| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | MiChelle Fredrick |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; tjensen@alameda.gov |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D --- Please maintain 4 to 1 voting requirement |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 2, 2024 3:07:34 PM |

---

Mayor and Council Members:

Please maintain the existing 4 to 1 voting requirement for sale or lease of City-held properties.

Decisions regarding disposal of City property require careful consideration and must have broad approval. Too often decisions have been made in the past without considering their long-term consequences. Disposal of City property will be difficult, if not impossible, to reverse. Once it's gone, it's gone forever. The super majority of 4 to 1 intentionally makes it more difficult to dispose of property and requires careful analysis of land use, thoughtful discussion of future impacts, and consensus among the voters.

One has only to look at the fallout from recent Supreme Court decisions to understand the importance of thoughtful decision-making on behalf of the people that government bodies are sworn to protect. The Court's recent rulings have substantially eroded the rights - and the trust - of citizens while ceding more and more power to the select few. Please do not set that trend in motion here in Alameda.

Maintain the 4 to 1 super majority for these critical decisions.

Thank you
Mi'Chelle Fredrick
Alameda Resident for 33 years

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Carol Gottstein |
| **To:** | City Clerk; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Tracy Jensen |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] 7-2-2024 Council mtg: Agenda Item 7-D. Supermajority for Lease Approvals |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 2, 2024 2:49:11 PM |

---

Dear Alameda Mayor and City Council:

I strongly oppose the proposal to reduce the current 4-1 council super-majority requirement for approval of sales or leases of City-owned real property. Such crucial decisions should not be made based on a simple 3-2 majority.

Recently, questionable businesses such as Science and failing businesses such as Astra, domiciled or seeking domicile at the Point, have come to the attention of the community provoking considerable discussion. In addition, we had the salt spray incident at the Hornet. The Alameda Community needs to continue to be ever vigilant as to what is going on out there. Business entities seeking leases must be well known to the public, which is best achieved by ensuring that as many Council members as possible are vetting them before a long lease is awarded.

Please keep the supermajority requirement. Thank you.

Carol Gottstein
Alameda, CA 94501

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | patricia.lamborn@aol.com |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Tracy Jensen; Malia Vella |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] City Council Agenda Item 7-D July 2,2024 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 2, 2024 1:56:59 PM |

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, and Council members Daysog, Spencer , Jensen and Vella,

I am writing to strongly oppose placing any of the options presented in the staff report on the July 2 agenda item 7-D. I do not believe it is safe or in the public interest to reduce the 4-1 council super-majority for sales or leases of city real estate.

We know that in 2024 the City is engaged in a unique project compared to other Bay area cities, the sale and leasing of hundreds of acres at Alameda Point. Decisions on placing any of the real estate in private hands has raised a multitude of issues including what is appropriate for the sites, protection of historic sites, the nature and location of the businesses and residences that should be placed there, protection of views of the Bay, preservation of open space, environmental concerns, etc.

I have had personal experience in the last few years with our City Council making decisions to convert open space to commercial space and then proceed to illegally approve developer plans out of compliance with the specific zoning constraints. A super majority of Council members reviewing and needing to vote on sales and leases means that due diligence will be expected, required and achieved.

The importance of these decisions to the future of the City requires the broad Council consensus that the current Charter provides.

Sincerely,
Pat Lamborn
32 years, Alameda Resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Reyla Graber |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Trish Spencer; Tracy Jensen |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Urge the Council to vote NO on Agenda Item7D |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 2, 2024 1:49:35 PM |

---

Dear Mayor and City Council Members

Our real estate  properties are too valuable and too important to have them sold or leased with just  3 votes of the Council. For 80 year 4 votes have been required and this has been successful. Do not change it now because one or 2 council members don't like it. Also, your approval would necessitate putting it on the Novmember ballot with all the money and effort and time involved
Please don't spend many thousands of dollars  putting it on the November ballot, as it is predicted too fail at the ballot box.
It doesn't matter what other cities do or don't. Alameda is Alameda and besides being a Charter City,  the residents demand that the City takes financial matters and community matters seriously. Therefore, the supermajority 4 votes is  appropriate and right  for Alameda, thereby providing broad approval for the dispostion of our extremely valuable real property.
Sincerely,
Reyla Graber
Alamed resident

**From:** Trish Spencer
**To:** Lara Weisiger
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D
**Date:** Tuesday, July 2, 2024 12:05:07 PM

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Suzanne Bernhard <sjbernhard52@yahoo.com>
Date: Jun 30, 2024 7:59 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

> Do not vote to reduce votes needed to sell city real estate assets. Keep super majority.
> Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Trish Spencer
**To:** Lara Weisiger
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Please Vote No on decreasing voting standards
**Date:** Tuesday, July 2, 2024 12:05:07 PM

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Kathleen Valerio <kathleen.vlr10@gmail.com>
Date: Jun 30, 2024 11:04 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Please Vote No on decreasing voting standards
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>,Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>,Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>,Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

> VOTE NO "ON DECREASING VOTING STANDARDS FOR OUR CITY PROPERTIES FROM 4 CC VOTES TO ONLY 3 VOTES.
> Alamedans need to keep a close watch on city development. There are too many developers out there just looking to make a quick buck, but we live here and want to maintain our friendly parks and neighborhoods.
>
> Thanks
> --
> Kathleen Valerio
> 206 Baywood Road
> Alameda, CA 94501
>
> --
> Kathleen Valerio
>
> "Life isn't about finding yourself. Life is about creating yourself." - *George Bernard*

**From:** GARY THOMPSON
**To:** CityCouncil-List; lweisiger@alamedaca.gov
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Vote NO on CITY CHARTER CHANGE!
**Date:** Tuesday, July 2, 2024 11:29:18 AM

---

The city charter requires a super majority vote of the council to sell or lease real estate assets. This was passed more than 80 years ago for a very good reason! The concentration of power into such a small group regarding this beautiful cities assets is dangerous and unwise.
PLEASE VOTE NO ON A CHANGE FROM SUPER MAJORITY!!
Gary Thompson
Alameda Resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Geralyn Gulseth |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Tracy Jensen |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] PROPOSAL RE: Sale and Leasing of Alameda property |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 1, 2024 10:23:22 PM |

---

Good Evening -

I am writing to ask to please vote NO on agenda item 7D. Please keep the status quo and do not make any changes to how city property is sold or leased.

As a longtime homeowner, I want the character of our city maintained and our property values protected. The way Alameda has dealt with these issues in the past should continue. We need to have a super majority to ensure that proper consideration is given to all proposals for the use of our land.

In addition, any change would necessitate a ballot measure, an unnecessary expense.

Please vote against any changes.

Thank you
Geralyn Gulseth
Harbor Bay homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Jay |
| **To:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Cc:** | Jay |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Letter of Opposition to Item 5D re elimination of Supermajority Requirement |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 1, 2024 10:21:58 PM |
| **Attachments:** | Letter in opposition to Item7D.docx |

---

Hello, Madam City Clerk.

Sorry about the late hour of my correspondence re tomorrows CC meeting. I'm only now going over the agenda.

I would appreciate it if you would add the attached letter of opposition to Item 7D's Correspondence file.

I don't believe there will be any letters of support from individual residents of the City. Maybe from realtors and/or other commercial interests looking for business, but not individual residents. That's only a guess, but it's a guess based on how well I know and understand the interests of my neighbors here in Alameda.

Thank you.

Jay Garfinkle

July 1, 2024

RE: Item 7D on July 2, 2024, City Council meeting Agenda

Honorable members of the Alameda City Council,

I am offering this correspondence in **opposition** to the adoption of Item 7D.

As a lifelong resident of our city, I strongly encourage you to preserve the current requirement for a supermajority on votes related to leasing and/or selling any/all of the city's assets, especially our real estate, whether it be at The Point or elsewhere in the City.

Alameda is in the unusual position of owning a number of unused and/or underused properties. I can understand the urge to dispose of as many of them as quickly as possible. But there should be an over-arching plan in place, a more specific plan than what we might have at the present time

It seems to me that the residents of Alameda should have a major say in how we proceed. I would prefer that it not be left up to Staff, many of whom may have no personal investment in our city other than as a source income. I am not saying this to disparage any member of the Staff, but it is an inescapable fact.

I would also be reluctant to allow these decisions to ride on the vote of a simple majority of three members.

Respectfully,

Jay Garfinkle

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kathleen Anderson |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Tracy Jensen |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] NO on agenda item 7D |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 1, 2024 10:14:28 PM |

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog and Council Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen,

I urge you to vote NO on City Council agenda item 7D. The council should maintain the 4 votes super majority and not lower it to only 3 votes.

This is especially important at a time in Alameda's history in which many important decisions are pending regarding the sale or lease of our valuable city property that raise a variety of concerns. Broad council consensus is even more critical now.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Anderson
Alameda resident

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Donna Fletcher |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Tracy Jensen; Malia Vella |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Fletcher Comment on Item 7-D (July 2, 2024 Council Meeting) |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 1, 2024 7:17:45 PM |

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Members of the Council,

Please do not consider a ballot measure that changes the current requirement that sales of City property be approved with a 4 to 1 affirmative vote by council members. I did not see a strong rationale made in the staff presentation for Item 7-D that warrants the drastic action of changing our City Charter.

Our City's real property--and more significantly the hundreds of acres of Alameda Point property sitting on San Francisco Bay--are without question our City's greatest assets. As such, I would like to see that our decisions to accept specific offers or proposals, are based on a) the solid consensus of what's best for Alameda that the current 4 to 1 vote represents, and b) a comprehensive viable master plan that provides guidance and direction to the private interests interested in developing at Alameda Point.

*What is our master plan for the Point?* It could greatly facilitate cohesive decision-making by council members according to issues that our community values such as "what is appropriate for the site, protection of historic sites, the nature and location of the businesses and residences that should be placed there, protection of views of the Bay and San Francisco skyline, preservation of open space, environmental concerns, etc." as suggested by the Alameda Citizens Task Force (A.C.T.).

If the Council is evaluating the development opportunities before us based on the community values represented in our master plan, I believe their decision-making will be less susceptible to controversy, and more inclined to unanimity.

Thank you for your consideration,
Donna Fletcher
112 Centre Court
Alameda

**From:** Amy Wooldridge
**To:** Manager Manager; Jennifer Ott; Lara Weisiger
**Cc:** Brandon Sheirich
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D July 2 Meeting, Super Majority
**Date:** Monday, July 1, 2024 4:19:11 PM

---

Hi Lara,

Please see public comment below for this item.

Amy Wooldridge, she/her
Assistant City Manager
awooldridge@alamedaca.gov
(510) 747-4709

---

**From:** Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
**Sent:** Monday, July 1, 2024 3:21 PM
**To:** Jennifer Ott <jott@alamedaca.gov>
**Cc:** Brandon Sheirich <bsheirich@alamedaca.gov>; Amy Wooldridge <AWooldridge@alamedaca.gov>
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D July 2 Meeting, Super Majority

From CM email (J)

---

**From:** Charles Bret <sfczech4@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Friday, June 28, 2024 9:51 PM
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>; City Attorney <cityattorney@alamedacityattorney.org>
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D July 2 Meeting, Super Majority

**Strongly disagree** with eliminating the presently required super majority for selling or leasing city land. The rush to build on every available space on the island without regard to establishing the needed infrastructure, emergency evacuation, let alone the present nice character of Alameda with appropriate zoning, is a travesty. Already we have high rises cropping up in the middle of single family areas as well as multi units. Is there any master plan for the City? Seems not! Well we need one.

I lived in SF where the Fillmore district was razed and still not redeveloped. Wiped out a vibrant black neighborhood that has never come back,full of Victorian Queen Annes, like here, then they spent money to physically move the few remaining ones to Japan Town. At least residential area have a 40' limit. We could do without the first and need the latter. Your plan is clearly political. Is Alameda that desperate for property taxes?

Bottom line, I see no reason to make the rush to development easier. Inform the people and let them decide. That's call democracy and I vote!

Charles Bret..... 1215 Pacific Avenue, Alameda.

" When the debate is lost, slander becomes the tool of the loser."
Socrates

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | FEDERICO ROCHA |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; tjensen@alameda.gov |
| **Cc:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Vote NO on Decreasing Voting Standards on the Sale of Alameda City Properties from 4 CC Votes to only 3 CC Votes |
| **Date:** | Monday, July 1, 2024 10:07:36 AM |

---

Dear Alamada City Council,

We support keeping the voting standard of requiring 4 city council member votes to sell Alameda's city properties.  Please vote to keep this standard in place.

Regarda,

Vicki Lane
Federico Rocha

**From:** Robert Park
**To:** Lara Weisiger; mezzyashcrat@alamedaca.gov; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Tracy Jensen
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I oppose recommendation to Consider Amending Charter Section 3-10
**Date:** Monday, July 1, 2024 9:50:26 AM

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog and Council Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

I strongly object to the recommendation to Consider Amending Charter Section 3-10 to Eliminate the Supermajority Vote Requirement File # 2024-4067.

The recommendation is based on the following two pieces of research:
1) No historical evidence can be found for adding the four-vote requirement.
2) Other cities, except one, do not have a supermajority requirement.

Neither fact presented is an argument explaining why time and considerable expense be devoted to placing this Charter amendment measure on the ballot for voter consideration. I presume therefore, that the only true reason this recommendation is being considered is for convenience of a three member council coalition that wants control of the selling process of City Property. In other words, Politics.

Again, I strongly oppose placing any of the options presented in the staff report on the July 2 agenda item 7-D which would place reduce the 4-1 council supermajority for sales or leases of city real estate.

Robert C. Park
9 Coleport Landing
Alameda, CA 94502

**From:** Dorothy Freeman
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Lara Weisiger; Manager Manager
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Agenda July 2, 2024 Item 7-D
**Date:** Monday, July 1, 2024 8:58:03 AM

---

Alameda City Council Agenda July 2, 2024 – Item 7-D

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog, and Council Mmembers, Vella, Spencer, and Jensen;

City real property is owned by the citizens of the City of Alameda. Each person elected to the city council represents those who have voted for them. Before any city owned property can be sold or leased it should be voted on by the representatives of the largest number of citizens possible.

The city council owes it to the public to protect our city property in every way possible including having at least 4 members of the city council vote affirmatively before selling or leasing our city property. The people of Alameda have voted for this responsibility to be part of our city charter for a very long time and there is not a real good reason that it needs to be reconsidered.

The citizens of other cities may have a different idea of how their city owned property should be managed but that doesn't mean Alameda has to change to be like them. Why does what they do have anything to do with what should be done in Alameda? Also, why is it even being considered to waste $35,000 to $50,000 of public tax dollars to place these items on the general election ballot for something that is a totally made-up problem. I urge you to vote to not place either the sale of city property or the leasing of city property on the ballot for a vote.

Respectfully,
Dorothy Freeman

Cc: City Clerk
City Manager

**From:** Trish Spencer
**To:** Lara Weisiger
**Subject:** Fwd: Item 7-D July 2 Meeting, Super Majority
**Date:** Saturday, June 29, 2024 6:14:30 PM

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Charles Bret <sfczech4@yahoo.com>
Date: Jun 29, 2024 12:51 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D July 2 Meeting, Super Majority
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>,Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>,Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>,Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>,Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>,Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>,City Attorney <cityattorney@alamedacityattorney.org>
Cc:

> **Strongly disagree** with eliminating the presently required super majority for selling or leasing city land. The rush to build on every available space on the island without regard to establishing the needed infrastructure, emergency evacuation, let alone the present nice character of Alameda with appropriate zoning, is a travesty. Already we have high rises cropping up in the middle of single family areas as well as multi units. Is there any master plan for the City? Seems not! Well we need one.
>
> I lived in SF where the Fillmore district was razed and still not redeveloped. Wiped out a vibrant black neighborhood that has never come back,full of Victorian Queen Annes, like here, then they spent money to physically move the few remaining ones to Japan Town. At least residential area have a 40' limit. We could do without the first and need the latter. Your plan is clearly political. Is Alameda that desperate for property taxes?
>
> Bottom line, I see no reason to make the rush to development easier. Inform the people and let them decide. That's call democracy and I vote!
>
> Charles Bret..... 1215 Pacific Avenue, Alameda.
>
> " When the debate is lost, slander becomes the tool of the loser."
> Socrates

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Trish Spencer |
| **To:** | Lara Weisiger |
| **Subject:** | Fwd: [EXTERNAL] IMPORTANT: Re 6/25 Tues. 7:00 : Urge NO vote by City Council on Agenda Item 7D: We should not lower our voting standard from 4 to 3. |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, June 26, 2024 8:51:20 PM |

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Reyla Graber <reylagraber@aol.com>
Date: Jun 24, 2024 10:52 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] IMPORTANT: Re 6/25 Tues. 7:00 : Urge NO vote by City Council on Agenda Item 7D: We should not lower our voting standard from 4 to 3.
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>,Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>,Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>,Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>,Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Dear Friends and Neighbors:
**Yes, this issue is arriving really late to you but its important.** ***Truly important!!***
If you agree with Paul Foreman's letter to the City Council( below)
Will you please send your own email to the Council urging them to vote NO on lowering the voting standard from 4 votes to only 3 votes when it comes to selling or leasing our very valuable City property. Alameda residents, the public , should be concerned about city property disposal as we, the public. have supported and maintained these properties for years thru our taxes.
**Why lower the standard now after 80 years of the 4 votes being successful:** The CityCouncil should maintain the 4 votes super majority. It should not be lowered to only 3 votes.
Will you please, before Tuesday afternoon if possible ,send a very **brief email** to the Council urging them not to support lowering the voting standard from 4 to 3 on Agend item 7-D tomorrow evening Tuesday/
You can also speak in person on this at City Hall or on the City zoom.
**Council email addresses are below.**
Thank you,
Reyla Graber

# *ACT*

## Alameda Citizens Task Force

**Vigilance, Truth, Civility**

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog and Council Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

ACT strongly opposes placing any of the options presented in the staff report on the July 2 agenda item 7-D which would place reduce the 4-1 council super-majority for sales or leases of city real estate.

Due the fact that the form of Council minutes in 1943, when the super majority provision was added to the Charter, did not preserve any comments from council members or the public we don't know the rationale of that City Council for the super-majority requirement, but we must assume that both City Council and the voters who approved the ballot measure felt that the disposition of city real estate was an important matter that should have broad approval.

Most importantly, we know that in 2024 the City is engaged in a unique project compared to other Bay area cities, the sale and leasing of hundreds of contiguous acres at Alameda Point consisting of a large portion of the developable land in the city. Decisions on placing any of the real estate in private hands has raised a multitude of issues concerning the overall planning on what is appropriate for the site, protection of historic sites, the nature and location of the businesses and residences that should be placed there, protection of views of the Bay and San Francisco skyline, preservation of open space, environmental concerns, etc.

It is ironic that Council has not questioned the super majority rule for over eighty years, but now considers repealing it just when the most important land use decisions in the City's history are being made, decisions which should have a broad Council consensus before being made.

We understand the frustration of Council Members in having to achieve a super majority, but the importance of these decisions to the future of the City requires the broad Council consensus that the current Charter provides. If it is placed on the November ballot by a simple majority of the City Council, it will be seen by the public as a purely political act. We are confident that the voters of Alameda will reject it.

Sincerely,

ACT Board of Directors.

CC email addresses: mezzyashcrat@alamedagov.net, tdaysog@alamedagov.net, tspencer@alamedagov.net, mvella@alamedagov.net, tjensen@alamedagov.net
City Clerk: lweisiger@alamedagov.net

**From:** Trish Spencer
**To:** Lara Weisiger
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] July 2 Agenda Item 7-D
**Date:** Wednesday, June 26, 2024 8:42:35 PM

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Alexandra Petrich <apetrich@earthlink.net>
Date: Jun 25, 2024 7:13 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] July 2 Agenda Item 7-D
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>,Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>,Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>,Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>,Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Dear Mayor Ashcroft, Vice-Mayor Daysog, and Council-Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

I strongly oppose the proposal to reduce the current 4-1 council super-majority requirement for approval of sales or leases of City-owned real property.

Such crucial decisions should not be made based on a simple 3-2 majority.

Very truly yours,

Alexandra Petrich

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Madlen |
| **To:** | CityCouncil-List |
| **Cc:** | SRM - Ernst Development Partners; Power Engineering Construction Co.; Vox Populi; McGuire and Hester |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] July 2, agenda item 7-D support letter |
| **Date:** | Wednesday, June 26, 2024 9:49:44 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Outlook-glmezjyl.png<br>Support Letter_Charter Amendment.pdf |

---

Honorable Mayor and councilmembers

Please see attached our support letter for Agenda item 7-D July 2nd meeting.

Thank you

**Madlen Saddik**

President & CEO

**o**:510.522.0414 | **m**:650.954.0848

**w**: alamedachamber.com

**e**:madlen@alamedachamber.com

*Click here to find me on LinkedIn*

***Click Here to Schedule a Meeting With Me***


*"The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others."*

Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance
2215-A S Shore Center
Alameda, CA 94501
T: (510) 522-0414
madlen@alamedachamber.com

July 2, 2024

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers
Agenda item 7-D
Recommendation to Consider Amending Charter Section 3-10

Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance strongly supports the proposed Charter Amendment to reduce the requirement for a supermajority vote of the Council to a simple majority for the lease or sale of City property. We urge you to vote in favor of placing it on the November ballot for consideration by Alameda voters.

The Charter provision is over 80 years old and does not consider today's economic environment. Since the Navy conveyed the Alameda Naval Base to the City, we have witnessed the tremendous transformation of a property that is the crown jewel of the East Bay. From climate tech businesses like Rain.aero, Natel Energy, and Saildrone to emerging technologies like Navier boats, Pyka and recently a new addition to Spirits Alley, The Gold Bar Spirits, Alameda is creating an innovation hub at the Point.

The Council needs more flexibility to continue attracting and retaining businesses in new and emerging sectors. This amendment is vital for the continued growth and economic stability of our city, especially at Alameda Point.

The dated requirement for a supermajority vote often results in delays and hinders the City's ability to act swiftly to approve leases or sales of city-owned properties. Transitioning to a simple majority – the standard for almost every surrounding city in the Bay Area - still allows for a thorough review and evaluation of leasing and sale opportunities while streamlining a fair and democratic process that positions Alameda as a competitive destination for new business.

We strongly encourage you to support this Charter Amendment and advocate for its placement on the November 5th ballot, when the voters can decide on fostering an environment that is welcoming to businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Madlen Saddik*

Madlen Saddik
CEO/President
madlen@alamedachamber.com
Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance

**From:** ACT
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Trish Spencer; Tracy Jensen; Manager Manager; City Clerk; Yibin Shen
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-D on July 2 City Council Agenda
**Date:** Tuesday, June 25, 2024 10:03:05 AM

# *ACT*

## Alameda Citizens Task Force

**Vigilance, Truth, Civility**

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog and Council Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

ACT strongly opposes placing any of the options presented in the staff report on the July 2 agenda item 7-D which would reduce the 4-1 council super-majority requirement for sales or leases of city real estate.

Due to the fact that the form of Council minutes in 1943, when the super majority provision was added to the Charter, did not preserve any comments from council members or the public we don't know the rationale of that City Council for the super-majority requirement, but we must assume that both City Council and the voters who approved the ballot measure felt that the disposition of city real estate was an important matter that should have broad approval.

Most importantly, we know that in 2024 the City is engaged in a unique project compared to other Bay Area cities, the sale and leasing of hundreds of contiguous acres at Alameda Point consisting of a large portion of the developable land in the city. Decisions on placing any of the real estate in private hands has raised a multitude of issues concerning the overall planning on what is appropriate for the site, protection of historic sites, the nature and location of the businesses and residences that should be placed there, protection of views of the Bay and San Francisco skyline, preservation of open space, environmental concerns, etc.

It is ironic that Council has not questioned the super majority rule for over eighty years, but now considers repealing it just when the most important land use decisions in the City's history are being made, decisions which should have a broad Council consensus before being

made.

We understand the frustration of Council Members in having to achieve a super majority, but the importance of these decisions to the future of the City requires the broad Council consensus that the current Charter provides. If it is placed on the November ballot by a simple majority of the City Council, it will be seen by the public as a purely political act. We are confident that the voters of Alameda will reject it.

Sincerely,

ACT Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Edward Sing |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Tracy Jensen; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella |
| **Cc:** | City Clerk; alamedacitizenstaskforce@gmail.com |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Fw: IMPORTANT: Re 6/25 Tues. 7:00 : Urge NO vote by City Council on Agenda Item 7D: We should not lower our voting standard from 4 to 3. |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, June 25, 2024 9:44:04 AM |

TO: Alameda City Council Members

I do NOT support lowering the voting standard from 4 to 3 on Agenda item 7-D.

I am in agreement with the opposition posed by A.C.T., below, to any change in this voting standard.

Respectfully,

Ed Sing
Alameda Resident 27 Years

# *ACT*

## Alameda Citizens Task Force

**Vigilance, Truth, Civility**

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog and Council Members Vella, Spencer, and Jensen:

ACT strongly opposes placing any of the options presented in the staff report on the July 2 agenda item 7-D which would place reduce the 4-1 council super-majority for sales or leases of city real estate.

Due the fact that the form of Council minutes in 1943, when the super majority provision was added to the Charter, did not preserve any comments from council members or the public we don't know the rationale of that City Council for the super-majority requirement, but we must assume that both City Council and the voters who approved the ballot measure felt that the disposition of city real estate was an important matter that should have broad approval.

Most importantly, we know that in 2024 the City is engaged in a unique project compared to other Bay area cities, the sale and leasing of hundreds of contiguous acres at Alameda Point consisting of a large portion of the developable land in the city. Decisions on placing any of the real estate in private hands has raised a multitude of issues concerning the overall planning on what is appropriate for the site, protection of historic sites, the nature and location of the businesses and residences that should be placed there, protection of views of the Bay and San Francisco skyline, preservation of open space, environmental concerns, etc.

It is ironic that Council has not questioned the super majority rule for over eighty years, but now considers repealing it just when the most important land use decisions in the City's history are being made, decisions which should have a broad Council consensus before being made.

We understand the frustration of Council Members in having to achieve a super majority, but the importance of these decisions to the future of the City requires the broad Council consensus that the current Charter provides. If it is placed on the November ballot by a simple majority of the City Council, it will be seen by the public as a purely political act. We are confident that the voters of Alameda will reject it.

Sincerely,

ACT Board of Directors.

CC email addresses: mezzyashcrat@alamedagov.net, tdaysog@alamedagov.net, tspencer@alamedagov.net, mvella@alamedagov.net, tjensen@alamedagov.net
City Clerk: lweisiger@alamedagov.net

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Susan Natt |
| **To:** | Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Lara Weisiger; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Trish Spencer |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] No on 7-D |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, June 25, 2024 7:08:33 AM |

---

**I am writing to request that you leave the required 4 votes standard in place. I feel having this super majority is in best interest for our city.** It should not be lowered to only 3 votes.
It seems like the only reason to do so would be so it's easier for council members to "get things done" and ease of doing business should not be the goal when it comes to long term decisions that could greatly and negatively impact Alameda. I realize you do not have an easy job and frankly it must be exhausting getting anything accomplished sometimes but that is just the nature of city politics.
Please consider leaving well enough alone on this topic.