

DRAFT

December 15, 2008

John Sindzinski
Water Emergency Transportation Authority
Pier 9, Suite 111
San Francisco, CA 94111

Re: Comments on Berkeley/Albany Ferry Terminal Study EIS/EIR

Dear Mr. Sindzinski,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS/EIR for the Berkeley/Albany Ferry Terminal Study. On December 15, 2008, the Albany City Council reviewed this Draft document with input from the City's Waterfront Committee, Planning and Zoning Commission, and Traffic and Safety Commission. Overall, it was found that the document was fairly comprehensive.

The City of Albany wishes to express our support for ferry service in the Berkeley/Albany area. In particular, we wish to express support for Alternative B, located between the landside end of the Berkeley Fishing Pier and Hs Lordships Restaurant, in that this alternative appears to represent the environmentally preferred alternative. Alternative B, along with Alternative A, produces fewer environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated in comparison to Alternatives C and D. Alternative A would involve less dredging than Alternative B, but may disturb native oyster beds and have more disruption to existing waterfront land uses. Per the EIS/EIR, Alternatives C and D "produce multiple environmental issues that would be difficult or impossible to mitigate." Of particular note is dredging, traffic, and land use policy (Eastshore State Park) impacts or issues.

Albany is currently engaged in a visioning process for the Waterfront area. Locating a ferry terminal at the base of Buchanan Street (Alternative D) could foreclose the community's ability to consider future land use options at this location.

Attached for your consideration are the technical comments and concerns relating to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Lieber
Mayor

**CITY OF ALBANY COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIS/EIR BERKELEY/ALBANY
FERRY TERMINAL STUDY – December 2008**

Exhibit Maps

In the Executive Summary, either add additional maps or enlarge the range around the subject Site Alternatives to better show their relationship surrounding features. For example, Site maps for Alternative C and D, do not show the site's relationship with or distance from the major access roads (Gilman Street and Buchanan Avenue respectively), Eastshore State Park properties, or Interstate-80.

Traffic/Circulation/Parking

When walking or bicycling to the various ferry terminal locations, was consideration given to how people will be able to get home in the dark?

The Draft EIS/EIR should include a more comprehensive evaluation of the impacts on Buchanan Street and Gilman Street, in that it does not address _____.

Land Use

Add more discussion regarding Department of Transportation Section 4F requirements, and: how it applies to the Alternatives where the project would be constructed in State owned aquatic lands, which are part of Eastshore State Park.

Alternative C parking requires displacement and relocation of horse stables at Golden Gate Fields. How many stables would be removed? The EIS/EIR should discuss possible relocation sites for the stables.