

From: [Neal Holmlund](#)
To: [BCDC PublicComment](#)
Subject: 02/06/25: Item 8
Date: Thursday, February 6, 2025 8:12:48 AM

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

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

The marina replacement application has a stated primary goal of “improving public access”

This application contains two notable points: “Dredging necessary for future navigation safety and ongoing marina operations would be reviewed under a permit amendment application when needed, and not part of the construction process as described in the proposed project”...”The marina project authorized under this permit is located entirely within the Bay, with no shoreline protection component”.

The marina is useless without dredging, so that application must be submitted and approved before this project is considered. Also notable is that the current marina is not fully occupied, so why is a larger marina necessary? The current docks are poorly maintained and should be repaired to improve occupancy (with dredging) before expansion is considered.

Clipper Cove used to be a great anchorage but is largely inaccessible now due to silting. The shoreline is inaccessible to kayakers and small boat sailors due to current construction, but this project does nothing to improve shoreline access and parking.

If you truly want to improve public access, dredge the cove, build appropriate parking and beach access with public restrooms, and provide secure dinghy docking for transient anchored boats. You don't need a bigger marina.

Neal Holmlund
Oakland resident, sailing instructor, SF Bay sailor

Sent from my iPad

From: [Andrew Lesslie](#)
To: [BCDC PublicComment](#)
Subject: Subject: Public comment, Item 8 Meeting on Thursday, February 6, Permit application 2023.006.00, Clipper Cove.
Date: Monday, February 3, 2025 3:20:55 PM

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

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

Dear Panel and guests,

I have used the water in Clipper Cove over the past 20 or so years, for recreational sailing (including with TISC), for boating safety training (also with TISC) and as a cruising anchorage.

I would ask that when reviewing the application, the commission consider requiring the items below:

General, I fully support the refurbishment and renewal of Clipper Cove Marina. But I ask it be done in a way that does not displace or disrupt the existing and long-term usage of Clipper Cove. Specifically as a premium venue for educational boating and as a sheltered anchorage and place of refuge for visiting boaters.

1- Mandate that sufficient open water is preserved for recreational and educational boating areas in Clipper Cove and that these activities are protected in any operating permits granted to the new marina operator. In particular, measures will be required to ensure that new marina users do not endanger the existing recreational and educational boating users of Clipper Cove. A particular risk is created by increasing the average boat length from 32 feet to 55 feet. The larger boats have restricted visibility, and restricted maneuverability and create substantial wash. Particular care should be taken to prevent risks to smaller boat operators and mitigate noise and wash nuisance to boats at anchor.

2- I note the Marina navigation channel on the map passes directly through both a shallow area of the cove, and through the most protected part of the cove used for overnight anchoring. The marina anticipates significantly larger vessels than are currently accommodated, and this implies deeper draft. The proposed channel seems impractical without dredging to create an access channel, which would effectively remove the anchorage. If this is not addressed, I struggle to see how the marina can operate with boats any larger than it currently accommodates.

3- A floating guest dock that also acts as a 'wave mitigation device' does not replace a sheltered anchorage, with good holding. If a wave mitigation device is needed, by its very nature it will be a hostile and uncomfortable dock. If a wave mitigation device is needed, it should serve that purpose alone, and the docking / anchoring arrangements should be separated from wave mitigation plans.

4- there is landing access (a dinghy dock) at the current Clipper Cove marina. This should be preserved in the permit for the new marina.

From: [Tommaso Boggia](#)
To: [BCDC PublicComment](#); [Fielding, Sam@BCDC](mailto:Fielding_Sam@BCDC)
Subject: Treasure Island Marina staff recommendation ignores current important public use that is still under threat.
Date: Monday, February 3, 2025 4:00:31 PM

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

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

[resending with correct publiccomment email address]

Dear Sam and BCDC board,

I'm one of the people from the sailing community that has been following the Treasure Island Marina development for years.

I saw that the topic is on the agenda again and I am writing to ask why the staff report doesn't mention maintaining the anchorage at all when it's currently one of the significant public access uses of the cove.

The Treasure Island Enterprises, Inc. presentation document on Page 5 straight up removes the anchorage with a swimming lane no constituency has asked for. Currently the anchorage and swimming public uses of the bay coexist without problems. If the Marina developers succeed in building out their swim lane (hard to not see it as retaliatory when us sailors were some of the most vocal opponents of their initial plan), it will be in direct conflict with the anchorage usage of the cove.

Feel free to give me a call if you'd like more info about this. It's not obvious if you haven't anchored there why that specific area of the cove is so special and almost unique in our section of the coast. Page 5 on the Treasure Island Enterprises, Inc. presentation would essentially kill this public access

I'll try to attend the meeting, but I have a job and I've already spoken on this topic multiple times so it's hard to see whether it will be worth me taking the time to do so.

Tommaso

--

Tommaso Nicholas Boggia
(831) 234 4507

From: [Andrew Lesslie](#)
To: [BCDC PublicComment](#)
Subject: Subject: Public comment, Item 8 Meeting on Thursday, February 6, Permit application 2023.006.00, Clipper Cove.
Date: Monday, February 3, 2025 3:20:55 PM

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

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

Dear Panel and guests,

I have used the water in Clipper Cove over the past 20 or so years, for recreational sailing (including with TISC), for boating safety training (also with TISC) and as a cruising anchorage.

I would ask that when reviewing the application, the commission consider requiring the items below:

General, I fully support the refurbishment and renewal of Clipper Cove Marina. But I ask it be done in a way that does not displace or disrupt the existing and long-term usage of Clipper Cove. Specifically as a premium venue for educational boating and as a sheltered anchorage and place of refuge for visiting boaters.

1- Mandate that sufficient open water is preserved for recreational and educational boating areas in Clipper Cove and that these activities are protected in any operating permits granted to the new marina operator. In particular, measures will be required to ensure that new marina users do not endanger the existing recreational and educational boating users of Clipper Cove. A particular risk is created by increasing the average boat length from 32 feet to 55 feet. The larger boats have restricted visibility, and restricted maneuverability and create substantial wash. Particular care should be taken to prevent risks to smaller boat operators and mitigate noise and wash nuisance to boats at anchor.

2- I note the Marina navigation channel on the map passes directly through both a shallow area of the cove, and through the most protected part of the cove used for overnight anchoring. The marina anticipates significantly larger vessels than are currently accommodated, and this implies deeper draft. The proposed channel seems impractical without dredging to create an access channel, which would effectively remove the anchorage. If this is not addressed, I struggle to see how the marina can operate with boats any larger than it currently accommodates.

3- A floating guest dock that also acts as a 'wave mitigation device' does not replace a sheltered anchorage, with good holding. If a wave mitigation device is needed, by its very nature it will be a hostile and uncomfortable dock. If a wave mitigation device is needed, it should serve that purpose alone, and the docking / anchoring arrangements should be separated from wave mitigation plans.

4- there is landing access (a dinghy dock) at the current Clipper Cove marina. This should be preserved in the permit for the new marina.

From: [Gregor Robinson](#)
To: [Fielding, Sam@BCDC](mailto:Fielding_Sam@BCDC); [BCDC PublicComment](#)
Subject: Preserve the anchorage at Clipper Cove
Date: Thursday, February 6, 2025 5:56:29 AM

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

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

Hello,

The anchorage of Clipper Cove is unique in the entire bay, so I am alarmed by the impacts the proposed marina expansion will have. To reduce the anchorage's size is to reduce public access to this unique resource.

As a sailing instructor, Clipper Cove has been an indispensable resource for teaching the fundamentals of safe anchoring. This is because nothing else matches its combination of protection from the elements, firmly-holding and mostly-unfouled seabed, and margin for error afforded by its size.

The same reasons make the anchorage the only one suitable for large rafts of boats, where diverse communities of boaters employ advanced anchoring practices for the enjoyment of community gatherings. The size of the anchorage is imperative to facilitate these gatherings.

One way the existing plans seem to encroach on the anchorage is the design concept for a navigational channel through it. Whereas boats can presently travel northeast toward the exit of the cove without passing through the anchorage, the larger footprint of the proposed design would force traffic into the anchorage. This would, therefore, present a risk that dredging through part of the anchorage will eventually be required to preserve access to the new marina. If the design can be modified so that all marina traffic can pass through the northeastern side of the bounding rectangle without needing to pass through the anchorage, I am much more likely to endorse it.

I am under the impression the area closed for swimming has been removed from the proposal, but it still appears in a sketch to be presented in the meeting. So this topic still worries me. A swim area closed from boating would destroy the anchorage. It would also prevent access to the beach area to boats practicing beaching and careening techniques; I am not aware of anywhere else in the bay as suitable for these exercises.

Thank you for considering my input. I trust you will help us protect access to this unique resource.

Gregor Robinson
Oakland