specified, creating a long-lasting infrastructure, allowing disabled people greater access to Sausalito, help in emergencies, and improving the speed we can get on and off the ferry. The ferry is such an important element of Sausalito, we really must support it.”

Sam Penrose says, “It serves so many people. Get it done without further delay.”

Here’s one from Doreen Gounard that says, “As a user of the ferry, we need a new landing that allows the boat to load efficiently, bikes and people loading at the same time to maintain schedules. I support the latest designs.”

Molly Graham says, “Sausalito residents and visitors deserve a safe and improved ferry landing for better access and better flow of passengers on and off the ferry. The current facility is outdated and needs to be replaced. The new design reflects community input, and it is time to move forward with this important transportation project. “

I’ll just read a couple more.

Kurt Weinsheimer says, “I use the ferry to commute to work every day, and see how important it is for residents and visitors alike. We need the improvements to

improve access and speed for the onboarding/offloading process, which creates consistent delays all summer."

And I think my favorite one is from Morgan Mac, who says, "To do otherwise would strain credulity." Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Emmet Yeazell.

EMMET YEAZELL: Thank you, Councilmembers. There are some issues here, some with easy solutions. The gorilla in the phone booth first.

The document not should, but must, carry a lifetime guarantee against using it or its replacements for overnight storage of ferries or other vessels unless there is a disaster, and that is absolutely important. If you've been to the landing in Larkspur, they're tandem tied and so are some other locations. We don't want the Sausalito dock to be constructed so it can be a ferry landing for overnight use.

Second, bikes.

Oh, let me add something. Last time I was here, it wasn't the recent meeting, I asked a question of the Ferry District having to do with storage, and their response was, "Not at this time," regarding storing ferries, and we should be absolutely clear, there is not "Not at this time," it's never, it's written into the lease, and that's a must.

Bikes. Easy. Get a lease from the Maddens to use a small space in the lot, that space for a truck that can be used to take bikes back to the City, thereby mitigating the off and onloading of bicycles on the return trip. And the San Francisco Ferry District I'm sure would be happy to pay for the lease and the truck.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

EMMET YEAZELL: I'm not done.

CHAIR WERNER: Well, then stop showing off.

EMMET YEAZELL: There has been some talk about constructing a dock that could be served as a landing area in the event of a disaster. I promise all of you, in the event of a disaster every float, dock, beach and bulkhead would come into play. We don't need to construct a dock for the unusual, we need to construct a dock for the usual. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Is there a Mary Westwater? That was the name that I have up here. Okay, if there is no Mary Westwater, then Doreen Gounard, and Greg Kandankulam, and then Kass Green.

DOREEN GOUNARD: Hi, I'm Doreen Gounard; I live at 300 Napa Street here in Sausalito, and I do use the ferry, pretty often, at least once of twice a week.

I want to say that I think that this new plan looks really good. I'm really happy with the changes. I think that the Bridge District has absolutely responded to what the community was asking for, but I want you all who are sitting up on the dais to remember that your job is part of this governing idea of what we have to do when we're dealing with public issues, and that is that nobody gets to win, nobody gets to lose; it's called compromise. We have to take what has been heard, work it out, and come up with a result, an answer. We know it's not going to solve everything, nothing is going to be a panacea, but we've got to get somewhere.

We can spin on this axis as we have been for the past year-and-a-half, two years, or we can move forward, and I think there's a plan right here to do that with. So I encourage you to vote to move forward with this plan. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

GREG KANDANKULAM: My name is Greg Kandankulam; I'm representing the Sustainability Commission of the Sausalito as a federal commissioner. We adopted our fifth resolution supporting improvements to the Sausalito ferry landing.

Some of the highlights of the resolution call into fact that ferries have been an integral part of our history since 1868, that the General Plan currently supports efforts for a ferry service provision for better passenger service and more efficient loading areas; that Sausalito provide alternative transportation as an important network and multimodal transportation covers this in concept; that public transportation is a valuable tool in terms of climate change, reduction, and in keeping with Sausalito's climate action plan; and that when an appropriate scalable use for a fuel switching biofuel is available, then we have an opportunity to reduce 40% of carbon emissions per passenger over automobiles, and to reduce congestion through enhanced ferry service is going to be a tantamount part of that.

As a commission we recommend that you approve this project and recommend this project to the City Council. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Kass, just before you start, the next three are John Flavin, Quito Karpinski, and Michael Rex.

KASS GREEN: I'm Kass Green; I'm one of the owners of the Inn Above Tide. I'm here with my co-owners and my brothers, Willie and Mike McDevitt.

There are two items I want to discuss, one very quickly just as a chronology of the Inn Above Tide, and then also talk about what we would like to see as conditions for a permit moving forward. I just want to give you some of the chronology.

The building was built by my father in 1961. The ferry service started in Sausalito in 1970. In 1993 the District moved the ferry landing from its original position to where it

is now, and then in 1994 my father totally redid the building and created the Inn Above Tide.

We've got some issues that we think need to be addressed. Unfortunately, we don't believe that Point 5 has been adequately dealt with yet, and Point 5 was, "The overall design negatively impacts the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide," so I want to go through those. There are three major issues still: The belvederes, the placement and duration of the temporary pier, and the construction schedule. I'll go through these quickly, because I have presented them before.

Concerning the belvederes, please do not approve a plan that includes the belvederes. I think you're hearing that from a lot of people.

In terms of the temporary pier, that is frankly, our biggest problem and our biggest concern, because it will impact our ability to run the Inn Above Tide and probably cost us $400,000 to $600,000, which will impact the City's tax revenues from the occupancy tax, so we're very worried about that. I think if you just extend the temporary pier, it won't have the impact that is planned now.

This is how the temporary pier is planned in the current plan. This is me doing PowerPoint and just extending the temporary pier. It doesn't have to go very far to not impact the Inn Above Tide significantly.

Some of the solutions. The construction impact mitigation. So we had one solution for the temporary pier, another one construction impact mitigation. We request that these conditions be included, if you decide to go forward and approve the plan, that these be some of the conditions: that the construction occur offsite as much as possible, that the construction be timed to be away from the peak season, that the District give us 60-day notice for any heavy construction, and that the District work very closely with

both the Yacht Club and the City and the Inn Above Tide to minimize damages and traffic congestion resulting from the project.

And I think that's it. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. John Flavin.

JOHN FLAVIN: This process got off to a pretty ugly start. If you remember, residents had to hire an attorney to block a fast track approval of the original ferry landing without any public input. So that's why we're here tonight, the public. Why are you here tonight? Well, the three-man majority of the City Council is hoping, probably praying, that you will give them a reason to approve this design.

But this is a legacy design, and it should include both the landside and the waterside in tandem. To not do so is going to end up causing us problems down the road. You've already heard how they're matching the landside landing to a landing at the 21-foot level, so an old landside is already dictating the design of the ferry according to them. That's not the way to do it.

So an important decision, a design decision, has been overwhelmed by politics. It should be done together, and that's the way you should present it to the City Council. This must be done in timing. The absence of money is not your concern, and it is a solve-able problem given the amount of grants that seem to be flying around.

The fact that the three-man majority on the Council may overrule your decision, like they did with the fishing pier twice, should also not be your concern. You must do the right thing at this opportunity, and it is a tandem decision. Do the landside and the waterside together. You may ultimately end up with the very, very same design here, but right now there's no historic input, there's no feeling that this is part of Sausalito. It is

an institutional, industrial design that's being slapped onto our waterfront, and it should not proceed. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Quito.

QUITO KARPINSKI: Yes. I'm going to agree with just about everything John said. I first came to Sausalito in about 1969 and lived over here from the early 70s on, and there were 7,000 people back in 1969, and now there are 7,100. We're a small town, and yet we're getting a ferryboat landing that seems to be more akin to a very big city.

It seems to me, as one of the members of the Board asked, why don't they do this test run over in San Francisco? And I agree with that 100%. We're a small town. The landing we have right now, that they're replacing, was supposed to last 40 years, that's what they told us, and it's only made it to 20. What's up? Why should we believe anything down the road is going to last and that they're not going to come back again in another ten or twelve years? We're a small town; we deserve to be treated as such. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Michael Rex, and before you start, Clayton Smith, Vincent Maggiora, and Vivian Wohl.

MICHAEL REX: Hello, I'm Michael Rex, local architect. Since the last hearing I went down to the site to tour it and spend some time and consider the comments from the last time, and I'd like to share some observations and make some suggestions. Overall, I support the project.

First, the new pier. I think we already have a pier that's going to remain. I think the new one should be basically matching it. I suggested last time maybe it could be a series of arches, but the existing pier isn't arched, so the new one shouldn't be either.

However, a couple of thoughts. That angled jog in the new pier is very abrupt. Maybe it could be a S-curve instead to marry the old pier to the gangway better. And if it couldn't be an S-curve, maybe at least where it jogs at each end it could be rounded.

I observed that the guardrails should match, and we have galvanized guardrails on the existing pier. I think the galvanized color is right, except maybe the gate could be white, which would make it happier.

And I observed those benches down the middle of the pier right now where a lot of people sit, so maybe there could be a single bench with no back right down the middle, which would separate the people waiting to get on from the people getting off. That would address BCDC's concern, and also help circulation.

On the float, the light stanchions, it's going to look like a parking lot out on the bay. Those stanchions, just making them lower won't work. The spotlights that are on the guardrail on the pier could be on the guardrail for the platform, but on both sides, and then along the perimeter maybe bullers (phonetic) at each one of the fenders would provide sufficient light and avoid these tall stanchions.

Also, maybe the hydraulics could be recessed not in a pit, but in a trough that self-drains to each side of the float. That might lower the platform a bit.

Then last on the gate, the problem with that center light isn't the height; it's its character. It's boring and sterile. I think we need something artistic there, and I think we should include a small Sausalito sign. Every port of call, every transit station, universally has a small sign to announce your arrival, and I think we can have a small tasteful sign, and something more artistic, instead of that silly tall light fixture in the center of the gate that commands attention in an awkward way.

But overall I think we should move on with it. We shouldn't mix landside, because it will take too long and we need this to move forward with this project. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Clayton Smith.

CLAYTON SMITH: My feeling is that what attracts people to Sausalito is that it's warm and quirky and European and small, and I think that this architecture that the Bridge District is planning is anything but small, quirky, European and friendly feeling. It's very industrial, and I don't think it fits in the character of the City of Sausalito, which is why I agree with those people who think that if this is what is necessary as an engineering creation to satisfy all the regulations that are imposed upon us, then a concurrent development of the landside improvements would be necessary to cushion this ugliness in a way that might preserve some of those characteristics that I mentioned about the town that is so important to the people who visit here.

The second thing I'd like to say is deception in advertising. If you look through all the pictures that were presented of the new construction, out there farther in the bay, one thing you'll notice was none of them had the boat there. We don't really know the true impact visually until you actually put the boat in the picture, so I would urge doing that.

The third thing I would say is that there is… Again, I'm a dog with a bone here about the 3-D model, so we could get some auditable truth in advertising, so if you could come back as the project progresses and audit whether or not they're actually delivering what they say they're delivering. Otherwise, I think you're going to be flying blind with these pictures, and you can see up at WinCup in Corte Madera the consequences of flying blind. You end up with a great, sorrowful bit of ugliness to live with forever.

I think finally there is an issue around behavioral ideas here, behavioral modification, you might call it, or dynamics. This project is being built for the future of two boats, and don't mistake that. The whole thing is about maximizing capacity, and if you are blind to this, then I think you're disserving your position in the community. This must be understood. The capacity is there. The use will follow the capacity. So help me God, it will be that way, and if you don't understand that, you really shouldn't be in your position on that board. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Vivian.

VIVIAN WOHL: Hello, I'm Vivian Wohl at 94 Cloud View, and thank you for the opportunity to speak here. I think I'm almost the last one.

When I look at the plans, I see the tall lighting in elevation, and I think for a brief moment that maybe there is actually a great plan to run late ferry service from San Francisco, but then I say, no, that's never been proposed, and I've lived here almost 30 years, and I don't think that's the plan. So if that is not the plan, I guess I would just look at that lighting and say maybe that could be scaled down for the 6:00 o'clock and the 8:00 o'clock boats that we have in the wintertime, that maybe we can just get away with lower elevation lighting, and Mike Rex talked about that earlier.

I just want to echo some of the other comments that Mike and others have said about coming into this town. I still remember when I came here the first time, thinking that it's this little Portuguese fishing village, and we still like to portray ourselves that way, and so to the extent that some character that brings that to mind could be added, I think would be a great addition to the project. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Vincent, before you start, Adrianna Dinihanian, Rich Conley, and Sandra McCloud White. Thank you.

VINCENT MAGGIORA: I'm Vince Maggiora. I sat in on the Saturday meetings and tried to have the Bridge District justify the size of the float and the gangway and everything else, and they didn't. They reduced the width of the gangway, made the railings smaller; that's a lot nicer, but my feelings are still that it's too large. The old float needs to be replaced; it's ugly. They need to move the new float in closer to shore, but the Bridge District says they cannot dredge; they won't dredge. I talked to a company that dredges that gets the permits, and they said it would take about a year. They looked into the matter and they said there's no problem, there's no eelgrass. I just feel that it's time now for the City or the residents of Sausalito to hire an engineer to do the dockside, hire an architect to do the landside, to justify the size of what's going on.

I ask you to deny the permit as of now, until we can get something that makes a little more sense. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

ADRIANNA DINIHANIAN: Hi, I'm Adrianna Dinihanian, and although I want to speak towards the design aspect of this I want to mention that the width of the pier is about the width of Woodward Avenue, where my house is.

As far as the design is concerned, we've come a long way from where it was initially with the hideous large members and the gaudy white or blue, but we still haven't gotten there yet. Right now it just looks industrial. It doesn't look like Sausalito. It's not something I think we could be proud of; it looks utilitarian. I think we should look at it again and see where lighting stanchions can be changed to something more traditional that looks more like the stuff that we have downtown. Perhaps the tops of those piers should be chamfered so that they're maybe a low pyramid or a little cone on the top.

That would also keep the pigeons from roosting there. There's a lot we're looking at here that looks very unfinished to me. Characterless and unfinished. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Rich Conley.

RICH CONLEY: Rich Conley. I didn't speak last time, but I will this time.

We started with a bad decision made by the Golden Gate Bridge District back in 2008 when they got the stimulus money to fix the landing that that's out there for $3.8 million, hire a hundred people, and have it done in 2010. That's the history. A decision was made to the Golden Gate Bridge District to make this ferry landing the same as Larkspur and San Francisco, and when that decision got made, the City of Sausalito lost all of its options to do something that makes sense out there.

So all this process has gone from a bad decision, and now we're even hearing some waffling on whether our ferry landing is going to be exactly the same as Larkspur or San Francisco. Why in the world is the smallest capacity ferry landing going down first, instead of following some track and saying we have a unique place? Not only in the Bay Area, but go around every single city that surrounds the bay; there's nothing else like this. Not even close.

One of the things that we said in this decision process was that we would integrate the landside with the ferry landing so that it made sense for the City of Sausalito. All we're hearing now is that there ain't money to do that. I think that's the wrong answer.

The second thing is the massiveness of this ferry landing. All you're getting is pictures. They're artist's renditions. They don't really represent… If you took one look at the as-built drawings that we finally got, you'll begin to get some feeling for the real scale of this. My feeling is that the City of Sausalito and the County of Marin should give

the Golden Gate Bridge District a set of requirements, a framework, from which they could then come up with something that makes sense. I would start with why don't you build this for $5 million, you could have done it for $3.8 million, let's do it for $5 million. Let's replace the float, build it elsewhere. Bring it in on some Tuesday night, have the old one pulled out, put a new one in, and leave the configuration integrated with some landside plan that makes sense for the City of Sausalito.

I really think that this thing is still too big, and too ugly, and we've spent the last year accomplishing this.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Sandra, and then I have two more speaker cards to follow you. Wren Herring, and Paul LeBaron. Thank you.

SANDA McLeod WHITE: Yes, hi. I'm Sandra McCloud White; I've been a 40-year resident of Sausalito.

I was commuting on the ferry for 20 years, and I'm just awed by the fact that there is no shelter for the commuters out there. Can you imagine being out there this winter in the rain? It's horrible. It's really a horrible way to go to work, standing out there for anywhere from 10 minutes to 45 minutes in the rain waiting for the ferry to come in. Or, in the summer when it's blazing hot? There's nowhere to go. I believe this plan for Sausalito with no shelter is the only ferry terminal in the whole Bay Area that doesn't have a shelter for people, and I don't understand that. I'm here on behalf of the commuters, not the bicyclists. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you.

WREN HERRING: Hi, my name is Wren Herring, I live on Cazneau; I've lived here about 20 years. I love the ferry; it's the first place I take people when they come to visit. I also take it to the City myself.

My understanding at the meeting I was in last year is that there was to be a significant reduction in the size of this entire project, and as Rich demonstrated, 4 feet is not a significant reduction. It's still a massive piece of real estate right in the middle of our village of 7,100 people.

I support commuting by ferry, I think it's a wonderful thing to do, but this project is still just massive. The pilings on the drawings, the reason I asked to see the drawings again when we just kind of zipped by, although they're not a very clear depiction of it, but they show it kind of…it's almost like a see-through drawing. But the end of the new terminal with those giant pilings, and that construction for the workers, and the 16 feet of the box, that is going to be massive on the waterline from the Sausalito Yacht Club, from the Spinnaker, from walking. Even though it's out in the bay, it's still just way too big for this pristine, charming location. I think it should be reduced in half.

I love the idea of doing San Francisco or Larkspur first. This looks more appropriate for that place anyway.

The landside, that does look a little better.

I appreciate all the work everybody has put in this, all the people on both boards, and all the people in the City who are coming out. As Rich said, it's a legacy project that's going to be here forever, so we really need to do what it takes to get it right. If you want to see, as someone else pointed out, what happens when you do it wrong, it's the giant apartment complex that's all in filled in Corte Madera. So please, get it right.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Paul LeBaron, and I think you're the last one.

PAUL LeBARON: Hi, I just wanted to urge you guys to go ahead and move forward with this. I moved here from San Juan Island, where we used to take the ferry to Costco, and if the ferry didn't work, if the dock was somehow damaged or whatever, you

didn't get bread, you didn't get materials, or whatever. We don't have to worry about that here, but it's certainly nice to know that when the next catastrophic earthquake comes we will have a decent, well built, stout ferry dock, so hopefully you guys can move ahead. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. That's the last speaker card I have, and I believe that it is now time to close the public hearing, take a ten-minute break, and bring it back up here for our deliberations.

(INTERMISSION)

CHAIR WERNER: The staff report of March 16th stated that, and I quote, "The Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board will provide a recommendation to City Council based on whether the District had satisfactorily revised their plans to address the eight points."

The way we're going to go about this is each commissioner and board member is asked to respond to as many of the City Council's eight points as they wish initially. The Planning Commission chair will go first, the HLB chair will go next, and then after that we will go to Planning Commission and the HLB, starting with outboard and coming in. After all have spoken, we will call for a vote, first from the HLB, and second the Planning Commission. The vote will be yes or not on each of the eight points as to whether the District had satisfactorily met the eight points that the City Council created, and there should be no discussion during the course of that vote. So, since we made the rules, I'll start.

I'll start by saying that the only way I could address these was to turn each of those eight points into a question.

Point 1: Has the planning for the waterside and the landside improvements been pursued and handled? The answer is no. The District has promised a $2 million contribution to the City for the landside planning, with the exception of the six "improvement priorities" identified in the May 2, 2013 landside planning issues document prepared for the District by the Boston-based Cecil Group. Landside impacts of the ferry landing expansion have not been analyzed. The District takes cover for this in the terms of the lease with the City for the underwater land on which the ferry landing is located. The City facilitates this planning fiasco by claiming that the citizens of Sausalito and defenders of Ordinance 1128 would tie up any landside planning indefinitely.

The proposed ferry landing complex on public land is no different from any other development project. It, like all major projects, should be subject to the City's power to exact from the developer, before granting any approvals, an approved design and funds for the construction of offsite improvements necessitated by the impacts of the project.

The District's promised FTA pass-through grant of $2 million to the City does not fulfill this requirement. In fact, according to the District's authorization for this grant, it comes with five required provisions, and I quote from their May 9, 2013 meeting of the District's Finance and Auditing Committee. The conditions are, 1) "The final design is satisfactory to the District." Sort of a chicken and egg thing there. 2) "The improvements are compatible with the District ferry terminal improvement project." 3) "All improvements constructed are available for use by the District at no cost for its public transportation activities for the length of the improvements." 4) "The District is not responsible for any cost overruns," and 5) "The City complies with all FTA (inaudible) terms and conditions applicable to the funding."

Those are the conditions for those $2 million dollars. Ignoring the impacts on the landside, pedestrian, automobile and bicycle circulation created by tripling the path of travel width to and from the ferryboats is contrary to all reason. The District's own previous grant representations of the contemplated bicycle queuing in the parking lots are evidence of the absolute folly of permitting ferry landing expansion without intelligent and responsible landside planning.

Point 2: Has the overall size of the project been appreciably reduced? The answer there also is no. A 4-foot, 6-inch reduction in the length of the float is not a reduction in the "overall size of the project." This 3% reduction in length leaves the increase in square footage over the existing float alone at almost 70%. This is more an insult than a concession.

The gangway reduction from 21 feet to 16 feet was achieved by removing the grossly over-designed truss supports, while leaving the operational width for pedestrians and bicycles unchanged at 16 feet.

The intent of this directive from Council was to require a reduction in the overall size of the project. The new project size, float, gangway, and access pier is 11,167 square feet, a quarter of an acre, 91% larger than the existing 5,353 square feet we have now. What the District has done is given their industrial scale ferry landing complex the equivalent of a manicure and a pedicure. The project with only cosmetic alterations is identical to the project presented to BCDC on December 4, 2014.

Point 3: Has the project been made more compatible with the Historic District? (Inaudible). The District devotes a page-and-a-half of their response to that point. (Inaudible) leaves a question of design. The public had conflicting views on this at the last meeting. Michael Rex called it "antiseptic in nature." Bob Politzer found it "timid and

boring." On the other hand, David Schonbrun referred to it as a "brute force solution." The guided stakeholders workshops confirmed the old adage that a camel is a horse designed by a committee.

The District goes one step further and continues to give us a magical Winnie the Pooh creature, the big elephant on the waterfront called a heffalump, it having become less objectionable in color, lighting, and engineering bravado in truss design qualifies as increased compatibility, and the answer to that question is probably yes.

Point 4: Has anything been done to remove the belvederes? The answer again is no. The District blames the belvederes on the suggestion by BCDC. Had the District not arbitrarily decided to move the entrance gate over 95 feet farther out into the bay from its present location, BCDC would not have even considered the belvederes. The District has done nothing to advocate for the host city's clearly stated opposition to the belvederes. The District could have made a strong case to BCDC that the belvederes interfered with the operational efficiency of the access pier. The District could have argued that the belvederes increase the amount of bay fill without cause. Building concrete platforms in the bay for a few benches was hardly the goal of the McAteer-Petris Act. Instead, the District just chose to add the belvederes, caring only about securing BCDC's permit approval. The District now offers to buy their way out of this problem with a promise to provide funds for public access elsewhere.

Point 5: Has anything been done to mitigate the negative impacts on the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide? Again, the answer is no. This as yet unsubstantiated removal of the belvederes is only a small part of this matter. The District's new presentation conveniently neglects to show the temporary relocation of the existing float and the construction of the new two-ferry access pier. As was clearly

described in Kass Green's presentation at the last meeting and tonight again, this will have negative financial and environmental impact on the Inn Above Tide.

Though the City has rescinded the erroneously granted encroachment permit for this use on City property, it is clear that at minimum the permit required should be a temporary use permit, which would require a separate public hearing before the Planning Commission and a short-term lease agreement with the City for the use of that property.

Point 6: Have the improvements been replanned to remain within the boundaries of the leased area? No. The most obvious work beyond the leased area boundaries is the temporary pier noted above. Also omitted from the presentation are the site plans indicating the other improvements beyond the leased area. The donut fender continues to be located beyond the eastern boundary in Marin County waters. The staff report idly notes that, "Amendments to the lease between the City and the District will be made as necessary." This is Marin County property, not Sausalito's to negotiate. The transformer and other utility equipment located in the Parking Lot 1 were also not clearly delineated. There is also no evidence that the City, as custodian of the property for public benefit, has exercised its duty to negotiate a separate lease agreement for the use of that property.

Point 7: Has the City been convinced that the CEQA requirements in Section 3 have been adequately analyzed? Only the City can answer that. The District makes the case that there was the required amount of time provided for the public comment period, which was 30 days, from September 19th to October 19th, 2012. According to the public record, on October 2nd the then Sausalito Community Development Director signed in, made no comment, and left his business card. On October 18th, one day

before the closing of the public period, a member of the Sausalito Planning staff signed in and left four comments which concern the impacts associated with pile driving, construction staging, temporary use of the ferry landing, and the effect on eel grass. There was no mention of impact on the Historic District, the existing circulation, views, or anything regarding the overall nature and impact of the project itself. The City dropped the ball.

In fact, if you look at the initial statement and the Mitigated Negative Declaration, in the section on Transportation and Traffic, a line item asks the question: Would the project conflict with adapted policies, adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? With no discussion and no reference to the Sausalito General Plan or necessary landside improvements, the District inexplicably checked No Impact.

While there were major flaws and deficiencies in the content of the initial study itself, incompleteness, inaptitude, and misrepresentation of the facts is nowhere to be found in Section 3 as grounds for revisiting the CEQA study. While a no vote is called for, it would doubtless only be symbolic.

Finally Point 8: Has the project been modified in consideration of the historic designations and historic context? Historic designations, same response is .7. Historic context thing is .3.

CHAIR McCOY: First I want to thank the members of the District for coming in and giving a presentation, and members of staff and members of the community for bearing with us through this long evening as it grows longer, which I'm sure it will.

Commissioner Werner chose to phrase these issues in a question of yes or no. We're not bound to do so; that's just his personal preference. I choose to look at these

as issues of concern for the City Council that they provided to us, and the question is has the District addressed each of these listed concerns? I'll move through them one at a time.

Point 1: The plan for the waterside and the landside improvements should be in tandem to the degree that they were allowed. I believe the District has addressed this. I was in meetings almost two years ago with a preliminary group, and some of the members of these two committees were there, as well as members from staff, from Public Works, and the Ferry District, and one of the first questions that I wanted to know if they had (inaudible), are we going to work on the landside at the same time? At that time the City gave direction that the City was developing the plan for landside and that the Ferry District was developing the plan for the ferry landing, and that's the direction they were given at the time. They've been true to that, and they followed the direction of the City since, and in all the subsequent meetings that's been the topic of concern.

In a perfect world, in a perfect design, we would be doing this in tandem and it would one large project. These are essentially two separate pieces of property with two separate directives to two separate entities. One has followed through with their design; the City of Sausalito has fallen short.

So has the District addressed that concern? To the degree they're allowed, I believe they have. And just to take that a step further, the existing landside will be improved with the larger landing, because there will be less people stuck there for a short period of time. They'll have more room to move, they'll move more efficiently, and they'll be off and on. We hopefully won't have these long lines of bicycles and pedestrians that we see now.

Additionally, the landside is in still functional shape, and some would argue still looks good and accommodates everyone adequately and will get better. So I think that one has been addressed.

Point 2: The overall size of the project is too large and should be reduced. That one has certainly been addressed. Well, we can say it's only come back 4.5 feet, I think that's a very misleading statement in some ways by virtue of omission. I think being involved in all those meetings, when I heard from the community about the size of this, when I heard about how tall it was and the views it would block, and the massive steel trusses that were there, and the 12-inch diameter steel (inaudible) blue.

I think the District has done a good job at redesigning completely and greatly reducing the mass and impact to the surrounding area. So I think that one can be a yes.

Point 3: The project is not compatible with the Historic District. I think this one has been addressed, and was even previously addressed, and it's been taken to the next level, and I think they did a good job with it. I think an active ferry service is in and of itself very historically compatible with Sausalito and the history of Sausalito. While the ferry landing itself is not a historic structure, the service and the experience of Sausalito merits this as an historical resource, and it needs to be maintained.

The past ferry landings dating back to 1868 were much larger. They always met the contemporary needs of the time, be it trains, trucks, automobiles, and now we have pedestrians and bicycles and we're trying to (inaudible). So again, it's historically compatible.

The current proposal, with some minor inclusions, I think we need to talk about the lighting a little bit, the downlighting with a softer, more orange light instead of white is definitely appropriate, the height of the pole lights out there, if they could be reduced,

that would go a long way to reducing impacts from the Historic District, although it's not within the Historic District. I think it's a very positive fact that when service is not active, which I don't know when the last ferry leaves, that the lights go out, so it's not a 24-hour impact with those lights, whatever they turn out to be, so I think that could be addressed.

Then as far as the design, I think it's very appropriate for an historical aspect in the sense that what we have is essentially an appropriate industrial, concrete and steel design, and waterfront industry is extremely (inaudible) in our history of Sausalito. We have areas of our city that we viciously protect that are waterfront marine industry, and it is reflective of that, it is reflective of our city, and I think it pays homage to the history of our city as well, so I think number three can be a yes.

Point 4: The proposed belvederes add unnecessary size to the project. Again, I think the District has addressed this to the degree that they can. I feel that they're committed to removing them. I think the City needs to take them up on their offer. I think we need to go in in tandem and address the BCDC requirement, and I am confident as well that that can be overturned. I've been involved in other projects in the past with BCDC. They're a very reasonable board. They work with you. As long as you meet the requirements, they will work with alternatives. I think that it can be overcome, and I think the District is adequately pursuing it, so I think that can be a yes.

Point 5: The overall design negatively impacts Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide. I believe that the removal of the belvederes—even with the belvederes, but I'd prefer removal—I don't think people are going to be spending a great deal of time leaning out and looking in, peering into Yacht Club and/or Inn Above Tide. I think the distances are adequate to allow for a reasonable degree of privacy for those two

commercial businesses. By exploring the removal of the belvederes, I think the Bridge District has addressed that concern as well.

Point 6: Improvements are outside the bounds of the leased area. That one I think can be addressed. The District is open to exploring amending the City lease, which can be done; there are mechanisms and tools for that to happen, and the City will not lose any resources in additional square footage; it's fairly minimal in the scope of this project.

Point 7: The City cannot yet determine the project and adequately analyze pursuant to CEQA's requirements as set forth in Section 3. That's an interesting one for a yes or no question. My opinion is that it has. I think the District has shown that it has. I think the original EIR and MND process was thorough, the process is complete, and all the rules were followed and it was open to public comment through the required amount of time, and then some. I think the revisions since that time are minimal in nature, because basically it's still a ferry landing; it's still in the same location. If anything, it's smaller and we have less of an impact as far a CEQA understanding, so I think that one has been addressed as well, particularly when you get to Section 3. I've gone through and printed out Section 3. When I read through it, the revisions since the original EIR, none of them have any significant impacts, if any impact at all, on the findings that were made at that time, so I think that can be a yes as well.

And Point 8: The project did not consider historic designations. I would go back to my comments on Number 3. I think if you read through the staff reports and you read through the documents and materials the District has provided, I think they did consider the historic designation and its context and its location in Sausalito. Granted, they may have done it a bit wrong with the first design with the trusses being oversized and

painted white, but they were responsive to the community's comments that they don't fit in within the Historic District. Although it's not in the Historic District, it's certainly adjacent to it and experienced from it, and I think they took that to heart and did a good job. Again, with the industrial waterfront materials and homages paying back to the heritage of Sausalito, I think they've definitely taken that under consideration and done a good job in addressing it.

With that, I won't go through everything I've listed here and just read everything twice, (inaudible) about the historic fabric of Sausalito and how integral the ferry and the ferry service is in our waterfront industry, and that's a huge part of Sausalito's history. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Thanks. Again, I would also want to thank the Ferry District for all of the hard work they've put into this and conducting the stakeholder meetings, etc., and thank staff for, again, all the hard work they've put into this. I don't want to reiterate everything that was said, so I will try to be brief.

As for Point 1: The planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem. While not as intimately involved in the minutiae of municipal protocols as Chair Werner, it is clear that there's an apparent lack of foresight in the development of this project. Obviously, the Ferry District or the Bridge District has made some attempts to respond to this, but it seems that a project that was conceived in 2008 would have some more complete and considered approach to landside improvements during the development of this design.

As for Point 2: The overall size of the project is too large and should be reduced. Again, I echo some sense of Chair Werner. The overall size has been reduced by

structure, not by scale of the various elements, and in a town that's as compact and modest as ours, scale is everything. I'm not convinced that a 16-foot wide pier and gangway are necessary to improve considerably the performance of the ferry service. I'm definitely looking forward to a new ferry landing, but I believe this one is still too large. I believe that if Caltrans employed the same operational considerations, then we would have four lanes of traffic in each direction from Manzanita to Muir Woods. I think we can work a little harder to work on a solution that meets both our needs for constraint, for restraint, and appreciation of the character of our town, and suit the majority of your operational needs.

Point 3: Regarding the Historic District. Again, my issue is scale. I do appreciate the Bridge District's attempt at minimizing the design. I believe this is an industrial, institutional transport component and I think it should fade into the background. I don't think it should be celebrated as an artistic piece. I think it should go away to the greatest degree possible.

Point 4: The belvederes are superfluous on a pier already projecting into the bay. They do not need (inaudible).

Point 5: The overall design negatively impacts the Sausalito Yacht Club and Inn Above Tide. I think they do to a certain degree. I think they do much less so now with the proposal to remove the belvederes. Obviously, any improvements you're going to do impact both of those properties. Ideally, if there were some other configuration for the access pier that can pull a little father away from the Yacht Club, or the orientation of the float to keep it a little farther away from Inn Above Tide, that would be ideal, but I think there's room for refinement.

Point 6: Improvements are outside the boundaries of leased area. I think that's been addressed satisfactorily by Chair Werner and Chair McCoy.

Point 7: The City cannot yet determine whether the project has been adequately analyzed pursuant to CEQA. Again, I'll defer to earlier comments.

Point 8: Project did not consider historic designations and historic context. I'm not sure historic designations are as much of a factor here as the context, and the context goes back to Items 2 and 3 regarding (inaudible).

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: I have some things to pass out, so bear with me on this. Based on public comments from the recent meeting, I've come up with comments that address Points 3, 4, 5 and 8.

The Historic Landmarks Board is expected to evaluate compatibility of the proposed new terminal with design principles established for its urban setting. The project does not comply with the Zoning Ordinance Policy CD-124 to enhance the historic quality of established districts. Elements that are lacking that have historically been provided are: 1) Covered roofs for waiting passengers; 2) Directional signage; 3) Arched elements in the design; 4) Traffic mitigation for loading; and 5) To soften the industrial design with local art and historic elements.

Being a visual person, an architect, and historic preservationist, I provided history and evidence of passenger roof overhangs in the old ferry terminals, and then there has been public testimony tonight about the need for protection from rain and sun.

And then historical evidence of directional signage. I think at the least we need departing San Francisco, arriving Sausalito, something that's welcoming and (inaudible) from the design. There is historical evidence of arched covered spaces on the

waterfront, and this could be incorporated in the covered places for waiting passengers in this transport gateway.

And then, in the old days it was loading on the cars clogging the streets; nowadays the issue is bike traffic and loading with bikes getting left behind because of no efficient way to load them. Many members of the public have stated that the design needs a smoother boarding and more welcoming landing for arriving passengers. This still has not been addressed. Possible solutions are to have separate lanes for bikes and passengers, to keep the belvederes for bike waiting areas, or have bike rental companies pick up bikes in Sausalito.

Lastly, historical evidence of art in the community. I have an illustration of the Sausalito mermaid and then the elephants, and there was so much testimony from the public about having more character. We have this history of art in the community.

My closing comments are:

1) To improve the current design of the new ferry, float and gangway. They're well engineered and should start to be built. The glass gates should use bird protection glass or similar, and the tower lights on the float could be more historic in feeling.

2) Focus on how to solve the five points brought up to bring historical elements into the access pier to this transportation terminal. Form a committee with the other HLB members to come up with suggestions that can be worked on while the current proposal is moving forward. So I propose option 2, to prove this design with the additional added conditions for the new ferry float.

That's it. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Vicki.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I do want to thank the Bridge District, and I want to thank Supervisor Sears and the public, some that oppose the project, some that like the project, for working together. I think we had some good evidence in our staff reports that there had been some changes made and some good suggestions.

I'm going to start my comments with just reiterating what I said at the first meeting, and that was that I've attempted to review this project after being instructed that we were to look at this project like we look at every project on the Planning Commission in fairness to every applicant, and I've tried to do that.

For that reason, on Point 1, the discussion about the waterside and landside improvements, when we get an applicant's proposal we don't look at what he might be proposing for his neighbor's property or whatever. The property that is contained in the application where the improvements are to be made is the area that we look at, so that's how I look at this. Granted, it would be terrific if we had the joint planning, but we don't, and I have been at these meetings since 2008, and this has been talked about for a long time. The City has not had direct plans. We've been waiting for money, grant money, and do the planning, so it has not been the District during my understanding that has preventing this tandem planning to go ahead, so for that reason I would say that they didn't have any reason to be working in tandem, except that it would have been an ideal situation. It certainly wasn't their jurisdiction; they only have jurisdiction over the water, to do a plan according to their lease.

So I will say I'm not even sure how I'd answer that, because yes or no, but I guess I would say they fulfilled their obligation for the two areas. It would be great, again, if we could have done this, but we haven't. We've heard from information about some conditions about the grant money, I don't know, I haven't read that. I don't dispute

them, but I do still think that that will assist with some of the costs, if that's been the City's not hesitation or City's reasoning for not being able to come up with these landside plans.

Also, you've seen and participated in how extensive this project has been, or this outreach. This will give the public a big opportunity to come, and I'll sure there will be a lot of opinions about what needs to happen landside.

Point 2: Overall size of the project being too large and should it be reduced? I believe that we have seen a reduction in this, and I know we keep hearing these 4.5 feet primarily is the main reduction. My main objection, and the first findings that we had to make, was the bulk and size, and particularly one of the things that got me were those very large trusses, which seemed very industrial overkill, block the view, just were to good in a lot of ways. I think we've seen improvement there.

The railings that are suggested now allow for more views. The glass is great, and I'll go so far to say if we put the glass in, let's do the bird glass so we don't have any accidents there.

The proposed design for the lower gangway actually gives more of a bay view. It opens up more of a bay view on the bay water and the City. It does go out farther in the water, but if you look at the profile, I think you're going to look…at least from my perspective at looking at the drawings, so I think that's an improvement.

The Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide, I'm very sympathetic to. I also support the recommendation to partner with the City to strongly urge BCDC to drop the belvederes. I think that will lessen the burden on both of those two businesses to the north and south.

I also think that the design has even made an improvement from walking along Bridgeway. I don't consider, as it was illustrated from some of the vantage points, for instance, the Sausalito parking lot having a primary view. I think we have many more areas that are more unobstructed, but I do think that we get this improvement along Bridgeway, which I think is a clearer public view. In Sausalito, to my memory, we don't have any designated views or vistas, so to use that as criteria, we have never done that and sort of codified what is a vista or a view, so we don't have anything to bang that against, except for what the public appreciates, and we have open water along Bridgeway and to the north.

I would like to see the light poles reduced. I do think they stick up out at the end, if that's possible. That's a minor consideration of me being able to say that the project has been reduced.

Point 3: Compatibility with the Historic District. When I look at this, having spent eight years in the Historical Society, what's historic is ferry service in downtown. Since it's been mentioned several times, 1868, when the landowners that were trying to sell land in Old Town said geez, we better invent something to get these San Francisco buyers over here to buy these lots, and so they put in a ferry. It's been around forever. It needs to continue, not only as a viable mode of transportation. I was happy to hear from our Sustainability Committee that they're looking at ways to reduce our carbon footprints, etc.

The compatibility thing, I see that this design stands alone. This is an industrial design, I'll agree with my fellow planner here, Mr. Pierce, about making the design not in the spotlight, but minimizing it to the degree that it's possible, because it is a functioning technology design, so I think that has been addressed as far as it's a need that we want

there. I can't even envision what a historical ferry terminal would look like, except the historical ferry terminal that was there before that you've seen with these huge pilings that really did not afford the Yacht Club a view at all, so if that's what historic ferry design looks like, I don't support that; I'd rather see the newer design.

Point 4 and Point 5: I've spoken about the belvederes. I'd like to get them removed for Point 4 about adding unnecessarily size, and also impacting the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide.

Point 6: The idea that some of these improvements are outside the boundary of the leased area, as I said in the first hearing I believe in the 2015 hearings, we have an opportunity that's codified in the applicant's lease to go back periodically and adjust for market rate. Surely there can be a tweak here as to the areas that will take care of that as well as the transformer or any other issue at the City's handling of that through our City Attorney.

Point 7: Analyzing CEQA. Again, having been at these meetings, the City was the lead agency here. No, the City had to certify this Mitigated Negative Declaration, which they did in December 2012. In the previous hearings I made a point of going through what was in the staff report and asking the applicant what objections, if any, did the City raise, and the City did not raise any of these issues about anything with the historic analysis being needed. So this is how these work. Maybe we've all learned something here. We have to make sure that when there's a project in front of the City or whatever that we look at all the components. But that was not done. In my view the Mitigated Negative Declaration went forward legally, so I don't have a problem with the way that was handled.

Point 8: Then the consideration of historic designations and historic context. I again will go back with the comment that this was not asked for by the City, that it was addressed in the District's letter, and I can accept that explanation, because I think they have addressed that.

No one has really talked about this, but we've had some suggestions about the bulk, the size, the railing, etc. I've mentioned that I'd like to see the poles lowered. I now understand, which I suspected, that the diameter on those huge floats were for securing that float. I can't imagine in a heavy storm that the diameter is going to help, and I'm happy to see how tall they are. I could see that they probably would raise for sea level, so I'm glad you're planning for that, because we're not going to get away with not planning for that.

Everybody knows that I love orange, but I don't want to see orange on our facility. Let's leave it down at the Golden Gate Bridge and keep this gray, not white; I think that's too disruptive out on the water.

Spotlights, warm.

The City working with the Inn Above Tide and the Yacht Club, and I'm sure they will be good partners about setting up plans that, if this goes forward, you work well together and try to minimize the disruption to each other. And the suggestion about when the work can be done there coinciding with the travel season, I think there are also considerations for biological times when there is work being done in the water, so I think that has to be planned as well, so I'm sure you could work that out.

I think we've talked about shelters before, but I think what I remember is that people realize any shelter you put there, you're going to have more of a view impact, and I think we're going to have to have a few more meetings if we get there. I think

that's why that was stopped before, and I can live without that and use an umbrella, I guess.

I think that's it.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Shasha.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you again for all your work on this. Before I share my comments, I just want to say that I respect the position that you're in. You're here with a charge and charter, and you're honoring that by bringing in a design that is to meet the requirements of the Ferry District.

I do think that looking at this I still have some overall concerns about the scale and the size. I did have concerns about the size of the pilings, but I think the way you described it, it does make sense that we want to have a dock or a float that stays in place. I do think that there should be some room for more negotiation around the use of the two doors that's driving the size of the float.

I think when we take a look at the village quality of Sausalito that we want a ferry landing that reflects that. I don't think anybody is arguing that we need a new float, that we need service; service is integral. It is I think the number two ferry service in the world, so I don't think anybody wants that to go away, but we do need to be able to work in tandem to manage the service that it brings and what it does to the landside.

With that, taking a look at Point 1: Planning for waterside and landside improvement. I believe the landside, that responsibility, is on the City, however, I would recommend that when the City renegotiates the lease that there is language in there that the Ferry District pays for FTEs to help manage the trash, the traffic. Right now we have a City Council member volunteering to manage the buses. Herb. Thank goodness he's there, but I think we need to plan for a more fortified plan around that.

Point 2: The next question, and I addressed this, overall size of the project. I think it's an issue of scale, and I would encourage and hope that the District… I love the creativity that you showed in reducing the size of the railing on the gangway. I'd love to see that carried through to the size of the gangway, the width of the gangway, and the overall float.

Point 3: Then the project compatible to the Historic District. I think that scale is still an issue there.

Point 4: The belvederes. I'm not sure how to answer that question. It would be great to see you produce plans that did not have them on it as recommendation, but I understand that that's part of the permit process with BCDC.

Point 5: I think, again, with the Yacht Club and Inn Above Tide, it goes back to scale.

Point 6: Improvements are outside the boundaries of the leased area. I don't feel qualified to answer that question.

Point 7: And then same with the City can determine if it's adequately analyzed CEQA.

Point 8: And then the project did not consider the historic designations, and I think that that is a tough and tall order for you to address, and I think that when you take a look at the responses on the board here there is a level of subjectivity, and my subjective opinion as a member here is that it goes back to scale, and I think that the design still, the scale of it, is not village in nature, and therefore does not take into account our historic context.

So thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Joan.

COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you. I also appreciate the effort that went into the District's presentation, and the preparation of the renderings, and their participation with Kate Sears and other members of the City in study groups to make an effort to address some of the residents' concerns.

I want to say I also appreciate the Sustainability Commission showing up tonight with a resolution providing us with their perspective on this.

I agree with one of the residents who characterized Sausalito as "warm, quirky, European, and small," so it's from that perspective that I address some of these issues.

Point 1: The first issue, the planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem. I agree that it should, and I believe that it has not been, and I believe that a blanket approval of the seaside improvements is premature until we've done design effort on the landside. I think this needs to be a holistic project, and I think that we cannot possibly predict all of the impacts on landside until we make some design efforts. I'm not saying we have to have full drawings and specifications, but perhaps some performance criteria and some concept drawings, such as what the District gave us tonight about where they intend to locate their equipment in the parking lot. I think that a plan to prepare future landside designs does not satisfy this point. I think a $2 million grant laden with conditions does not assure that this important work with be done.

Point 2 is the overall size of the project. I agree with Chair Werner that a 4-foot, 6-inch reduction in the float is not a significant reduction. The revised proposal did not significantly decrease the size of the gangway, the size of the float, the size of the access pier, and it did not eliminate the belvederes, although that direction I think was pretty loud and clear throughout the initial hearings. Also, I would note that the float

accommodates simultaneous boarding on both sides, not a necessary feature for our ferry landing.

Point 3: Is the design compatible with the Historic District? I think that some consideration was given to this point, and I appreciate the consideration. I want to endorse some of the suggestions that we heard from various residents, including local architect Michael Rex.

I think that the glass in the entry gates is an advantage, but it should be special glass so the birds don't fly through it.

I agree with Commissioner Nichols and others that the color should probably be light gray. The float color should be dark blue or dark gray, but not white.

I think that the lighting should be warm tone, not cool tone; spot rail type, not continuous rail type. I am also concerned about the tall stanchions on the float; at 19 feet they are too high and they are glary. I think that the light fixture over the anchor gate needs to be lowered.

While I think the overall design is improved, it's still industrial, and with respect to Commissioner Pierce, I believe that it should make more of an effort to complement the cottage-like feel of Sausalito as opposed to being a design that would belong in Oakland.

I think that the new pier should match the existing, and I endorse Michael Rex's solution that the angle in the pier should be an S-curve as opposed to such a sharp, angular transition.

I did appreciate the comment about shelter for commuters. I don't know if that's been considered, but I'd like to see that be considered.

I also agree with the thought of a sign announcing that you are entering Sausalito.

Point 4: Proposed belvederes add unnecessarily to the size of the project. Absolutely, I think they do. I could not possibly recommend approval of a project that includes belvederes. I think that it is too easy for BCDC to approve as-is if a project is submitted that has the belvederes. I think submitting a project that recommends removal of existing belvederes belies a quick process. I think BCDC will perhaps be concerned about a cumbersome process to go back through approvals without belvederes.

Point 5: Proposed belvederes negatively impact the Sausalito Yacht Club and Inn Above Tide. Yes, I think they do. I do think that consideration of the other impacts on the Inn Above Tide has not been fully addressed. The temporary pier should be properly located. The consistent schedule should be to the extent possible with other environmental concerns be planned in such a manner as to have the least amount of negative impact, and it is notable that an adverse impact on Inn Above Tide is an adverse impact on the City, because of the reduction in TOT income.

Point 6: Are the improvements outside the boundaries of the leased area? It's very clear that they are. I don't think that's a reason that this project should not move forward, but if we're being asked to answer yes or no, I think that it's clear that the answer is yes, there's a piling, the temporary pier, the donut fender, and the transformer in the parking lot, all of which presently lay outside the leased area.

Point 7: The City cannot determine whether the project has been adequately analyzed pursuant to CEQA requirements. Our staff report laid out those situations in which the CEQA review could be reopened; one of those is the addition of a significant

aspect. Certainly the addition of the belvederes, which has a significant impact on views, could be considered such a triggering event in my opinion. The belvederes are responsible for significant impacts on the scenic vista of the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide, and significantly reduced capacity.

Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration says there would be no increase in capacity, however, the whole purpose expressed by the application is that there would be an increase in capacity, which I believe will result in negative impacts to adjacent streets, sidewalks, and parking areas that were not considered, nor mitigation measures adopted, to be addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

As I said in an earlier hearing on this matter, the original study and Negative Declaration was completed by the District representing this as a replacement project. I don't consider this to be a replacement project; this is a huge expansion of an existing project.

I believe there's also an impact to the environment by the lights on top of the bollards, which create substantial glare.

And finally, Point 8: The project did not consider historic designations and historic context. I think the simple answer to that is correct, it did not. At an early hearing the Golden Gate Bridge District acknowledged that they didn't even know that this was an historic district, and they did not do a resource study or consider findings from HLB or other historical agencies. So the truth is that they did not consider historic designations in their design. However, that is history, if you'll forgive me, and they have made an effort in their revisions to address some of the historical context, although again, I don't believe they can fully do so without coordination of landside improvements.

So, I do understand that the ferry is an integral service to the City of Sausalito. I believe this important facility deserves to be designed and integrated appropriately. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Aldo.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Thank you, again, for the presentation tonight. And for everyone who is still here, I'll be brief.

Point 1: The planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem. Yes, they should be, but I don't think that's on you, I think that's on the City.

Point 2: The overall size of the project is too large and should be reduced. Yes, I think it should be. I've been thinking about the original submittal and the changes that were made, and almost thought it was intentionally made overbroad or large so the reductions we're at now almost seem like they should have been the initial submittal, because it seems to be we're starting to get with something that we can actually mold.

Point 3: The project is not compatible with the Historic District. I struggled a little bit with this one, but I think my answer on that is no.

Point 4: The proposed belvederes add unnecessarily to the size of the project. Yes, they do. I like the idea that they'll be removed, however, I'm concerned if the project is submitted as-is, what that could be. I think the City agrees that the belvederes are to be removed, but do we put ourselves in a position where we're stuck, since the project will be submitted with them? Just something about that I didn't like.

Point 5: The proposed belvederes negatively impact the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide. Yes, again, I like the idea that they'll be removed, so hopefully that will address it.

Point 6: Improvements are outside the boundaries of the leased area. I think everybody has touched upon that. They are. I would say not only look at the lease, but also the City needs to look at the area that's being impacted and what options, as that public area, they can do.

Point 7: The City cannot yet determine whether… This is the CEQA item. No, I don't think they can, because of the changes.

Then Point 8: The project did not consider historic designations and historic context. I think it did. Originally it was pretty clear they didn't, and through the meetings I felt like there was some real research that was done and data provided, so I think Point 8 is no. Thanks.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Susan.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Thank you, and again, thank you to staff and the District.

Just taking a step back and going back to where I think I started this whole process, I think that the ferry and the ferry landing is just a completely vital and central part of our small community, and that it's long-term viability is essential to both residents and tourists alike.

I couldn't agree more with the resolution passed by the Sustainability Commission. I don't know when that happened, but I would have loved to have been aware of that earlier. But the emphasis on commuters and residents who rely on the ferry every day, families who with increasing parking shortages in San Francisco and increasing policy of San Francisco to be a transit first city, to get there with your family, to go to a Giants game, hopefully Chair Werner can go to a Warriors game on the ferry somebody, but it's so fun and it's just a critical part of being a resident of Sausalito.

And not to mention the environmental benefits, keeping people out of their cars.

Keeping this resource in our city is to me one of our top priorities, and I agree with the purposes that the Bridge District in its capacity as a transit and transportation agency has put forward.

Going to the specific issues that the City Council asked us to look at, I won't repeat some of the points that I agree on with my fellow commissioners or Historic Landmarks Board members.

Except for Point 1: The waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem. I completely concur with the comments made by Chair McCoy, and some of the comments added onto by Commissioner Nichols.

Point 2: In terms of the overall size, the project is too large and should be reduced. Throughout the process last year I stated many times that my main objection to the scale was the truss. It was outsized and too big, and for someone who is 5-foot, 3-inches, exactly at my eye level walking onto the ferry, and 10 inches wide. I think also from a kind of visual and aesthetic standpoint from the shore, that was my main concern.

The Bridge District, despite their statements that that could not be addressed last year, they have addressed it, and I appreciate that and I think the scale overall, while large, is appropriate for the function that it's trying to serve.

In terms of Point 3: Compatibility with the Historic District. I agree with some comments that this is an industrial facility; it's bringing in large boats, and there isn't much that we can do about that whether it gets a little bit smaller or not.

But in terms of the historic character of this small City, the ferry has always been an integral and historic component, and keeping the ferry landing in its historic location I

think is important, and I think the Bridge District has done its best in the second iteration to make it disappear as much as possible.

I concur almost identically with the comments of Commissioner Cox in terms of echoing her design recommendations for all of the things. I won't repeat those, but I think all of those recommendations should be a condition that we forward on to the City Council if they approve this project.

I also was interested in Board Member LeBaron's idea of having possibly a small design review to discuss some of the lighting, the signage, and entering Sausalito and leaving Sausalito type things. So that could be a recommendation to the City Council as well.

Point 4: Proposed belvederes; I think we all agree that they should go.

Point 5: Impact to the Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide. I think that the issues that the Yacht Club had have mostly been resolved. In terms of the Inn Above Tide, those issues are very legitimate, but they all seem to be temporary construction issues, and I would make a condition of any recommendation to the City Council that they urge the Bridge District to accommodate the Inn Above Tide to the greatest extent possible during the construction phase. If I heard the Inn Above Tide correctly, it's not the ultimate project that they have an objection to.

Point 6: Whether the improvements are outside the boundaries of the leased area. Again, I would concur completely with Commissioner Cox's comments on the issue. They are outside the leased area, it seems, but what effect that has I'm not exactly sure, and to the extent that any county approvals or other approvals are needed, then that will be something the Bridge District has to deal with.

Point 7: Whether the project has been adequately analyzed under CEQA, I believe however we got to this point, that it is appropriate for the City as a responsible agency to rely on the District's Mitigated Negative Declaration. I do not find that there has been any substantial evidence that any project changes that were not analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration have substantial adverse effects on the issues noted.

Then, Point 8: Again, while I would agree that the initial project did not really take into account of the fact that it was adjacent to and in an historic district, that the project is compatible with the historic nature of downtown, and to the extent that elements can be introduced into the design to soften it and make it more compatible with the small town nature of Sausalito, I would support those.

CHAIR WERNER: That's it?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: That's it. Thank you.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Ben.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I'd like to start off by thanking all the members of the Sausalito community who participated in person, by email, by petition, and by speaking with us, for enlightening us about a lot of the issues that you're concerned about.

I think it's important to recognize that the things that unite us are probably greater than things that divide us. I think most of us agree that having a viable ferry service is important for Sausalito. I think most of us agree that improving our currently antiquated system with all of its loading and unloading problems is something that would benefit everybody, whether it's a limited group of commuters, whether it's people with families

that go to San Francisco, or whether it's tourists. It's how to get there in a way that suits our community that's the issue.

I would also like to thank the Bridge District, because they've done a really good job in addressing many of the issues that have been raised previously.

It's very late in this process. I don't think it's feasible to make major design changes at this point. We can make some minor changes in things like lighting, color, things of that nature that may be beneficial, but I think the time for major redesign is over. So I think we're faced with basically, and the City Council is really faced with this, approving moving forward with the project or not.

I took these eight points and I grouped them, and the way I grouped them was that two of the points, namely the point about whether the project is compatible with the Historic District and whether the District considered the historic context in it's latest proposal, not the first proposal.

I think the answer to both of those is yes, the current project is compatible with our Historic District, and it is compatible also with their consideration and reconsideration of our Historic District, so I think that's relatively a non-issue at this point from my standpoint.

I think the issue about CEQA standards, I would prefer to leave that in the hands our City Attorney who could render an opinion after evaluating all of this; it's a complicated legal issue. When I downloaded the 260 pages of the CEQA standards I realized I was not in a position to really try to decide which of these standards are applicable. I do appreciate some of Chairman Werner's comments on this, but I think we actually need an opinion from City staff.

The next few items on this list, in order for them to get an affirmative answer from me, I'm going to list them in groups. They require modifications.

The belvederes have to be eliminated in order to deal adequately with Points 2, 4 and 5, which are: Do the belvederes add unnecessarily to the size of the project? Yes, they do. Do they negatively impact the privacy of the Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide? Yes, the do. Do they add unnecessarily to the overall size of the project? Yes, they do. I don't think it's enough just to declare an intention to do this, it has to be part of the proposal that is actually submitted, because otherwise it's going to be subject to further negotiations, and we don't want to waste even more months on negotiations about something which I regard as a settled issue based upon the comments of fellow members of both the Historic Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission.

Going back to the issue of the overall size of the project, eliminating the belvederes is one important step. It's sort of a wrestling match in terms of deciding whether the other size changes have been adequate. My thoughts are as follows:

The District's redesign significantly reduced the size of the gangway over their initial design. I think that's a step forward. I think their design is much better also, because it's lower and less obstructive to views. I think if there were no belvederes in that area, even in the access pier, that would be fine. I basically accept their arguments that the size of the float and the access pier, probably dictated by engineering requirements of having something with greater capacity than we currently have, I suspect that that's unavoidable. Even though I don't personally enjoy the idea of having something that's that much larger, but taking a look at the pictures from the various viewpoints, I think the overall impact of the increase in size is not as great as one might think by simply looking at the square footage, which I did do.

I think that pretty much covers most of the points except we need to renegotiate the lease terms and obtain a permit that is from the Bridge District with the City of Sausalito in order to deal with Point 6, which is improvements outside of the lease area. Some of that may involve negotiations with Marin County as well, but they certainly involve negotiations with the City of Sausalito. And the lease badly needs renegotiation. It's been the same…planning issue…this point than at…seem to be cutting out here…when will they be available and are there going to be conditions that have to be met beforehand? If I'm going to be voting on this, it's going to be voting on the premise that the belvederes will not be part of the submitted plan, otherwise my vote would be different on four of these items.

I believe that's all I really have to say at this point.

CHAIR WERNER: Now that everybody has had a chance to voice their opinions, I would like to suggest to Chair McCoy that you proceed with your Historic Landmarks Board and make a decision as to how you want to vote on the issue, and whether or not you want to take the items on one-by-one, or whether you want to pursue it in a different fashion.

CHAIR McCOY: We're happy to do that. My thoughts are it makes sense to vote on the items one-by-one, and have Danny call the roll on each item. Then what we need to discuss is making sure we're very clear on how we're voting and what it is we're saying. Chair Werner had his yes or nos; turned it into a question. I had my opinion of has this been addressed? It could be is it adequately addressed? Or if there's another suggestion, we can vote that way, but I think so long as we give a clear vote to staff, something that they can pass along, that's the most important thing.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I have a comment on this. On the staff report they gave us four options, and we could potentially use any one of these for our vote. It would complicate things a little bit perhaps from a yes or no vote, but at least it would clarify what it is that we are favoring and not favoring. If people don't want to do that, I'm happy to go back to the yes or no.

CHAIR McCOY: Actually, another option is to vote on these eight items as a whole, and take a vote of an aye or a no with a motion for inclusion of conditions, whatever those might be, and then just do a collective vote on all eight.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: That sounds good.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: So we're going to vote on all eight with any conditions we have?

CHAIR McCOY: Yeah, I think that's…

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: All right, let's do it.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay. I heard some discussion earlier about having basically in essence a condition of approval that the belvederes be removed as part of a vote for approval.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I would favor that.

CHAIR WERNER: Excuse me, you're going to have to make motions, and have seconds, and do all those kinds of things.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I move that we include as a condition of voting approval that removal of the belvederes will be included in the plans submitted.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Is somebody going to second that?

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yeah, I don't know if I'm going to second that, just from the standpoint of I don't know if I want them included in the plans submitted, because it sounded like that was something that couldn't happen right now, to BCDC.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: But I think if it's that we agree that the belvederes will be removed, then I think the burden shifts to them as to when they will be removed.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay, I accept that, so I'll change the motion to simply the condition of voting approval is that the belvederes are removed.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: And I'll second that.

CHAIR McCOY: So is that a motion for approval with that condition, and a second for approval with that condition?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

CHAIR McCOY: You want to call the roll, Danny?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Thank you. Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes. I also have a question though. Is it too late?

CHAIR McCOY: It is.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Well, I'd like to put an additional condition in, so are we going to vote on each condition, or is this the one vote?

CHAIR McCOY: Well, yeah, that was my question. This would be the one vote, and my question was is this a motion for approval with that condition? And it was moved and seconded.

COMMISSIONER COX: As a point of order, I think that the City Council asked for the feedback of each body on each of the eight points. So is it your intention to deem that the Golden Gate Bridge District has addressed satisfactorily…

CHAIR McCOY: That was the motion, and it was seconded, correct.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COX: Well, I'm clarifying because Shasha seemed to have…

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Do we all vote aye and moving on a block, because I would prefer to take the eight.

CHAIR McCOY: All right, we can vote on them independently if that's…

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: We can vote on them independently and just use this motion to apply to the applicable.

CHAIR McCOY: No, we'll have to go through each one independently then.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: All right.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay, so I move that we vote on them independently.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I second it.

COUNSEL WAGNER: You had a motion.

CHAIR McCOY: All in favor of that motion?

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Danny, you have a question, clearly.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Yeah.

CHAIR McCOY: So now we make a motion for each eight?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: You had a motion on the table, and you started to vote, and are you…

COMMISSIONER COX: You have to vote on the motion unless someone makes a superseding motion, then you vote on the superseding motion first, before you vote on the initial motion, which I heard you just make a superseding motion that you take the issues one at a time.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

CHAIR McCOY: It was.

COMMISSIONER COX: And there was consensus on that motion, correct?

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COX: That supersedes the initial motion, so they need not vote on the initial motion. They're going to now take each point individually and provide their feedback.

CHAIR McCOY: Thank you. At this point it feels most efficient if Director Castro would call the roll for each of the eight issues, and we will respond. No, we can't do that, because we have to give them conditions as well. No, I think we have to discuss our conditions for each eight, and then make the motion, and then do the call.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

CHAIR McCOY: The floor is open for motions for a condition.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So for Points 2, 3, 4, and 5, my proposed condition is to eliminate the belvederes.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I would like to add a proposed condition to reduce the scale of the float.

CHAIR McCOY: I'd like that as a motion, so we could vote on that separately.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Got it.

CHAIR McCOY: Then I would second Board Member Brown's motion to eliminate the belvederes on Points 2, 3, 4, and 5. All in favor of the condition of eliminating the belvederes on Points 2, 3, 4, and 5?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: That was 4-1, which passes, yes.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay, yes. So we will include the condition of eliminating the belvederes on Points 2, 3, 4, and 5 when we vote on them. Shasha.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: On Items 2 and 3 I move that the overall scale of the float be reduced further.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: I can't support that. I'm sorry.

CHAIR McCOY: Yeah, I'm not going to second that either. I think it's too vague, and I don't think it's appropriate for the issues as well.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: So if I was less vague and we put conditions on it, would there be support for it?

CHAIR McCOY: Not by me.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Not by me.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: (Inaudible).

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It doesn't look like a majority supports it.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay, so that motion fails.

CHAIR McCOY: Are we ready to call roll on the individual eight items without any further conditions?

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: I would like to add the conditions of putting together a committee with the HLB to finesse the five points that I brought up: the possibility of covered roofs, directional signage, arched elements, traffic mitigation, and softening the industrial design. But that could be a separate…

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: It should be separate from these items. I don't think it belongs in these items.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Okay.

CHAIR McCOY: Yeah, it feels to me like we could vote on the eight items and then direct staff to maybe make a recommendation separately.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Okay.

CHAIR McCOY: Basically our task here tonight is to get through these eight items and give a reply to the City Council.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: So are we voting on each one individually?

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yeah.

CHAIR McCOY: Correct, with the condition that we eliminate the belvederes is now attached to Points 2, 3, 4, and 5.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Got it.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Let's clarify what we mean by yes or no. Does yes mean that the denial reason was eliminated?

COMMISSIONER COX: I would suggest that someone make a motion about what your perspective is on each of the issues. So for example, for the first you could move that the District has demonstrated that the planning for waterside and landside improvements has been in tandem to the extent possible, or something… So for each

one, one of you should make a motion about your perspective on that, and then see if you have consensus on those.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I would prefer to use the original terminology, because these are basically City Council permit denials, and the question is whether the reason for that denial has now been eliminated by the modified plan from the District. So to me, if the denial reason were eliminated, that would mean a yes vote, that it's no longer a reason that we support. I don't know if people feel comfortable with that, but it sticks closest to the original language by the City Council.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: They killed us on this one. Yeah, I'm in agreement with Ben on that. I think if we stick as close as we can to the language.

CHAIR McCOY: I agree. Let's use the exact language that was given in there and vote on that.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: So we're going to vote yes if we believe that the reason that the City Council denied it has been eliminated, it's no longer viable, or no if the denial reason has not been eliminated and is still a reason for continuing to deny it.

CHAIR McCOY: Does that work for staff? It works for me.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: I understand that.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: So I'll make a motion to call roll on Point 1.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Committee Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

CHAIR McCOY: Now I'll make the motion that we call roll on Point 2, with the attached condition that we previously voted on to eliminate the belvederes.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: The motion passes 4-1.

CHAIR McCOY: I'll make a motion that we vote on Point 3 with the attached condition of eliminating the belvederes previously voted on by this board.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: And I second the motion.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion does not pass 3-2.

CHAIR McCOY: Now I'll move that we take roll on Point 4, with the attached condition of eliminating the belvederes previously voted on by this board.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second the motion.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passed 5-0.

CHAIR McCOY: I'll now make the motion that we call roll on Point 5 with the attached condition of eliminating the belvederes as previously voted on by this board.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: I second the motion.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: The motion passes 4-1.

CHAIR McCOY: And I'll move that we call roll on Point 6.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: I'll second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: And Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

CHAIR McCOY: I move that we now call roll on Point 7.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I abstain.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Abstain.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: It doesn't pass. Two abstentions. Motion does not pass.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay. All right, now I'll make another motion to call roll on Point 8.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Mercado.

BOARD MEMBER MERCADO: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Richardson.

BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member Brown.

BOARD MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Board Member LeBaron.

BOARD MEMBER LeBARON: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair McCoy.

CHAIR McCOY: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 3-2.

CHAIR McCOY: Okay, so we'll turn it back over the Planning Commission at this point.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. Would the Commission like to decide how to go about this?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I would recommend that we follow a similar procedure as the HLB, making the condition of removal of the belvederes applicable to the same points that the Historic Landmarks Board did.

I would also like to make a motion to add the conditions that Commissioner Cox enumerated related to design issues, a condition to Point 2, 3, and 8. I would like to make a motion that there be a condition on Point 5 about the impact on the Inn Above Tide, and include a condition that the City Council require the Bridge District to work with the Inn Above Tide to a satisfactorily temporary construction arrangement.

CHAIR WERNER: Is there a second to any of these motions, and I think you made three of them.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I could make them separately, or all together.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Could they be separate, so we can know exactly what we're voting on?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Okay. So the first one is to have a condition to the same Points, 2, 3, 4, and 5, that the HLB did that the belvederes are removed.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I'll second that.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Then my second motion was Commissioner Cox enumerated a list of mainly design issues related to lighting and other concerns about the design; the S-curve, warm versus cold lighting, glass gates, etc.; and I would proposed that those be conditions of Point 2, which is the overall size and scale, and Points 3 and 8 related to compatibility with the Historic District.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Chair Werner, can I make a comment?

COMMISSIONER COX: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Okay. I would prefer that we do the conditions separately, because I won't be able to vote for the main question with all those conditions necessarily. There may be one in there that I don't agree with, and that makes me vote no on that whole topic. Can we do the conditions at the end, after we get through the…

CHAIR WERNER: I have a problem with getting ourselves involved in the minutiae of bits and pieces of design when in fact we're trying to deal with the overall issues that were raised by the Council, and so though I tend to agree with most of Commissioner Cox's suggestions about this, I think it is inappropriate for them to be tagged onto what we're doing.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: And I would just add that we're the Planning Commission, and design review is one of our normal functions, and as far as I can tell, we will not have an additional opportunity to weigh in on these issues.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: That's a good point.

COMMISSIONER COX: So how about if instead of conditioning these items on those design suggestions we just make a separate motion to convey those recommendations to the City Council?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: That's fine. I'll withdraw my motion.

COMMISSIONER COX: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: So then I'll make a motion that Point 5, the overall design negatively impacts the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide, that when we vote on that we would condition it on the District working with the Inn Above Tide on the negative impacts to the Inn Above Tide related to the temporary pier.

COMMISSIONER COX: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR WERNER: Call the roll.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Aye.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: And Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

COMMISSIONER COX: All right, so I'm going to make a motion with respect to Point 1, and I don't know if there will be consensus with me on this, but I move we recommend to the City Council that the District has not adequately addressed the requirement that the planning for waterside and landside improvements should be in tandem, because the District, although it has offered to pass through funds from a separate federal grant, the City has not yet received those funds, thereby preventing the City from commencing planning for landside improvements.

CHAIR WERNER: If that's a motion, I'll second it.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: So to clarify, a yes? The District has not adequately addressed…or the project has not adequately addressed?

COMMISSIONER COX: Correct. I am moving to make the recommendation that that condition has not been met on the basis I enunciated.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Thank you. I'm just clarifying that a yes would mean…

COMMISSIONER COX: So yes would mean it has not been fulfilled.

CHAIR WERNER: Before you call the roll, is there any further discussion on this?

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: I guess I'm unclear on when those monies were intended to be distributed…

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: …because I'm not sure that was ever specified. My understanding is that the City is more responsible for the lack of landside improvement planning than the District. I think the District has addressed it as satisfactorily as they have.

COMMISSIONER COX: And I'm aware that this is the perspective of some. The staff report says that the District has offered to pass through funds from a separate federal grant; however, the City has not yet received those funds.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Right, and when does that date from?

COMMISSIONER COX: My point is that the City's failure to commence landside improvements is directly related to the fact they have not yet received those funds. That was a basis for the City Council's denial, and in my opinion that basis has not yet been satisfied. That's the basis of my motion. I'm not saying that the City is to blame, I'm just simply saying that fact still exists, that the planning has not been done in tandem.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I don't know if it's appropriate at this time, but I would make a motion to recommend to the City Council that the planning for waterside and landside improvements have not been in tandem, but the Bridge District has done what they can do to address that in this process.

COMMISSIONER COX: That's a replacement motion, so is there a second?

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER COX: So unless there's further discussion, staff calls roll on the replacement motion first.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 3-2.

CHAIR WERNER: So you're on a roll. You can start the next one.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Okay. I don't think I've got a majority on this, but I'll make a motion with respect to the overall size of the project, that the Bridge District has satisfactorily reduced the overall size of the project in terms of reducing the truss and other improvements, and this is also with the condition that the belvederes are removed.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

CHAIR WERNER: Is there further discussion? Call the roll, please.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Was that Nichols who did the second?

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Okay. Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion is not passed 3-2.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I'll make a motion that the Bridge District has addressed compatibility with the Historic District.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

CHAIR WERNER: Discussion? Call the roll, please.

COMMISSIONER COX: And that is subject to the earlier…

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes, the removal of the belvederes.

COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion denied 3-2.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Then I will make a motion that with the removal of the belvederes that there is no…

COMMISSIONER COX: How about the belvederes no longer necessarily…

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes, thank you. It's getting late.

COMMISSIONER COX: …add to the size of the project?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: You can make the motion. I'll second it.

COMMISSIONER COX: All right. I'll make a motion that with the removal of the belvederes, the proposed belvederes no longer add unnecessarily to the size of the project.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: You betcha.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: The motion passes 5-0.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: So Point 5, with the condition that the Bridge District work with the Inn Above Tide on the temporary pier, the overall design of the permit project does not negatively impact the Sausalito Yacht Club and the Inn Above Tide in a significant way.

COMMISSIONER COX: May I suggest an amendment to your motion? That the Golden Gate Bridge District work with the Inn Above Tide with respect to the pier and the construction schedule.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I'll accept that amendment.

COMMISSIONER COX: And that's also subject to our prior proviso that the belvederes be removed.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER COX: I will second that amended motion.

CHAIR WERNER: Further discussion? Call the roll, please.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

COMMISSIONER COX: I'm going to move that we affirm to the City Council that improvements remain outside the boundaries of the leased area, and it's up to the City Council to address that issue.

CHAIR WERNER: Second.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Second.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Who was the second there? Okay, Bill.

CHAIR WERNER: Call the roll, please.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Aye.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 5-0.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I'll make a motion that the project has been adequately analyzed under CEQA and that there is no substantial evidence that

any project changes not analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration have substantial adverse effects in any of the relevant categories.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Second.

COMMISSIONER COX: I'll make a counter motion that the project has not been adequately analyzed pursuant to CEQA's requirements, including the fact that… I'll just leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: Do you have to say what you're basing it on?

COMMISSIONER COX: It's based on the fact that the…

CHAIR WERNER: Well, there was no basis for the first motion, so you might as well not have any basis for this one, so I'll second it.

COMMISSIONER COX: Okay, great. So there's been a motion and a second that the project has not been adequately analyzed pursuant to CEQA.

CHAIR WERNER: Could you call the roll on that one?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: I'm saying it has been analyzed. Is that a yes or a no?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: It's a no.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 3-2.

CHAIR WERNER: Last one.

COMMISSIONER COX: I will make a motion to recommend to the City Council that the project did not consider historic designations and historic context.

CHAIR WERNER: Second. Discussion? Call the roll, please.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Pierce.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Nichols.

COMMISSIONER NICHOLS: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Vice-Chair Cleveland-Knowles.

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: No.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Chair Werner.

CHAIR WERNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Motion passes 3-2.

CHAIR WERNER: And with that, I believe we have done our business. Just a moment, there are a couple of more items on the agenda. Director Castro, is there any old business to discuss?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: Old business? No.

CHAIR WERNER: New business?

DIRECTOR CASTRO: We have a meeting tomorrow night.

CHAIR WERNER: Thank you. It's hard to not remember that. Are there any communications from the Commission or the HLB at this point?

VICE-CHAIR CLEVELAND KNOWLES: I just thought perhaps the staff might want to announce the City Council hearing date for this item.

DIRECTOR CASTRO: The City Council hearing date is April 5th at 7:00pm. It's a week from today.

CHAIR WERNER: All right, then if there are no other communications, the members of the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmarks Board would like to thank all of you that are left for your continuing participation in the public dialogue regarding the ferry landing plans and their impact on the future of Sausalito.

I move we adjourn this meeting and advise all interested parties that they will have another opportunity to voice their opinions regarding the Bridge District's proposed ferry landing at the City Council meeting on April 5th.

COMMISSIONER COX: Second.

CHAIR WERNER: All in favor. Thank you.

Submitted by Danny Castro Community Development Director	Approved by Bill Werner, Chair