

From: [Alameda Citizens Task Force](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Greg Boller](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Attorney](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 5D on City Council's September 16, 2025, meeting agenda
Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025 1:50:46 PM

ACT

Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

Honorable Mayor and Members of the Alameda City Council,

We, the Board of the Alameda Citizens Task Force, are asking for clarification of the Agreements presented in Item 5D. We are not questioning the value or appropriateness of the City's participation in the project described but are simply requesting an explanation of what exactly is involved.

Of concern to us is that the City Manager who sits ex-officio on the PUB appears to be treating this as an urgent matter without what we consider to be an adequate explanation. Note that per the Staff Report this Consent Agenda item is calendared for the September 16, 2025, meeting in response to a PUB resolution that will be made at their next scheduled meeting on September 15th.

After reviewing the three exhibits comprising Item 5D, we are requesting discussion of the following factors:

1. The power supply under consideration is **not expected** to be available until **2029**. So why the urgency for signing the agreements?
2. The contract calls for our proportionate funding of **all** costs of operation, but it isn't clear if such costs are to include the cost of acquisition, regulatory compliance issues, and construction of the facility.
3. When will the City be required to provide its **non-refundable** Security Deposit and start making monthly payments?
4. Has our City Attorney evaluated the agreements?
5. The City is to be indemnified against certain losses with an exception for those that might be caused by simple negligence. Is it reasonable to exempt simple negligence? This would be a question for the City Attorney.

6. The proposed project is claimed to be exempt from CEQA regulations. Does our City Attorney agree with this assertion?

We acknowledge that participation in this proposed project will likely prove to be a worthwhile endeavor for the City, the above considerations notwithstanding. We would, however, request public clarification of the above issues for the benefit of Alameda's residents before the Council acts on Item 5D.

Thank you.

Alameda Citizens Task Force Board of Directors