

ACORNS

Community Research Project

Acorns are one of the most important Indigenous food groups in California. They require careful drying and storage to remain safe and usable.

The use of ozone to kill harmful pathogens and pests is a new approach with promise. However, it has not been evaluated for safe consumption in acorns.

This research project seeks to understand what happens to the healthy fats inside of acorns when they are exposed to ozone.

Why This Matters

If ozone is going to be used in acorn storage, our communities deserve clear information first. This project focuses on evaluating food safety before new storage methods are adopted.

Upcoming Paid Focus Groups

We are hosting paid focus groups with Indigenous harvesters, processors, and community members.

We want to hear:

- How you dry and store acorns
- What pest issues you face
- Whether ozone has been discussed in your circles
- What information you would need before trusting this method

Participants will be compensated for their time.



Find out more!

How You Can Be Involved

- Join a paid focus group
- Help source clean acorns for testing
- Share experience related to storage practices

Acorns used for testing will be documented and handled carefully. Excess acorns will support reforestation and food use through The Acorn Mill.

Alameda Native History Project • UC Cooperative Extension • UC Davis Department of Plant Sciences
If this question affects your harvest or your community, we want to hear from you.

Contact: cmurillo@ucanr.edu • (510) 305-3256

Submitted by Gabriel Duncan
Under Oral Communications
3/3/2026

From: [Mitch B](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written Copy of non-Agenda Comment for 3/3/26 City Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 9:38:41 AM
Attachments: [3 3 26 City Council Figure \(1\).pdf](#)

Hello,

I will be making a non-agenda public comment for the 3/3/26 City Council Meeting and wanted to share a written copy with linked citations. In addition, I have attached a PDF figure to be presented during my comment as I have seen other non-agenda item commenters do. There are many nuances of impact fees calculations and only so much can fit into 3 minutes. Other concerns about impact fee calculation that should be addressed include the fact that developer improved parks have not been granting developers a discount on the parks and recreation fee and the very unrealistic expectation that cities should maintain the same acres of parkland per capita as they grow. Additionally, council members should also consider that while impact fee cost housing developers greatly they contribute a very small portion to the city budget.

Last Monday, the planning board commission previewed an early look at the housing element report and it showed a truly disastrous situation. While in our previous best year we weren't on pace to meet half of the RHNA targets, last year showed a uniquely poor performance with less than 10% of target permits issued. This is an emergency. While Alameda has met the housing element zoning requirements, zoning is no longer the bottleneck. California's housing crisis was not caused purely by bad zoning, but by an insidious nativist and xenophobic ideology that infiltrated and influenced municipal government decades ago producing harmful policies that now seem commonplace today. The new bottleneck is cost of construction, a large portion of which is municipally imposed. While last year's uniquely poor performance was in part caused by cost drivers outside of Alameda's control including tariffs, loss of labor, and the Palisades Fire, this should not be an excuse to wring our hands of responsibility, but a wake up call that more drastic action to reverse the injustices of the past need to be taken.

One of the largest municipal cost contributors are impact fees and they are incredibly high in California with average impact fees nearly twice as high as the next state (<http://www.impactfees.com/publications%20pdf/2019survey.pdf>). While impact fees must be justified within a nexus study to be "roughly proportional" to the cost new development imposes on a city, there are many ways to calculate these fees and many cities have traditionally selected somewhat questionable methodology to produce higher fees. It appears that the last nexus study Alameda produced in 2014 (<https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/assets/public/v/1/publicworks/development-impact-fee-update-2014.pdf>) took that approach after losing a lawsuit in 2019 and had to be revised to not include parkland land acquisition (<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3991248&GUID=51A9206A-8FB4-413E-AA01-EA2D884BBEE3&FullText=1>). But within that revision, the estimated cost of parkland improvement was somehow conveniently doubled replacing one questionable justification with another.

One of our planning board members, Andy Wang, has previously thoughtfully proposed to city council a temporary impact fee discount to enable construction of more housing projects (<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7727809&GUID=542F5E0A-07C6->

[437E-9DF1-6093075C5293](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB602)). I would like to offer one of many ways that Alameda should apply this discount both temporarily and in its upcoming nexus study (https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB602).

Most impact fees within the 2014 study were calculated by taking the total value of all future or new city infrastructure and dividing it by the projected number of all future or new units. Here's the problem with that: While the RHNA target is 5,353 units over 8 years, this nexus study projects 4,600 units over 27 years amplifying the impact fees. The impact fee calculations assume we fail to meet housing targets and by virtue of that assumption, ensure that that's what happens! If Alameda is serious about solving the housing shortage crisis, it needs to use the RHNA targets to calculate its impact fees. We shouldn't be planning to fail.

Every year, more people in Alameda lose their homes, more young people leave the island knowing they'll never be able to afford to return, and more couples in Alameda give up on the dream of ever starting a family. This is all because for decades we haven't built enough housing. Previously, this was as an intentional outcome of policy designed to keep poor people, immigrants, and people of colour out. Now, it's because we haven't done nearly enough to reform this draconian policy design.

Thank you,
-Mitch Ball

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Targets

Jurisdiction	Alameda	
Reporting Year	2023	(Jan. 1 - Dec. 31)
Planning Period	6th Cycle	01/01/2023 - 01/01/2031

ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT Housing Element Implementation

This table is auto-populated once you enter your jurisdiction name and current year data. Past year information comes from previous APRs. Please contact HCD if your data is different than the material supplied here.

Table B Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress Permitted Units Issued by Affordability														
Income Level	RHNA Allocation by Income Level	Projection Period - 06/30/2023-01/01/2023	2								Total Units to Date (all years)	Total Remaining RHNA by Income Level		
			2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030			2031	
Acutely Low	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		47	1	66	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	-
Extremely Low	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	1,421	8	32	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	209	1,212
Very Low	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	816	11	9	4	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	95	763
Low	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	868	82	8	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	142	726
Moderate	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	2,248	9	13	14	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	257	1,989
Unaffordable	Deepest Restricted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-Deepest Restricted	5,353	87	92	80	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	663	4,690
Total Units			701	445	243	65	-	-	-	-	-	-	663	4,690

Total RHNA 5,353

2031 - 2023 = 8 years

5353 units

8 years

≠

2014 Impact Fee Nexus Study Housing Unit Assumptions

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2040</u>	<u>Increase</u>
Residents ¹	73,100	81,360	8,260
Dwelling Units ²			
Single Family	16,900	19,300	2,400
Multi-family	15,300	17,500	2,200
Total	<u>32,200</u>	<u>36,800</u>	<u>4,600</u>

2040 - 2013 = 27 years

4600 units

27 years