

To: Liza McNulty and the PRW Commission
From: Claudia Kawczynska
Date: June 4, 2026
Re: Draft Parking Implementation and Management Plan, Item 14 on PRW agenda

After attending both a recreational focus group and the general meeting on 6/3/26, I still have a few questions and comments about the Draft Parking Implementation and Management Plan.

Dynamic Management

I believe that more specifics about the “Dynamic Management” for this project should be required and what is meant by “routinely” reviewed be spelled out in more detail before its submission to the BCDC. It has been acknowledged that much is still missing from this draft (including which department is actually in charge of the meters, PRW or PW), or what possible modifications to this draft plan will be included.

“Dynamic” implies that modifications can be made at just about any time. But how will the public know about this? How can the public stay informed? How can the public alert staff about their concerns now and when this project is launched? This will be doubly challenging because, as we know, the marina is currently experiencing staffing shortages, and, to date, we still don’t know who will be in charge of this project. Would it be possible to calendar regular updates and reviews, perhaps assigning this to the PRW Commission calendar?

Dynamic wayfinding sounds expensive, can you give us an estimate of what the costs might be? And how will it be funded? Is this kind of wayfinding that in itself is “dynamic” meaning if changes are made to the component parts/lots, will it be difficult, and costly, to “reformat” the signage program? I ask because the various signage programs within the Waterfront Park (formerly known as CCP) have been less than successful.

Street Improvements

Can improvements to Marina Blvd of Seawall Drive qualify for Measure FF funding? Or other funding sources outside of the Marina Fund or Parks Tax?

Waterfront Benefits District

It is my understanding that there was interest, at least from the D1 councilmember, for the formation of a Waterfront Benefits District. Such a special district would allow the marina fund, and not the PW or GF, to retain any revenue that could be generated by paid parking. I also know there has been interest in expanding paid parking to the whole waterfront not just the recreation “heavy” south end. What is the status of this?

Equity

It is quite unclear to me, and to many others, to understand how Paid Parking protects Equity, since the lots most affected by paid parking are used by low income recreationist users? Can you detail what is meant by “not monopolized by any single user group”? I do hope it means ferry riders and not recreationists.

I know that staff has said repeatedly that the South Cove Lots are not under the purview of this Draft plan, but nonetheless they are probably the most important components of this parking puzzle and the whole Waterfront’s recreational ecosystem. They should not be separated out.

The whole planning process that was launched with the BMASP, morphed into the WSP, and the Pier/Ferry plan but this has been less than adequately handled since the start, hence the

many concerned, and articulate, stakeholder voices you have been hearing throughout this long process. Frankly it is all rather confusing to the public and even to someone, such as myself who has been involved with waterfront matters for more than 30 years.

The planning process and proposed changes to our much loved waterfront have been bifurcated, so during the BMASP, even though WETA took part in a few of the initial meetings, we were told that we could not discuss the pier, much less the ferry itself. 199 Seawall too, including its large parking lot, were also taboo. And now we hear that the misguided paid parking plan for the South Cove lots has nothing to do with the Pier/Ferry parking plan, it is too hard for me, with all that I have learned while serving on the PRW, to quite believe that.

So yes the marina fund is troubled, and back in 2025 the hotel hadn't paid its rent, but then a budget deadline loomed, so voila, we get a poorly conceived paid parking plan for the most used lots for recreationists, with no time for the public, via the PRW commission, to review this. The staff's plan was unveiled at a city council meeting, without the chance for the public to review it even hours before that meeting and the council blithely signs off on this paid parking plan, even though right before the vote, the hotel rent had been received. "Let them eat cake," sounds a lot like "no one likes to pay for parking" to me.

I am pleased that during the last two public meetings it was acknowledged that the public's input was important and ideas to solve this parking conundrum were asked for, so that modifications to the draft might be made. I just hope that those changes are also shared with the public before presenting the staff's plan to the BCDC and that, importantly, there is still time to reconsider a more equitable plan for parking in the South Cove lots.

Thanks for your consideration.

Claudia Kawczynska
Former Chair of the PRW Commission and Waterfront Commission

NO TIME LIMITS ON SOUTH COVE PARKING

DATE:	3 June 2026
PETITION ORGANIZER:	Tom Colton
ADDRESS:	1515 North St, Berkeley, CA 94703
CONTACT INFO:	tcolton@berkeley.edu 510-847-5771

The proposed 4-hour limit on parking at the South Cove lots would prevent most recreational use by sea kayakers. The Bay Area Sea Kayakers (BASK) club uses this location to conduct full-day classes and practice sessions on strokes, rescues, incident management, and paddling safely in bay chop. The location is ideal because it includes protected water for novices, and nearby windy, choppy conditions for practicing in realistic bay conditions. In addition, typical day paddles from here involve a 2-hour paddle out, landing on a beach for lunch, and a similar paddle back, with 45 minutes before and after to deal with boats and changing clothes. A 4-hour or even 6-hour time limit would preclude many paddlers from using this unique central-bay location.

We, the undersigned, oppose setting daytime parking limits on the South Cove lots.

	DATE	FULL NAME	City	CONTACT INFO
No.	6/3/26	Tom Colton	Berkeley	tcolton@berkeley.edu
1	6/3/26	Jennifer Chandler	Glen Ellen	jencjoyous@gmail.com
2	6/3/26	Tim Kohler	San Jose	tim@relhok.com
3	6/3/26	Jean Spurr	San Francisco	jeanspurr@gmail.com
4	6/3/26	Brad Findlay	Citrus Heights	bfind74@yahoo.com
5	6/3/2026	Ellen Simms	Berkeley	northstreetpaddler@gmail.com
6	6/3/2026	Cynthia Robinson	Richmond	cynson@yahoo.com
7	6/3/2026	Steve Goldfinger	San Anselmo	steve@ecomind.net
8	6/3/2026	David Longerbeam	Lafayette	david_longerbeam@yahoo.com
9	6/3/2026	Alan Kepner	Forest Knolls	akepner@mindspring.com
10	6/3/2026	Stacey Jones	Guerneville	taichitoes@comcast.net
11	6/3/2026	Winnie van Veen	Rescue	winnie@vanveeren.net

NO TIME LIMITS ON SOUTH COVE PARKING

12	6/3/26	Dwight Brown	Pacifica	cyclelab@gmail.com
13	6/3/26	Annie Valdes	Mountain View	poopmonkey@gmail.com
14	6/3/26	Jonathan Luskin	San Francisco	jonathan@moosepix.com
15	6/3/26	Jennifer L Fury	El Cerrito	jennsgarden@hotmail.com
16	6/3/26	David Kroll	Fairfax	krolldaveb@aol.com
17	6/3/26	Heidi Lypps	Oakland	hlypps@gmail.com
18	6/3/2026	Khoder Baydoun	Pleasant Hill	kbaydoun@yahoo.com
19	6/3/2026	Deborah Davis	Berkeley	deborahdavis07@gmail.com
20	6/3/2026	Chuck Cornwall	Berkeley	ccornwall@gmail.com
21	6/3/2026	Anne Kang	Corte Madera	akscuba@yahoo.com
22	6/3/2026	David Nguyen	Daly City	deeno35@gmail.com
23	6/3/2026	Harriet John	Sunnyvale	harrietjohn@gmail.com
24	6/3/2026	James Jacobs	San Francisco	freegovinfo@gmail.com
25	6/3/2026	Beth Kim	Oakland	bethkimrush@gmail.com
26	6/3/2026	Doerte Mann	Forestville	doerte.mann@gmail.com
27	6/3/2026	Sarah Murphy	Hillsborough	emailsarahjmurphy@gmail.com
28	6/3/2026	Alger Brian	Sebastopol	brian@algerkin.org
29	6/3/2026	Steven Rock	Berkeley	wavecloud@earthlink.net
30	6/3/2026	Nancy Briink	Berkeley	nancysbrink@gmail.com
31	6/4/2026	Jan Dolzer	Santa Rosa	mail@jan-dolzer.net
32	6/4/2026	Hollie Smith	Santa Rosa	hollie-annie@sbcglobal.net
33	6/4/2026	Alison Garrett	Guerneville	bluefishbeach@comcast.net
34	6/4/2026	Ron Mastalski	Concord	riverdebris@gmail.com
35	6/4/26	Chandra Spence	San jose	chandra.spence@gmail.com
36	6/4/26	Fran Sticha	Lafayette	fsticha@yahoo.com
37	6/4/26	Bill Rostenberg	Greenbrae	brostenberg@gmail.com

NO TIME LIMITS ON SOUTH COVE PARKING

38	6/4/26	Theresa Brigandi	Mill Valley	Theresa.brigandi@gmail.com
39	6/4/2026	Joe Petolino	Palo Alto	petolino@alum.mit.edu
40	6/4/2026	Dennis Meurer	Oakland	dlmeurer@comcast.net
41	6/4/2026	Dov Cohen	Lafayette	idcohen51@gmail.com
42	6/4/26	Terry Noe	Sebastopol	trnoe@yahoo.com
43	6/4/26	Anne Bernstein	Berkeley	acbernstein@comcast.net
44	6/4/26	Gail Feldman	Kensington	gail.zoning@gmail.com
45	6/4/26	Marvin Feldman	San Francisco	konamarv@gmail.com
46	6/4/26	Richard Luibrand	Oakland	rich.luibrand@csueastbay.edu
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				
61				
62				
63				

Miller, Roger

From: Robert <robert@alamolighting.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 5:01 PM
To: Miller, Roger; McNulty, Liza
Subject: Berkeley Marina Ferry/Parking

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Roger, and Liza,

Please include these comments for the PRW agenda packet for the June 10 meeting, Item 14 on the ferry parking plan. I'm also copying Liza McNulty for consideration regarding the Big Ferry proposal.

I support ferries operating from the Berkeley Marina, which can fit in nicely, without disturbing the current sensitive and balanced equilibrium, *when they are kept to a small scale, operating from K-Dock, as they have in the past*. To do otherwise, on the far larger scale contemplated, will certainly, negatively, impede critical recreational activities, so vital to Bay Area citizens' physical health and mental well being.

I'm concerned that the value of these precious waterside recreational activities—including, walking, daydreaming, painting, swimming, windsurfing, kayaking, sailing...—is increasingly treated by planners as of less importance compared to the perceived necessity of creating a “transportation hub” at the Berkeley Marina. I oppose current Big Ferry and associated parking plans, and ask all involved to instead redouble your efforts to appreciate and cultivate the marina for its sacred primary purpose, as a park.

In the zoom discussion last night on Big Ferry parking, I was struck that, yes, planners were currently working with “stakeholders” (actually, every Bay Area citizen is a stakeholder in the Berkeley Marina) to address concerns regarding unreasonable 4-hour parking limits associated with the Ferry; however, I wonder how was it possible that anyone started with 4-hour parking as the default baseline assumption in the first place? This aspect of the Big Ferry plan, is just one example of how far removed planners are from the actual typical citizens' activities and usage of this park. This saddens me, reflecting the great push to create a *transportation hub*, while giving recreational activities a kind of second-class priority status.

The plan, envisioning over 900 Ferry commuters per day, using about 300 parking spaces, for another example, is far too optimistic and unrealistic. Park users will certainly be negatively impacted. Please stop this Big Ferry plan, and reconsider alternatives.

Similarly, the lack of protection for the planned new Ferry, against North wind and seas in the fall and winter—which every sailor knows, comes around each year like clockwork — reflects an apparent disconnect and lack of planning, for likely, predictable, negative scenarios.

Lastly, on a related note, I beg all involved to reconsider and not start charging for parking at the Berkeley marina—this will yield a profound negative impact on park users. The *net* revenue—after costs—if any, will be the proverbial “drop in the bucket” at best, and at worst, after all this effort and heartache, not net a financial benefit at all. Please don't do it.

Yes, of course I understand the City's fiscal challenges, but parking fees at the marina are self-defeating, truly upsetting the present, working, delicate equilibrium. As noted above, this plan reflects a sad disconnect from actual marina park users, many low income, seeking a bit of solace in an increasingly stressful world. At the very least, can planners promise to study actual financial parking cost/benefit results after time passes, and rescind the program if it is shown to be a debacle?

I thank you sincerely for your service and consideration.

Robert Ofsevit

Miller, Roger

From: David Fielder <davidfielder@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:16 PM
To: Miller, Roger; McNulty, Liza
Cc: David Fielder; Claudia Kawczynska
Subject: PRW/Marina Parking Zoom comments

WARNING: This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Roger & Liza,

Please share with PRW.

Thanks, David

xxxxxxx

1. I almost commented on 75% reduction in Seawall Dr viewer parking (80 down to 20 spaces). That is sooo egregious. Regular users of that parking strip are well aware of how important it is. Comment that “walkers/bikers” are more important was really annoying - “out of car experience”, etc. Weather is huge factor in how people access/enjoy Seawall Dr.
2. Liza’s initial site photo/slide shows almost no recreational pier extension beyond the hilt breakwater. Also, no further pier remnants. Doubt those will be dealt with in future.
4. Nothing about fisherfolk parking near the pier, especially given all their gear, chairs, etc.
5. Emphasis on health benefits of the Marina at about 8:20 PM - recreation is too simplistic a description.
6. WETA siphoning \$ from BART and for minimal actual patron results - 8:15 PM or so.

xxxxxxx