

Minutes of the Special City Council Meeting  
Tuesday- -January 20, 2026- -5:00 P.M.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Roll Call – Present: Councilmembers Daysog, Boller, Jensen, Pryor and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 5. [Note: Councilmember Jensen arrived at 5:06 p.m.]

Absent: None.

Consent Calendar

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 4. [Absent: Councilmember Jensen – 1.] [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(\*26-031) Recommendation to Approve Adam Politzer, Interim City Manager, Abigail Thorne-Lyman, Base Reuse and Economic Development Director, Allen Tai, Planning, Building and Transportation Director, Walker Toma, Base Reuse Manager, Cara Silver, Special Counsel, and Daniel Turner, Deputy City Attorney, as Real Property Negotiators for the Property Located at APN 72-382-9, A Parcel within the Area Known as Encinal Terminals (Encinal Terminals). Accepted.

The meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(26-032) Conference with Labor Negotiators Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6; City Negotiators: Adam Politzer, Interim City Manager, Noelle White, Human Resources Director, Jack Hughes, Liebert Cassidy Whitmore, and Doug McManaway, Assistant City Attorney; Employee Organizations: International Association of Firefighters, Local 689 (IAFF) and Alameda Fire Chiefs Association (AFCA); Under Negotiation: Salaries, Employee Benefits and Terms of Employment.

(26-033) Conference with Legal Counsel – Potential Litigation; Potential Initiation of Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9, Subsection (d)(4); Number of Cases: One (As Plaintiff - City Initiating Legal Action); Potential Defendant: Astra Space, Inc.

(26-034) Conference with Real Property Negotiators (Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8); Property: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 72-382-9; City Negotiators: Interim City Manager Adam Politzer, Base Reuse and Economic Development Director Abigail Thorne-Lyman, Base Reuse Manager Walker Thomas, Planning, Building and Transportation Director Allen Tai, Special Counsel Cara Silver and Deputy City Attorney Daniel Turner; Negotiating Parties: City of Alameda and Bayview Landing L.P. and Sublessee RAR Capital; Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Lease

Following the Closed Session, the meeting was reconvened and the City Clerk announced that regarding Labor, staff provided information and Council provided information, which carried by two voice vote: Vote 1: Ayes: Councilmembers Boller, Jensen, Pryor, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4, Noes: Councilmember Daysog – 1, Vote 2: Ayes: Councilmembers Boller, Jensen, Pryor, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4, Noes: Councilmember Daysog – 1; regarding Potential Litigation, staff provided information and Council provided direction, which carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Boller, Daysog, Pryor, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 4, Noes: Councilmember Jensen – 1; and regarding Real Property, staff provided information and Council provided direction, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 5.

### Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft adjourned the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger  
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting  
Tuesday- -January 20, 2026- -7:00 p.m.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft convened the meeting at 7:13 p.m. Vice Mayor Pryor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call - Present: Councilmembers Boller, Daysog, Jensen, Pryor, and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 5.

Absent: None.

Agenda Changes

(26-035) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would call the referral [paragraph no. 26-052] after the resolution of appointment [paragraph no. 26-050].

Proclamations, Special Orders of the Day and Announcements

None.

Oral Communications, Non-Agenda

(26-036) Alan Tubbs, Alameda Naval Air Museum, stated there are a lot of maintenance issues with the building; a flood last year caused the insurance to be canceled; donation funds had to be used for repairs; requested assistance and rent relief from the City.

(26-037) Cora Piper, Alameda, stated that she loves riding her bicycle to school and would like to do so safely; discussed the dangers of cars; stated the wooden bridge and street potholes are unsafe; urged Council to make bike rides safer for everyone.

(26-038) Jacob Moore Motise, Alameda, stated that he likes to bike or walk to get around Alameda, including grocery shopping; thanked Council for the new changes which make biking safer.

(26-039) Liesl Roach, Alameda, stated that she rides her bicycle everywhere; it gives her independence and keeps her healthy; the bridge to the main Island is bumpy and difficult for non-accessible people to traverse; urged Council to resurface it soon and not delay bike and safety projects that have already been approved.

(26-040) Josephina Renaud, Alameda, shared a personal experience of nearly getting hit by a car, along with a crossing guard; urged Council to implement stronger measures to ensure cars slowdown in school zones.

(26-041) Josh Altieri, Housing Authority (HA), shared updates, including the HA's 85th Anniversary; acknowledged partnership and support from the City throughout the years to create affordable housing solutions in Alameda; discussed the Housing Choice Voucher program, Mastic Senior Center, and the mobile recreation unit at Esperanza; stated the Housing Authority works alongside the Public Works Department on the Zero Waste Program; the programs and partnerships have resulted in an operational savings of about \$65,000, which can be used on more programs and services; the HA will be opening property-specific wait lists for

two properties in the coming months: Rosefield Village and Everett Commons; stated to receive updates visit [www.ahagroup.click](http://www.ahagroup.click).

### Consent Calendar

In response to Councilmember Jensen's inquiry regarding the Surplus Lands Act [paragraph no. 26-045], the Community Development Manager responded based on the way that the Surplus Lands Act is written, the City Attorney has directed staff to ask the City Council to consider exempting land as surplus prior to engaging in any kind of negotiation; staff is bringing forth a number of properties before entering into negotiations for a long-term lease or sale.

Councilmember Jensen stated the properties were conveyed to the City in 2012; inquired why it has taken so long to ask.

The Community Development Manager responded there have been recent changes in the law; a number of resolutions were brought to Council several years ago for certain properties; staff is now redoing some of the earlier efforts, as well as including additional properties to enter into negotiations on numerous properties and be flexible and opportunistic.

The City Attorney stated that he agrees with everything the Community Development Manager has said; the Surplus Lands Act changed substantially in 2019, which placed greater burdens on the City to surplus the property before engaging in negotiations; with respect to timing, the advice has been that the City should not surplus property until it is really ready to engage in negotiations so the surplus declarations do not become stale.

In response to Councilmember Jensen's inquiry regarding the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City Attorney stated it is the first step of the disposition process; if the Council adopts the resolution, staff will engage in preliminary discussions; Council would only be asked to conduct more in-depth CEQA review when there is a concrete project; he stands by staff's recommendation that there are no CEQA implications for this action at this time.

Vice Mayor Pryor moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember Boller seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5. [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(\*26-042) Minutes of the Special Joint City Council and Successor Agency to the Community Improvement Commission Meeting and the Regular City Council Meeting Held on December 16, 2025. Approved.

(\*26-043) Ratified bills in the amount of \$5,267,737.66.

(\*26-044) Recommendation to Authorize the Interim City Manager to Execute a Fourth Amendment to the Agreement with the Regents of the University of California (UCSF School of Medicine, Department of Emergency Medicine) for Medical Director Services for the Alameda Fire Department by Extending the Term Through February 28, 2028, in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$216,582 for the Two-Year Extension and a Total Agreement Amount of \$382,079. Accepted.

(\*26-045) Resolution No. 16357, “Declaring Approximately 268 Acres of City Tidelands Property, including Areas at Alameda Point, Fortman Marina, Ballena Isle Marina and Grand Marina, to be Exempt Surplus Land Under the Surplus Land Act.” Adopted.

(\*26-046) Resolution No. 16358, “Authorizing the Interim City Manager, or Designee, to Execute an Agreement to Secure \$44,550,361 in Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program Grant Funding and All Amendments Thereafter.” Adopted.

(\*26-047) Resolution No. 16359, “Amending the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget Increasing Revenue Appropriations in Grants Fund (Fund 222) by \$10,000 for a Grant Received for the Library and Increasing Expenditure Appropriations in the Library Fund by \$10,000.” Adopted.

(\*26-048) Ordinance No. 3392, “Amending Alameda Municipal Code Section 1-5.3 (Civil Action Enforcement) of Chapter 1 (General) to Improve the City’s Collections Process.” Finally passed.

(\*26-049) Ordinance No. 3393, “Authorizing the Interim City Manager to Execute a New 36-Month Lease, with Two Three-Year Renewal Options with Rhoads Property Holdings, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, DBA CSI Mini-Storage, for Buildings 338, 608, and 608A-C Totaling Approximately 70,989 of Rentable Square Feet, Plus Associated Land and Parking, Located at 50 and 51 West Hornet Avenue in Alameda Point.” Finally passed.

#### Continued Agenda Items

None.

#### Regular Agenda Items

(26-050) Resolution No. 16360, “Appointing Yatin Shastri as a Member of the Golf Commission.” Adopted.

Councilmember Jensen moved adoption of resolution.

Vice Mayor Pryor seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Office and Mr. Shastri made brief comments.

#### Agenda Changes

(26-051) Councilmember Jensen inquired whether a motion is needed to make an agenda change, to which the City Clerk responded that Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft announced the change and there were no objections.

Councilmember Jensen moved approval of hearing the Referral next.

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

#### Council Referrals

(26-052) Consider Directing Staff to Place the Issue of Reconfiguration/Restriping of Mecartney Road on a Future Council Agenda to Allow Council to Provide Input. (Councilmember Daysog)

Councilmember Daysog gave a brief presentation.

The Public Works Director and City Engineer gave an overview of the project.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry, the City Engineer stated the issue at hand is the restriping of McCartney Road from Fortman Way to Island Drive, and Island Drive to County Road; the project narrowed down the lane width to a single lane in each direction; curbs widths were not modified; during an emergency or time of crisis, emergency vehicles could get through in the same manner as now; modifications were made at the Island Drive and Mecartney Road intersection, including eliminating the double right turn at the stop sign to promote safety and also help pedestrians cross; analyses showed there was not a significant impact post-project; another change reduces the number of approaches; it simplifies the interactions, which should actually increase efficiency.

In response to Councilmember Daysog's inquiry regarding whether Council explicitly directed the change to a two-lane road, the City Engineer responded in the negative; stated several different plans and policies have been adopted by Council; the most notable is the Vision Zero policy; the policy admonishes staff to consider safety as the highest priority in all transportation improvements; in the Active Transportation Plan, Mecartney Road is identified as a neighborhood greenway; the most recently adopted Strategic Plan directed assessment of the bike and pedestrian safety improvements on Mecartney Road; Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) Section 8-1.1 delegates authority to the City Engineer to develop transportation implementation plans, standards, procedures based on generally accepted transportation engineering and planning standards and principles to ensure the orderly operations of the City's transportation systems.

In response to Councilmember Daysog's inquiry regarding the Homeowner Association's (HOA's) opposition to changing the lanes, the City Engineer stated that he presented the project along with consultants to the Transportation Commission in January 2025; the Harbor Bay Isle Association (HBIA) and board members did not comment during the Transportation Commission meeting; shortly after, they passed the resolution not supporting the proposed changes; he went before the HBIA in March 2025; the lengthy discussion focused on evacuation safety due to fire or tsunami, roadway capacity and function.

In response to Councilmember Daysog's inquiry, the City Engineer stated the objections from HBIA were unfounded and focused on emergency access and Island egress during an evacuation; explained the three bottleneck areas of Bay Farm Island; stated the project area in the middle of the Island is not going to be the critical path that would prevent people from getting off the Island; also, the area is not a fire high-risk based on the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) definition; discussed the concern about tsunamis; stated there would be time to notify the public and evacuate; further explained how a mid-block reduction in lanes does not actually affect capacity on the roadway network for the project area.

Councilmember Daysog stated staff put aside a roundabout due to community opposition; inquired whether the uproar should have alarmed staff about the community's opposition to the striping.

The City Engineer responded staff could have done the community outreach differently and made it more expansive; stated that he is confident the decision for the striping is the right

decision based on a technical standpoint; the striping will lead to both a safer and slower mid-block portion of the roadway; people are going to be less inclined to drive fast; staff will continue to monitor things during the next three to six months, which is what is done with every paving project; difficult decisions have to be made and are not always popular.

Councilmember Boller inquired whether the Transportation Commission meeting a year ago was the main component for public input, to which the City Engineer responded there were three places for community input, including the Transportation Commission, HBIA, and at a Bay Farm Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) meeting.

In response to Councilmember Boller's inquiry, the City Engineer stated about three people provided public comment at the Transportation Commission meeting.

Councilmember Boller inquired what efforts the City made to get the community to attend the three forums, to which the City Engineer responded there was a news blast for the Transportation Commission, an email blast to another group, and information about the forums was posted on the City's website news page; the PTSA President advertised that the City would be presenting at one of its meetings, which was fairly well-attended.

In response to Councilmember Boller's inquiry about what other public outreach could have been done, the City Engineer stated the Central Avenue project had 10 years of lead-up and numerous well-attended public meetings, yet, once construction started, people seem to have forgotten; staff could look at other ways of trying to get more voices heard; as part of Vision Zero, staff was pressed to do more and do it faster; when re-striping, there are opportunities to re-stripe in a way that is safer for the public; it is something the City has been doing over the last few cycles; it is a relatively new process; staff is trying to find the right balance and right amount of engagement that does not slow down the process.

In response to Councilmember Boller's inquiry, the City Engineer stated it would be beneficial for staff to understand what things Council would like to see and the level of changes within the roadway network that Council would consider to be routine versus what would be considered a departure from routine; having to come to Council takes time; historically, paving was always a two-year program; if staff has to add in steps to go to the City Council and, potentially, Transportation Commission, it lengthens the duration; staff can do that, but would also need a bright and clear line that gives, as the AMC states, delegation of some authority and responsibility to staff.

Councilmember Boller stated the referral talks about halting the current work; inquired what has been completed so far and what halting would do in terms of safety.

The City Engineer responded the project is almost done; staff decided to move forward because the amount of time it takes to go through the referral process would have been an unacceptable risk; waiting for the referral process would mean having the roadways unstriped for an extended period of time, which is itself a safety hazard; staff proceeded with the striping; most of the long lines are in; some detail work needs to be added; the major component still outstanding on the project is the roundabout at Mecartney Road, Maitland Drive, and Melrose Avenue, which is scheduled to be installed in the next couple weeks.

Councilmember Boller inquired whether things could be changed after City Council review that would keep the same fundamentals, but make the roadway even safer, specifically with regards to the dashed lines in the areas of uncontrolled turns.

The City Engineer responded after the striping is done, changes and adjustments can be made; stated the dashed lines are intentional but could be reconsidered and evaluated over the next weeks to months.

In response to Councilmember Jensen's inquiry, the City Clerk stated Council has adopted a two-step process for referrals, with the exception for urgent legislative matters; because the item is not an urgent legislative matter, all Council can do tonight is provide direction for staff to bring back the matter.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether Council could take any action to halt the project today; to which the City Clerk responded in the negative; stated Council can only provide direction about what will come back.

Councilmember Jensen stated that she recalls reports on the General Plan, the Housing Element and Transportation Choices Plan presented in April 2025, including pavement management and safety improvements and the design and construction of the Bay Farm Island paving project; inquired whether the provision included in the Vision Zero Plan and Active Transportation Plan approved by the Council are sufficient authority to do the project.

The City Engineer responded that he does not recall the presentation of the plans; stated there may have been talk in general about the improvements on Bay Farm Island, but there may be a question about specificity, which is lacking; further clarified when engaging in strategic planning, Council is giving staff direction about what to prioritize; staff is drawing authority from the General Plan and policies Council has adopted; when the item comes back, it will be an opportunity for the Council and staff to work together to refine the policies.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether there would be any costs associated, either with staff time or contractor delays or anything, if the project were halted.

The City Engineer responded that at this stage, it would be problematic to stop; stated from a safety perspective, it would be unwise not to complete the project.

Stated the project is the straightforward implementation of Council-adopted policy; it reflects the direction highlighted in Resolution Number 15648 adopted in 2020; addressed the HOA resolutions cited in the support of the referral; many communities, including renters, are not part of the HOA; urged Council to take no action and allow staff to continue implementing the project as directed: Maria Piper, Alameda.

Stated that he supports the changes that have been made to McCartney Road; urged Council to take no action on the referral; highlighted a few items, including procedure, financial, and misinformation; stated a published paper regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety considers the higher rate of crashes near parks; additional traffic calming and safety infrastructure may be needed to provide safe routes to parks: Brian Piper, Alameda.

Discussed his experience nearly being hit by a car walking with his son at the intersection of Auginbaugh Way and Mecartney Road; expressed support for the actions of the City Engineer

and the Public Works Department; stated that he appreciates very much how McCartney Road is right now; people drive 25 miles an hour instead of 35 very frequently seen before; the extra crossing lights added make it much easier to cross; urged the City Council to take no action on the referral: Joe Matise, Alameda.

Stated that she attended the community meeting last year regarding the project; the meeting was part of a deliberate, multi-step engagement that included neighborhood outreach, revisions based on community input, traffic and safety analysis, and open opportunities for questions and feedback; it was exactly the kind of transparent, participatory planning process that builds trust, and ultimately makes the City's investments more effective; the project is central to the paving plan and addresses known safety concerns, improves traffic flow, and enhances multimodal access for people walking and biking; she understands the concerns but reverting to the old configuration would undo months of community engagement and staff effort and would be a costly move; she does not support the referral and urged Council not to take any action on it: Rachel Lee, Alameda.

Stated that she supports maintaining the bike lanes and safety improvements on McCartney Road; requested additional safety improvements on Kauffman Way at Tillman Park; stated that she disagrees with the HOA and commenters who say that Bay Farm streets were fine before the improvements; more people will use the safer bike and pedestrian options, decreasing congestion on the streets; urged the Council to stay true to the City's values as adopted in the Vision Zero Action Plan and Active Transportation Plan and continue with the improvements on McCartney Road and add a pedestrian crossing at Tillman Park: Jackie Zipkin, Alameda.

Discussed the 20 HOAs on Bay Farm Island; stated that he supported the HOA resolution last year opposing the proposed changes; he participated in all of the City and community meetings; urged Council to approve the referral and hear the matter in an open session; stated that he is concerned the process was not as open as it should have been; the City Council should be able to weigh in on the project; discussed a January 6 letter from the Oakland Law Firm, Sack Rosendin, regarding the legalities of the process: William Pai, Harbor Bay Isle HOA.

Stated that she is in full support of the project; she has noticed that cars are now going slower; her two children want to walk or ride bikes to school, but there have been too many close calls; she feels the community was given enough notice, told what was happening, and everything was transparent: Amy Cianci, Alameda.

Stated making the lanes one instead of two with a large, buffered bike lane makes everyone feel safer; she loves biking to school; the new wide bike lane will hopefully slow cars; she hopes to be able to bike to school more often; thanked the Council and staff for their hard work and good decisions to make Alameda and Bay Farm a safer place for walkers and bikers: Sawyer Lewandowski, Alameda.

Urged Council to take no action on the referral; stated restriping is part of the City's routine pavement management program, which typically does not go before Council, and exists precisely so that routine resurfacing and safety improvements can move forward efficiently, based on staff expertise, data, City policy and plans, and prior public input; pausing the work now to revisit the matter at a Council meeting would not add meaningful new information; it would create delays, uncertainty, and potentially higher costs; it would delay safety improvements for people who use the corridor every day, such as drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, and families; the referral risks slowing down a project that was already vetted, funded, and

aligned with the City's goals: Cyndy Johnsen, BikeWalk Alameda.

Urged the Council not to take action on the referral and to continue to focus on the plans that are already made; the rest of the school year is here and she does not want further delays for the safety of the kids: Aparna Kota, Alameda.

Stated although he appreciates the concerns of the community, he does not support the referral; discussed a letter he sent to Council regarding legislation and policy work; shifting legislative priorities leads to shaky budgets and over budget projects that under-promise on deliveries; there are opportunities and time to figure out ways to make projects more effective, on budget and higher quality; Alameda has lots of infrastructure projects coming up; citizens want to see this government can deliver: Thushan Amarasiriwardena, Alameda.

Stated the referral is based upon an email message that contains a lot of misinformation; losing a car lane to add a new bike lane is simply not true; Mecartney Road has had a multi-use trail and a bike lane on either side for years; a car lane is being removed to make it easier for pedestrians to cross the street; in the long-term, both directions of travel on Mecartney Road should be condensed down to the north side of the median, and the south side should be converted into mixed-use housing and local small businesses; Bay Farm needs options for nearby storefronts, and a low-impact way to contribute to the Housing Element: Mitch Ball, Alameda.

Stated that she hopes Council will vote for the referral tonight; she does not think it was handled appropriately with enough transparency; Bay Farm residents are not aware in general and are not here tonight because they think it is a done deal; the matter should be opened back up; the bike path looks like it should be in a commercial area, not residential; urged Council to vote in favor of the referral: Rayla Graber, Alameda.

Stated that she is opposed to the lane changes; urged Council to vote in favor of the referral: Maureen Kraw, Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft discussed participating in the Mayor's Institute on Pedestrian Safety; stated that she appreciates all the comments and does not think Council needs to move forward and open the project; thanked the City Engineer for explaining this process; stated health and safety are her top priorities; people need to get out of their automobiles for so many reasons: the environment, to move traffic along, and for health and safety; she also represents the 14 cities of Alameda County on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission; a recent study shows travel patterns have stayed the same since the pandemic; more people are working from home, working hybrid, and are walking much more; there are some improvements that can be done; the City could do a lot more messaging in real time; she does not support any change at this time.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated that she also would not support any change at this time; discussed driving on Mecartney Road versus Otis Drive; she receives significant incident alerts regarding pedestrians or bicyclists getting hit by cars; she does not want to take action on the referral; she is committed to Vision Zero and would love to make Alameda's streets safer for everybody, including the next few generations.

Councilmember Daysog stated there have been references to Active Transportation Plan, the Vision Zero Plan, and the Transportation Choices Plan; the changes that are being done on

Alameda streets, including Fernside Avenue, Central Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue had incredibly robust community engagement processes; the residents of Harbor Bay Isle and Bay Farm are saying they need to be as much involved in planning of Mecartney Road; the safety questions being raised needs to be seriously vetted through a community-engaged process.

\*\*\*

(26-053) Councilmember Boller moved approval of adding three more minutes for Councilmembers to speak.

Councilmember Daysog seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmember Boller, Daysog, Jensen, Pryor - 4. Noes: Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft – 1.

\*\*\*

Councilmember Boller thanked Councilmember Daysog for the referral; stated that he does think it is flawed because it continues to have the objective of halting the work, which would be unsafe; City staff has done a tremendous job and has indicated they want more direction from Council going forward; there are times when the community should be heard, which is important; this could be the basis for further discussion regarding when it is appropriate to get additional Council input on projects; transparency in the community process is important; the Vision Zero Plan is very important; it is going to be a hard sell for the people who are in favor of the referral; the community has an uphill battle to convince staff that going back to the way the intersection was would somehow be safer; this matter is an opportunity to educate, and find the best way to have community input, so that staff can have more discretion; staff are the experts, not Council; requested the referral be amended and expanded to consider public input, but not to halt the project; stated it would be a policy discussion, not just about this particular project.

Councilmember Jensen stated that she is comfortable that the project has been vetted; information has been shared with the Transportation Commission and with the Harbor Bay HOAs; there have been public meetings and the City Council actually approved the pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular safety treatments on McCartney Road when the 2025 transportation update was approved; there have been concerns by the residents regarding a perceived lack of transparency by Council or staff; she does not believe that is the case; she agrees with Councilmember Boller's suggestion for opportunity for additional comment, but does not agree with the referral provision to stop any work on the project; she would oppose any changes, but the policy could be expanded for sharing information and learning more about projects; Alameda's Transportation Commission is very effective; they approved this plan and she has full faith in them; Council should give the Transportation Commission more support and input; she would recommend the item come back, not with the potential to halt the project, but with the potential to expand the options for sharing information about projects.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that staff may already be planning an improved and refined process of public engagement.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated that she is not opposed to staff presenting about next steps and going forward, but she does not think the item needs to come back to Council; she trusts staff would be able to figure it out and make good choices.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry regarding improving the public engagement process, the Public Works Director stated staff could do better at notifying impacted residents about presenting the project to the Transportation Commission; staff could send out an email

notice that the City is starting a public discourse about a project at the Transportation Commission and provide notice of the hearing.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft shared what she learned from the Mayor's Institute on Pedestrian Safety, is the need to communicate about a project before, during, and after in real time; folks should be out there in bright vests with clipboards, along with sandwich board signs with a QR code to get more information; invite the public and the Council to walking workshops whenever possible to actually walk the streets to see what is being done and why, which should be done during the times when that street is the busiest.

The Interim City Manager stated that he met with the City Attorney and staff with the intent to bring an item back to Council; there is a lot of opportunity for lessons learned and to also improve the process; staff is seeking direction to come back at a date uncertain with an outline of a process to get further direction from Council and move the whole discussion forward; Vision Zero and Alameda's Transportation Plan should be reaffirmed; some of the discussion will also come during the upcoming budget process when looking at capital improvement projects; with Council's support, staff would take direction tonight to come back with a staff report and an overview of a process that improves how to move forward on transportation projects specifically, and look at other projects as they come forth.

Councilmember Daysog stated the issue is not adequate public engagement, but rather meaningful public engagement; residents' concerns should somehow be constructively involved; he believes Council should put guardrails in when staff members are making decisions in the face of several facts that tell them they should go back to the City Council; in this case, the three main facts, include the resident's opposition to the roundabout at Island Drive and Mecartney Road, the Harbor Bay Homeowners Association position on the project, and major improvements authorized through the Vision Zero, the Transportation Choices Plan, and a whole host of documents still came to City Council; for the process to be served, Council cannot just let staff make the decisions; a deficiency has been revealed.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval of directing the City Attorney and the City Manager's Office to work together to recommend to the City Council updates and revisions to City policies and the Alameda Municipal Code, ensuring future construction projects receive appropriate review by the City Council, and to develop a communication and community engagement plan for future construction projects to ensure meaningful public engagement and inclusion.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she objects to Councilmember Daysog's characterization of City staff; Council heard a thorough explanation from the City Engineer of everything that proceeded and formed the basis of the decisions for this particular street.

In response to Councilmember Boller's inquiry regarding whether Councilmember Daysog would make a friendly amendment to the referral, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would support and encourage the Council to vote for the Interim City Manager's suggestion to have a staff report come back to Council on a process that improves how to move forward with transportation projects.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated that she would also support the Interim City Manager's suggestion; reiterated the three things the City Engineer said to consider: the technical issue, the public engagement issue, and legal authority.

Vice Mayor Pryor made a substitute motion to approve directing the City Attorney and City Manager to come back to Council at a future date with how the City will carry out Infrastructure projects that include, not just the technical specifications, but also the public engagement plan and the legal authority.

The City Clerk restated Councilmember Daysog's motion: to direct the City Attorney and the City Manager's Office to recommend updates and revisions to City policies and the Alameda Municipal Code, ensuring future construction projects receive appropriate review by the City Council, and to develop a communication and community engagement plan for future construction projects to ensure meaningful public engagement and inclusion.

Councilmember Boller seconded the original motion, which failed by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmember Boller and Daysog – 2. Noes: Vice Mayor Pryor and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft - 2. Abstention: Councilmember Jensen – 1.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft noted although the motion did not pass, staff plans on returning to Council with a staff report that will include more information on an improved process.

\*\*\*

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft called a recess at 9:15 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

\*\*\*

#### Regular Agenda Items - Continued

(26-054) Recommendation to Adopt the 2025 Zero Waste Implementation (ZWIP) Plan Update.

The Public Works Coordinator gave a Power Point presentation.

Stated that her organization very much supports adoption of the updated ZWIP; Alameda has had an excellent collection and processing infrastructure since 2001; the Plan focuses on behavior change, community-based social marketing, outreach and education; Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda (CASA) enjoys and supports being a partner with City staff in implementing the programs, including the reusable cup program and the monthly cleanup program at Alameda Point; CASA works with the Recreation and Parks Department on public events and schools programs, receives grant funding and provides technical assistance; CASA also has interns who have been researching options for potential future implementation of an updated foodware ordinance: Ruth Abbe, CASA.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry, the Public Works Coordinator stated 11 cafes across Alameda participate in the reusable coffee cup program; there is a lot of enthusiasm and support for reusables within those users; the residential survey revealed there was less support for extending reusables, some unawareness of the existing reusable cup program, and folks did not feel it is an effective strategy; they also said they did not want to have reusables to go, the process felt cumbersome and clunky, and there was not a lot of interest in that part of the program; the list of participating cafes can be found on the Public Works Zero Waste page.

Councilmember Jensen stated that she is the chair of the Alameda County Waste Management Authority; she has some authority to establish the requirements and the regulations for the County which are implemented by the City; City staff works really hard with Alameda County Waste Management staff on waste reduction goals; she appreciates that one of the focus areas

in the ZWIP will be outreach to tenants in multi-unit buildings; she would like to explore more rigorous ways to enforce and educate requirements for renters, tenants, and landlords; she is excited to hear the proposals regarding reusable foodware and tenant waste disposal; discussed the smoking prohibition in apartment buildings, multi-unit buildings, and rentals; suggested establishing a requirement through an ordinance or through Council action to require landlords to include waste sorting information in leases; stated that she plans to bring a referral to work with the rental program to develop some provisions in the City's lease language, similar to the no-smoking ordinance; she would also like to address the issue of illegal dumping.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated it would be interesting to see what the City could come up with regarding waste; it is important as the City gets closer to reaching its goals.

Councilmember Boller thanked staff for the update; stated it is exciting to see the progress; he is looking forward to seeing what Councilmember Jensen brings forward; the educational piece is such an important part; anything the City can do to be collaborative would be great.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he looks forward to implementing the various proposals in the presentation; Alameda should be proud of the improvements to reduce any amount of waste to landfill; the City should enjoy even more successes with the program.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she is really proud of all the work the City has done due to great staff and great community partners, like CASA.

Councilmember Jensen moved approval of the staff recommendation.

Vice Mayor Pryor seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

(26-055) Workshop to Receive an Update and Provide Feedback on the Disposition Strategy for Leasing and Sale of Properties within the Reuse Area at Alameda Point.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director gave a Power Point presentation.

In response to Councilmember Jensen's inquiry, the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated Building 41's lease is up in the fall; the City will need to contemplate a long-term future home for the tenant; start to think about the long-term future of the building would provide some certainty.

Councilmember Jensen inquired about the conveyance schedule for Building 400 adjacent to Buildings 11 and 12.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded more due diligence needs to be done; stated Building 400 is also owned by the Navy; the transaction will be complicated; the beginning of an idea that needs to be explored is creating better firewalls between the three buildings; hangar doors divide up the spaces.

In response to Councilmember Jensen's inquiry, the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated phases is referring to the infrastructure; Phase 3C is the next conveyance which is comprised of Building 41, the Building 400 complex, and a little bit of property near the former Pacific Fusion site; Building 400 and Building 41 will be conveyed simultaneously.

In response to Vice Mayor Pryor's inquiry regarding a grant, the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated reference to a grant means the City could look at available outside funding opportunities; sea level rise adaptation is one area where a grant might be available; another one is the Port Infrastructure Development Program, a federal grant that could repair the piers; the assumption should not be that the former Base will pay for itself; looking for existing opportunities is important; staff is also looking for grants for DePave Park, which is part of the Master Infrastructure Program (MIP).

In response to Councilmember Boller's inquiry, the Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated Kaiser Marston looked at revenue bonds for the 2023 disposition strategy effort; the City could consider the approach, which does not necessarily have to be backed with a long-term ground lease; it could be backed with any steady source of income; staff has not really contemplated the bond market because the strategy has been focused on the sale of land; staff is open to looking at more financing options if it is Council's direction.

Councilmember Boller stated it definitely seems worth reviewing and diving into to get a better sense; challenges make looking at all options sensible.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director concurred with Councilmember Boller; stated a ground lease is done when there is a reason to continue to own the land in the long term, which is not the direction the City has taken since it started receiving the land; capturing revenue on the long-term basis and capturing the gains could be done through sale as well; there are things that can be built into the deal structure where a share of the profits would be received upon sale.

Councilmember Boller stated there is an overall premise that when the market is low, it is important to find a way to stay the course until it improves and not sell valuable assets.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director stated there are some really compelling thoughts and ideas in the letter from Common Ground; the City's assets are not appreciating in value, they are depreciating, because assets received from the Navy already have deferred maintenance; the deferred maintenance is becoming more of a burden on the City; it is causing the assets to depreciate themselves; buildings are found to need new roofs or structural work when getting ready to sell, which comes out of the land value; the challenge is that the value of the assets is not correspondingly strengthening as the market strengthens, because the assets need so much work; the City's goal is not really to generate the maximum amount of revenue, it is to create the best place and generate the most economic development; creating momentum and doing it more quickly has other added benefits.

Councilmember Daysog inquired whether the City captures any amount of the sales proceeds to set aside for the long-discussed regional sports park or even long-term transportation solutions out at Alameda Point.

The Base Reuse and Economic Development Director responded that she does not know how things were done in the past; stated in 2023, the City amassed quite a fund balance in the Alameda Point Fund, which went towards investments in the Phase 1 infrastructure; in her observation over her two years with the City, it has been more piecemeal rather than setting aside little pots of funds for long-term infrastructure improvements.

Stated that he strongly supports selling more Alameda Point property; it would be great to get

the cash infusion for much-needed infrastructure; discussed the property management side; stated property management takes up a lot of time; there have been landlord challenges, both with businesses and individuals; dealing with landlords and tenants does not seem like the City's core expertise; getting out of the landlord business is a good direction to go: Paul Beusterien, Alameda.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated Alameda's policy of fiscal neutrality for Alameda Point is not quite fair; Alameda Point cannot receive funding from the main Island; when the Navy conveyed the property, the goal was to make it feel like one continuous City; a lot is asked of Alameda Point; the ferry terminal is very robust and busy during the work week; the Point also houses the Alameda Point Collaborative, formerly homeless individuals and families, Operation Dignity and Building Futures; there is also transitional housing at the Point and other non-profits; she would like to update the thinking; it is still a policy, but it does not need to say that only revenue generated at Alameda Point can be used for Alameda Point; the whole City budget needs balancing; the plan is great, but also daunting; the properties are just going to get older; the Base Reuse and Economic Development Department has laid out a really good strategy for the City; staying the course and staying flexible with the need to pivot; the market may change in a certain way, or a particular sector might present itself as an opportunity; Pacific Fusion was a great trial run for compiling an excellent proposal; choosing to go to another state was not for lack of opportunities at the Point, but was economic; the whole economy is in a holding pattern with a lot of uncertainty and flux; she supports everything brought forward to the Council on this matter.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated the report is thoughtful and presents creative options; staying flexible with the long-term solutions is important, especially since the properties will grow in value, even if the buildings do not.

(26-056) Introduction of Ordinance Authorizing the Interim City Manager to Execute a New Lease with Kai Concepts, LLC., a California Limited Liability Company, for Sixty Months for a Portion of Building 168, Located at 1651 Viking Street, Alameda, CA; and a Lease with Kai Concepts, LLC., for Sixty Months for a Portion of Pier 1, Located at Alameda Point, Alameda, CA. Introduced.

The Administrative Management Analyst gave a Power Point presentation.

Vice Mayor Pryor moved introduction of the ordinance.

Councilmember Jensen seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

(26-057) Introduction of Ordinance Authorizing the Interim City Manager to Execute a Five-Year Lease Agreement, in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$783,636, with G&I IX Marina Village Office Park LP for Approximately 6,944 Square Feet of Office Space Located at 1001 Marina Village Parkway to Serve as the Alameda Fire Department Administration Facility. Introduced.

The Fire Chief gave a Power Point presentation.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft inquired where the expanded decontamination area would be, to which the Fire Chief responded it would be in an area that comes off the apparatus base; Firefighters just coming back from medical calls or fire calls will have a decontamination room or corridor where they can clean up.

In response to Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's inquiry, the Fire Chief stated the decontamination area would be in a place that the staff would have to go through before going into the living space, which would probably be in the existing Firehouse; this would require the relocation of other functions in that portion of the building.

Councilmember Jensen inquired whether the Fire Department looked at other sites and how this site was selected.

The Fire Chief responded staff looked at other spaces in the City; City Hall West is completely full; the only other possible office space in usable condition that does not need a significant investment is the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters in Building 2, which is currently being utilized by other tenants.

Vice Mayor Pryor inquired whether the consolidation is the industry norm, to which the Fire Chief responded in the affirmative; stated most administrative divisions are all consolidated under one roof for efficiency, collaboration, and coordination; the work assignments and responsibilities of the Fire Department have increased; the space does not exist in a 1960s building; Fire Prevention had to find locations throughout the City; the Fire Department is dispersed over five locations.

Councilmember Boller stated there are a lot of different opportunities for synergy; there is a cost savings from combining the geography and the fact that the building could possibly be used in the long term; it is a good solution to move the City's infrastructure needs along; the enhancements and improvements with Fire Station 1 ultimately means better service for the residents.

The Fire Chief agreed with Councilmember Boller's comments; stated Fire Administration is working cohesively towards serving the community; vacating City Hall West leaves space that will be used very quickly by other City departments.

Councilmember Daysog thanked the Fire Chief for the presentation; inquired why the Emergency Operating Operations Center (EOC) cannot be utilized.

The Fire Chief responded that the EOC is a very mission-focused, task-purposed building to be there in the worst days and disaster response; the main floor of the building sits in a state of readiness and could not be occupied as day-to-day offices because it has to be ready to go at a moment's notice; the space is also used for City meetings and trainings, while maintaining a state of readiness; it is not configured to have cubicles; there are two office spaces on the ground floor that are used for breakout rooms; they currently are occupied by Emergency Management staff.

Vice Mayor Pryor stated Alameda is growing; with the Housing Element, more fires, and sea level rise, making the change now makes sense.

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft stated the landlord is very excited to have the Fire Department coming; the Police Department has a substation at Marina Village Business Park; the landlord likes the public safety aspect; it is a great idea and she fully supports it.

Councilmember Boller moved introduction of the ordinance.

Vice Mayor Pryor seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

City Manager Communications

None.

Oral Communications, Non-Agenda

None.

Council Communications

(26-058) Councilmember Daysog announced that he attended the grand reopening of the athletic field at Encinal High School on January 9 with Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft; the School District did a great job; the scoreboard was moved to side of the school; now the view of the bay can be seen completely.

(26-059) Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft announced that she attended and spoke at the Police Department swearing-in of two new officers on January 12; on January 14, she met with a Girl Scout troop who were recipients of gold and silver awards; she attended the Alameda County Mayor's Conference in Fremont later that evening; she participated in a League of California Cities webinar on e-bike regulations this morning with Councilmember Jensen, the Assistant City Manager, and a Police Lieutenant.

(26-060) Vice Mayor Pryor announced that she participated in a CASA cleanup at the Seaplane Lagoon on January 10 and the Point in Time count training with Councilmember Boller and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft today.

(26-061) Councilmember Jensen announced that the League of California Cities e-bike Forum was quite interesting; she hopes to bring some of the ideas to Alameda; discussed implementing Alameda County's Integrated Waste Management Plan and Hazardous Waste Management Plan; stated that she attended a recent meeting at Stop Waste for an update on the Plastic Pollution Packaging Producer Responsibility Act of 2022; she attended a memorial service for Alameda teacher and activist Gretchen Lipow on January 11.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft adjourned the meeting at 10:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger  
City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.