

From: theresemhall@aol.com
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting Nov 30: Proposed Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 6:34:46 PM

Dear Council Members,

Background: Recently adopted State Statutes

SB10: Parcels in job-rich areas that are located near high-quality public transportation are eligible for the SB10 statute that allows up to 10 units per parcel to be built, the construction of which is not subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act CEQA

SB9: Additionally, all parcels within Single Family Neighborhoods may be split without any local discretionary review or compliance with CEQA while allowing for up to 10 units to be built.

I am part of the 60% that voted to maintain Single Family homes in Alameda (originally Article 26) and unlike zoning ordinances passed by local government, this ordinance was adopted at the ballot by initiative measure and may not be amended or repealed without a vote by the people. At the the State level, state provisions allowing legislators to override our local zoning restrictions is unconstitutional and is being challenged in court. At the local level, rezoning needs to be put back to a vote by Alamedans before the Planning Department and Council adopt new zoning restrictions and embed them in our Charter.

Until then, in order to meet the Regional Housing Needs requirements, State ordinances may be employed to build out new homes throughout R1 neighborhoods without any local government restrictions or interference.

Additionally, upzoning in R2-R6 neighborhoods should be postponed until a reasonable plan for new housing is proposed that addresses an Emergency Evacuation Plan for Alameda residents to get on and off the island.

I'm not against development. I want to see Smart Development with a eye on preserving the architectural character of this city. What I see so far is High Cost Housing that is truly unaffordable and does not actually directly address the Affordable Housing issue.

Thank you,

Therese Hall

From: [John Klipsch](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing Element draft
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 4:37:04 PM

Hello Alameda CC,

Being a new resident of 3 years (the last two WFH due to COVID), I like to express a number of concerns with the growth of the 5k units.

- The current outgoing traffic through the Posey tube is an absolute nightmare. It is dangerous being stuck in it during slow traffic due to a variety of reasons (ventilation, under water, etc).
- More sync'ed and timed traffic lights and/or stop signs.
- Most importantly, the proper allocation of these units to help revitalize areas such as Webster.

Growth of residents must be met with responsible growth in other infrastructural areas. Please use more forward thinking to plan ahead.

Thank you

From: [Ashley Gregory](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Housing
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 3:58:42 PM

Hello Ms. Weisiger,

I am writing in general support of the draft housing element plan the council is discussing tonight. I look forward to being a part of a community who accepts people from diverse backgrounds and circumstances. It is all of our responsibility to implement changes in each of Alameda's neighborhoods in order to support meeting housing needs for all.

Thank you!

Ashley Gregory

Lara Weisiger

From: Zac Bowling <zac@zacbowling.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 3:39 PM
To: City Clerk; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Trish Spencer; Manager Manager; Andrew Thomas
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment RE: item 7-B

Mayor and Council,

Specifically concerning the comments from WABA and the West Alameda Vision, the changes proposed actually track closer with WABA's original intent and don't seem to fit the original goals they set forth originally 10 years ago.

Please see the attached AAPS newsletter from that period which notes the direction the district originally wanted to go by allowing for taller buildings with higher density along Webster to attract developers. I agree with this. It's interesting how this opinion has seemingly changed in their recent letter.

We should be encouraging housing near our transit and main corridors. It's both good for residents and for businesses.

Webster Street Vision Plan Under Review

As a compliment to the Civic Center "Vision" Plan (see September, 2010 *Preservation Press*), the City has hired the same consultants to prepare a Webster Street Vision Plan. The Plan is available at City libraries and is posted on the West Alameda Business Association web site at http://westalamedabusiness.com/pop_ups/webster-street-visioning.pdf.

AAPS generally supports the Plan's proposals and especially appreciates the Plan's recognition of Webster Street as a unique environment with significant concentrations of historic buildings that should be reinforced and enhanced. AAPS's main recommendations are to include restoration of the Posey Tube Portal and Neptune Beach Tower as Plan action steps.

Posey Tube Portal

The portal structure has not been well maintained and some of its most significant architectural features have been compromised. The portal approaches have also been cluttered up with incompatible signage and light standards and the surrounding areas are mostly weeds. AAPS has therefore proposed that the Vision Plan include an action step that the City work with Caltrans to restore the portal and clean up the portal approaches.

AAPS's proposal includes:

- Restoring the original decorative light fixtures



1930s image of the Posey Tube Portal.

street's image in the minds of visitors with a feature unique to the East Bay and comparable to the Ferry Building's role on San Francisco's Market Street, and provide a point of attraction for private investment along the street. Like the Ferry Building, the building around the tower, especially the Neptune Plaza complex, could be developed into a permanent marketplace with multiple vendors such as butchers, florists, candy makers, bakery, and produce sellers. It could also become the site for the Farmers Market. Not only would the tower be an anchor and reminder of the past, it could become a destination.

To help pay for the Tower, an elevator might be installed to allow people to go to the top to view Alameda and the bay for a fee.

Other AAPS Recommendations

From: rob_hough_alameda@yahoo.com
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); tdaysog@alamedaca.com; [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B-Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 3:35:44 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[30nov21_housing element.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear Alameda officials:

Please see attached letter opposing up-zoning the existing residential districts for the record..

Thank you,
Roberta Hough

From: [Savanna Cheer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment for item 7-B 11/30 council meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 3:08:08 PM

Hi Council,

I wanted to share my general support for the draft housing element plan you're hearing tonight. The goals and proposed means to achieve those goals are clear and show that you're thinking about and planning for the best way to meet our RHNA obligations. I know that an Alameda that is affordable and accessible to everyone is an Alameda I would be proud to call home. We have a ways to go, but this is a good first step and we can get there.

The folks that are opposing this plan would suggest that we relegate new housing plans to outlying areas of the island, use spaces away from where they live, preserve historic buildings, and generally ensure that the impact of new housing on them is minimal. What they might mean to say is that they want charming building facades and a tight-knit community feel, but only if it looks a certain way, includes certain people and doesn't make them the least bit uncomfortable. Please resist the urge to cave to this point of view.

Government's job is to meet the needs of its people. That is what the RHNA allocation is for - meeting the needs of the people. People need housing. And in the Bay Area, the need is immense. If a relatively small group of residents fail to understand this need and the role of government in meeting it, that's really their issue. That small, vocal group doesn't own Alameda. They own one, maybe a few, structures on this piece of land. They are not the majority nor are they those in the most need. You're doing the right thing for most people by moving forward with a plan like the one presented tonight. Thank you to the staff who worked hard to put this together.

Take care,
Savanna Cheer

From: [Karen Lithgow](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 2:38:48 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-igaitufl.png](#)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers:

I strongly urge you to take the time to carefully consider the well thought out and comprehensive recommendations for updates to the Housing Element that have been sent to you by our AAPS representative Christopher Buckley. Our organization has consistently and thoroughly researched and thought through the best alternatives to add needed housing throughout Alameda while taking into consideration the competing priorities of our citizens, the potential impact to our neighborhoods and the geographical and financial limitations that we face.

More specifically, adding the RHNA required housing units in areas of town that can accommodate additional car traffic and parking would minimize the burden on residents living in already densely populated areas. Many of these high-density areas are in the historical districts which include a large number of multi-unit turn-of-the-century properties that provide some of the lowest cost apartments in the area. Because these historical buildings often lack off-street parking, adding living units to these streets will put an undue burden on these tenants to find places to park their cars. Also, many of the people looking to move into Alameda have an interest in driving electric vehicles which likewise can't be used by people without regular parking spots. New housing in the larger lots including the old Naval base and the shopping districts would make a lot more sense.

Last year the city council chose not to work in good faith with our AAPS representatives to craft an adaptation to Article 26 that would accommodate the new realities of housing shortages without compromising the integrity of our historical neighborhoods. The council chose instead to plow forward with an all-or-nothing ballot measure that would remove all of the Article 26 protections and, as we saw, ended up with nothing. Maligning the intentions and motivations of our group only strengthened our resolve and our community-wide support. The voters of Alameda clearly saw value in the Article 26 protections and I urge you to take them seriously this time and make the effort to craft meaningful compromises and solutions.

Sincerely,

Karen Lithgow
President
Alameda Architectural Preservation Society

Karen Lithgow, MBA

Your Vintage Home Specialist in Alameda!

REALTOR | SRES | CalBRE # 01984101



510.846.7288

Karen@VintageHomesAlameda.com

www.VintageHomesAlameda.com

[Click here to learn more about Compass Concierge](#)

[Click here to learn more about our Bridge Loan services](#)

[Ask me about helping someone move to or from anywhere in the US!](#)

6211 LaSalle Ave | Oakland, CA 94611



From: [Jason Biggs](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, November 30, 2021 City Council Agenda - Draft Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 12:30:30 PM

Dear City Council,

I recognize that this is my second letter on this agenda item, so I will not belabor my previous points raised. Your time is important, so I will get right to the point by quoting a letter from the Housing and Community Development (HCD):

"Specifically, HCD finds and agrees with the staff analysis that Alameda City Charter Article 26 conflicts with state housing law and is preempted and unenforceable."

Thanks,
Jason Biggs
Alameda Resident

From: [DENINE KELTNER](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Ronald Curtis](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov.30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 12:28:50 PM

Mayor, City Council, Planning Board and Staff,

I am aghast at the proposed actions within the Draft Housing Element. The actions proposed will more than double the existing density limits in our City Charter, Article 26. I hope you recall the citizens in Alameda voted down Measure Z.

This action will abolish Article 26 in the majority of Alameda. The upsizing is reckless and could encourage demolition and replacement of many of our historic structures.

This blanket approach is exactly why citizens said NO to Measure Z!!

ARE YOU LISTENING TO THE VOTERS?

ARE YOU JUST DOING AS YOU WANT?

This proposal appears to show no regard for our City of Alameda or for the citizens.

Our former Representative Rob Bonta wrote SB9 after Measure Z failed. Sadly for Alameda, his actions circumvented our NO vote on Measure Z.

Now your actions are going far beyond what is even mandated in SB9. The density proposals are extremely scary. The R-1 neighborhoods and our main streets could become very over built and parking would be impossible. Alameda has some open areas that might be able to accommodate more density. Alameda Point is restricted, get the Federal Government to change this.

Please consider with your head, as well as with your heart what your actions will do to our beautiful Alameda.

I am a native Alamedan!

Dee Keltner

1137 Bay Street, Alameda

H 510-865-0479

C 510-409-6657

From: [Alameda Citizens Task Force](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] PETITION SIGNATURES--ITEM 7-B
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 11:16:27 AM
Attachments: [petition_signatures_jobs_31330794_20211130191146.csv](#)

Dear Ms. Weisiger,

Please see attachment of updated petition signatures to be included as correspondence to the City Council Meeting Agenda item 7-B for today's Nov. 30 meeting regarding the Housing Element. The count is now up to 370 signatures...and still going. Thank you.

On Wed, Nov 17, 2021 at 10:45 AM Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hi,

This item was continued to November 30, 2021 at 5 p.m. Your email will be included in the meeting record.

Respectfully,

Lara

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk

City of Alameda

From: Alameda Citizens Task Force [mailto:alamedacitizenstaskforcembrshp@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 5:36 PM
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <jknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] PETITION SIGNATURES--ITEM 7-B

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

RE: Agenda Item 7-B

Please note there are over 200+ signatures of Alameda residents:

<https://www.change.org/u/me>

Please take this into consideration during your discussions and directions to Planning Board Staff tonight.

Thank you.

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country	Signed On
Alameda Citizens				US	11/11/2021
Jay Garfinkle	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/11/2021
Brenden G. Sullivan	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/11/2021
Mike Van Dine	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/11/2021
Carmen Reid	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/11/2021
Patsy Baer	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/11/2021
Rob Halford	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
William Courant	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Donald Scroggins	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Shaquan Carter	Rockville		20902	US	11/12/2021
Paul Foreman	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Peter Conn	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Brian McDonald	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Karin Sidwell	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Jemima Desmennu	Lexington		40505	US	11/12/2021
Stephen Yslas	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Bev Zia	ALAMEDA	CA	94502	US	11/12/2021
Maria Perales	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Karen Lithgow	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Arianna Siegel	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Marie Kane	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/12/2021
Joe LoParo	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Nicole Tran	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Sheila Marie Baldwin	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Beth Peterson	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Zach Kaplan	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Kazi Hossain	Jersey City	NJ	7302	US	11/12/2021
Lillian Sullivan	Glenwood		51545	US	11/12/2021
Yasmine Horton	Bessemer		35020	US	11/12/2021
KC Egan	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Helen Simpson	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Dorothy Freeman	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Birgitt Evans	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Doree Miles	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Eric Smiler	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Brittney Bridges	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/12/2021
Dolores Kelleher	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Kevin Frederick	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Ryan Taylor	Wheaton		60189	US	11/12/2021
Devon Westerholm	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Mary McFarland	Oakland	CA	94611	US	11/12/2021
Alyx Karpowicz	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Joseph Woodard	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021
Rudra Guin	Sudbury		1776	US	11/12/2021
Arielle Silverstein	Laurel	MD	20723	US	11/12/2021
Karen Miller	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/12/2021

Darlene Gardner	Hayward	CA	94541 US	11/12/2021
Tianxi Zheng	Oakland	CA	94603 US	11/12/2021
Michael Paladini	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Jeff Franco	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Daniel Ouellet	Hayward	CA	94541 US	11/13/2021
Denise Gasti	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
Mark Greenside	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Denise MacGregor	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
Olney Grindall	San Francisco	CA	94117 US	11/13/2021
John Gill	Alameda	CA	94544 US	11/13/2021
Flora Tso	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
James Jefferies	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
reyla graber	alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
James Hudkins	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Jenny Sui	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Wendy A Mariani	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
Scott Hamilton	San Jose	CA	95129 US	11/13/2021
Ronete Hamilton	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Karin Fox	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/13/2021
Benjamin McCrea	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
david rooker	Rockford	MI	49341 US	11/13/2021
Larry Jones	Las Vegas		89142 US	11/13/2021
stephen Slauson	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Zenner John	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
George Soskin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Peter Cianciulli	Riverside	CA	92506 US	11/13/2021
Al Stefani	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Karen Ratto	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Edward Sing	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Elizabeth Sorenson	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Daniel Flores	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Edward Kenna	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Judith A Lynch	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Jennifer Bowles	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Angie Slichter	Portland	OR	97211 US	11/13/2021
Corinna Zanetti Millosovich	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Michelle Morgan	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Michele Laubach	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
richard berman	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/13/2021
Lauren McBride	schohaire		12157 US	11/14/2021
christopher joseph chalmers	Spring Hill		34609 US	11/14/2021
Emebet Woldetensay	Antioch	CA	94531 US	11/14/2021
Gabby H	East Orange		7018 US	11/14/2021
John O'Brien	North Little Rock		72118 US	11/14/2021
Lynne Scalapino	Berkeley	CA	94501 US	11/14/2021
Haredo Nurani	Columbus		43202 US	11/14/2021
Melissa Bever	Neodesha		66757 US	11/14/2021

Ben Deligato	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/14/2021
Rocio Sanchez Mariano	Los Angeles		90026 US	11/14/2021
Gina Le	Lakeland	FL	33812 US	11/14/2021
Megan Brock	Ocala	FL	34471 US	11/14/2021
Donna Fletcher	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Diane Alexander	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/15/2021
alan molina	Seattle		98111 US	11/15/2021
Lisa Shen	Reston		20191 US	11/15/2021
Ellen Jean Graham Gilliat	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Noreen Christin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Teresa Miller	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Teresa Miller	Oakland	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
John Turner	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
David Howard	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
William Hayes	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Ellen Chesnut	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Phillip Seay	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/15/2021
Patricia Lamborn	San Jose	CA	95127 US	11/16/2021
Ana Rea	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Leslie Milosevich	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Alexandra Petrich	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
kris motola	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Corinne Lambden	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Laurie Bochner	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Joe Van Winkle	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Thomas Bennett	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Joyce Boyd	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Anthony Pontino	Hayward	CA	94541 US	11/16/2021
Eddy Liang	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Evelyn Vargas	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Catherine Marcos	Wyckoff	NJ	7481 US	11/16/2021
LittleTheRabbit yes	Atlanta		30315 US	11/16/2021
Zach Cohen	Wyckoff		7481 US	11/16/2021
Tywanna Tate	Columbia		29203 US	11/16/2021
madi Minnotte	greenwood village		80111 US	11/16/2021
Don Curtis	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Deborah E Beck	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Mary Foss	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Eddy Lehrer	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Melinda Munroe	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Stephen Cytron	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Emma Kung	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Debbi Nakahara	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Cathy Leong	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Lesa Ross	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Elizabeth Rush	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Carole Lohr	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021

Sandra Berger	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Vicki Lane	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Janet Libby	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Lisa Trousdale	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Kurt Libby	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
karen jine	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Char Scannell	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Aaron Tam	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Debbie Damele	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Carol Rivano	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Karen Hoffmann	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Rena Palloff	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Fred Lebe	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Michele Langford	Alameda	CA	96150 US	11/16/2021
Patricia Gannon	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
joseph cloren	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Andrew Dallin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Dennis Valerio	Oakland	CA	94607 US	11/16/2021
Joby vasquez	Corpus Christi		78414 US	11/16/2021
Seung-yeop Paek	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Carol Gottstein	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Kathleen Kugler	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Richard Vaterlaus	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
JULIE VAN BUHLER	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Walter Jacobs	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
James Gooch	Hayward	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Kay Blair	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Mariah Healy	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Stephen Sims	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Richard Noordyk	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Jeffrey Petersen	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
George Moniz	Waterford	CA	95386 US	11/16/2021
Jean Rubin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Frances Tam	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Jane Veale	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Grant Scully	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Laura Barker	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
gary krauss	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/16/2021
Jayden Zheng	Charleston		29412 US	11/16/2021
Kori Mae	Birmingham		35208 US	11/16/2021
Josh Standiford	Lake Zurich		60047 US	11/16/2021
RAYMOND TAM	ALAMEDA	CA	94502 US	11/16/2021
Melissa Bloom	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/17/2021
Donna Loudon	Alamo	CA	94507 US	11/17/2021
Bruce Zulaica	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Lourdes Argueta	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Kelvin Shum	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021

Laura Ramirez-Gonzalez	ALAMEDA	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Marian Breitbart	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Lisa Tang	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Zaid Mahmood	Hicksville	NY	11801	US	11/17/2021
Erich Stiger	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Huiying Wu	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Karen Ruiz	Albuquerque		87121	US	11/17/2021
Karen Park	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Margaret Hall	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
therese hall	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
jessica sontupe	Bala Cynwyd		19004	US	11/17/2021
John Barhaugh	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Bill Longwell	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Janelle Spatz	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Adrian Lazo	Los Angeles		90011	US	11/17/2021
Anoon Ihmiss	Branchville		7826	US	11/17/2021
Kathleen Taylor	Aubrey		76227	US	11/17/2021
Michael Devine	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Cindy Sui	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Donna Cheng	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Ann Walls	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Bill Pai	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Aurora Battani	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Maria Somma	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
James Otten	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
leslie carter	Hayward	CA	94544	US	11/17/2021
Elizabeth Blankenship	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Cicely Doyle	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Susan Levine	Hayward	CA	94541	US	11/17/2021
john myovich	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Sharon Martinez	Alameda	NV	94502	US	11/17/2021
Cathy Leong	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Antonio Natera	Miami	FL	33178	US	11/17/2021
Rosalinda Corvi	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Sandra Deffner	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
Dirk Setchko	Richmond	CA	94805	US	11/17/2021
Kathleen Snider	Alameda	CA	94501	US	11/17/2021
bruce wallach	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Landon Brinkley	Woodstock		22664	US	11/17/2021
Emma Smith	Frisco		75036	US	11/17/2021
Roger McClure	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021
Omotunde Esan	Staten Island		10311	US	11/17/2021
Trevor Thomas	Brooklyn		11216	US	11/17/2021
Meredith Myers	Cary		27518	US	11/17/2021
Zami Austin				US	11/17/2021
Sarah Tosin	Chicago		60616	US	11/17/2021
Susan Tu	Alameda	CA	94502	US	11/17/2021

Fey Adelstein	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Melinda Hayes			US	11/17/2021
mark neiman	alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Diane Brophy	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Lori Hale	Fair Oaks	CA	95628 US	11/17/2021
Janet Castro	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Valerie Ruma	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Katya Sedgwick	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Ted McGavin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
John Kramer	Marshfield		2050 US	11/17/2021
Esgar Montiel	San Diego		92123 US	11/17/2021
Semaaj Colbert	Battle Creek		49037 US	11/17/2021
Joseph St.Clair	Chicago		60647 US	11/17/2021
Robert Park	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/17/2021
Eileen Kelleher	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Damari Johnson	Tulsa		74106 US	11/17/2021
Melodi Gulsen	Los Angeles		90066 US	11/17/2021
Ashley Romero	Indianapolis		46268 US	11/17/2021
Soren Roeser	Glenview	IL	60025 US	11/17/2021
Mara Denegri	Aurora		80016 US	11/17/2021
Cathleen Reese	Hamilton	MT	59840 US	11/17/2021
Rodney Swift	Norman		73071 US	11/17/2021
Nancy Hird	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Jennifer Trevis	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/17/2021
Nancy McKinley	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Emily Olson	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Christopher Shipley	Danville	CA	94526 US	11/18/2021
Alana Williams	Aurora		80011 US	11/18/2021
Tom Jennings	Los Angeles		90039 US	11/18/2021
lily luna	California		95076 US	11/18/2021
Lilly Foley	Chelsea		35043 US	11/18/2021
Tristan Scott	Walnut Cre	CA	94595 US	11/18/2021
Joyce Saad	alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Michael Heley	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Patricia Cronin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Susan Correa	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
Allan Y	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
James Wong	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/18/2021
Mark Palmer	Alameda	CA	94502 US	11/18/2021
Daniel Cremin	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/18/2021
WILLIAM GALLI	Alameda	CA	94501 US	11/19/2021
Maria Liberati	Lynchburg		24503 US	11/19/2021
Richard Bartley	Brooklyn		11204 US	11/19/2021
Evan Stone	Okmulgee		74450 US	11/19/2021
Connor Ross	Aurora	CO	80015 US	11/19/2021
Lynn Cox-Hakanson	Tacoma	WA	98466 US	11/19/2021
Sam Sanchez	Phoenix		85001 US	11/19/2021

Richard Brown	Newark	7102 US	11/19/2021
Michael Rizzo	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/20/2021
Seymour Butts	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/20/2021
Ralph Appezzato	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/20/2021
Raymond Zack	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/20/2021
Catherine Morgan	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/21/2021
Steve Gorman	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/21/2021
Heidi Dietz	San Jose CA	95129 US	11/22/2021
Gabriele Bungardt	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/22/2021
Tracy OShea Romero	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/22/2021
Grant Hayes	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/23/2021
Beatrice Lebrec	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/23/2021
John Takayama	Alameda CA	94502 US	11/23/2021
Danee Mears	Mickleton	8056 US	11/23/2021
Maddie Fay	Avon	44110 US	11/23/2021
Franklin Dalpe	Kingwood TX	77339 US	11/23/2021
King Gaines	Virginia Beach	23452 US	11/23/2021
Elizabeth Rush	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/23/2021
Lara Yan	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/23/2021
Rocky Su	Alameda CA	94502 US	11/23/2021
Blair Skellie	Alameda CA	94502 US	11/23/2021
Cathy Jefferson	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/23/2021
Sam Cyr	Raymond	3077 US	11/23/2021
Hope M. Bowe	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/24/2021
Tony Devencenzi	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/24/2021
Santi Sanchez	Alamosa	81101 US	11/24/2021
Malcolm Bartley	Bronx	10468 US	11/24/2021
Keyla Milian	Miami Beach	33141 US	11/24/2021
Dale Van Slyke	Virginia Beach	23452 US	11/24/2021
Julian Flynn	Worcester	1601 US	11/24/2021
Steve Lewetto	New York City	7739 US	11/24/2021
Henry Haight	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/26/2021
Otis N. Grand	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/27/2021
Fern Side	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/27/2021
Julia Krintz	Henderson NV	89011 US	11/27/2021
Sophia Dann	Poway	92064 US	11/27/2021
Lilith Rose	Lafayette	70506 US	11/27/2021
Demon Kennedy	Las Vegas	89148 US	11/27/2021
Summer House	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/28/2021
Christian Perez	Chicago	60629 US	11/29/2021
Elleni Lakew	Elkridge	21075 US	11/29/2021
john ludlow	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
Valerie Leonard	monroe	8831 US	11/29/2021
Clark Wang	San Jose	95126 US	11/29/2021
Jackie Joslin	Dublin CA	94568 US	11/29/2021
Iecurry james	Mesquite	75149 US	11/29/2021
Zachary Dwight	Powell	43065 US	11/29/2021

Tony Rios	Los Angeles	90002 US	11/29/2021
Walter Grady	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
Cynthia Grady	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
Ariel Park	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
Toni Hamilton	Detroit	48 US	11/29/2021
Jennifer Martinez	Nashville	37013 US	11/29/2021
Tokunaga Freesia	Evanston	60201 US	11/29/2021
Adam Zhuo	Alameda CA	94502 US	11/29/2021
Courtenay Davis	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
Maria Perales	Pleasanton CA	94566 US	11/29/2021
Barbara Orbeta	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
VG Cabanilla	Danville	94526 US	11/29/2021
Andrea Yao	Santa Clara	95053 US	11/29/2021
kellie nelson	Indian Land	29707 US	11/29/2021
Na'Layiah Rooks	Prairie View	77446 US	11/29/2021
Jarred Essissima	Hempstead	77445 US	11/29/2021
Laura Herrera	Westfield	46074 US	11/29/2021
Shiva Jahani	Los Angeles	90014 US	11/29/2021
Natalie Brooks	Panama City	32405 US	11/29/2021
Kay Weinstein	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/29/2021
dee tho	New York	10003 US	11/29/2021
Yvonne Ramos	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
J Peters	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Paula Walker	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
K Hare	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Michael Torchia	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Michael Covey	Los Banos	93635 US	11/30/2021
M Bibbs	Marshall	75670 US	11/30/2021
Cole Sutton	Hoover	35216 US	11/30/2021
Marsen Belotte	Palm Bay	32909 US	11/30/2021
Tim Maurer	Anaheim	92808 US	11/30/2021
Brandon Beckwith	Prairie View	77446 US	11/30/2021
dustin anderson	boston	2101 US	11/30/2021
Marco Muralles	Eugene	97403 US	11/30/2021
Benjamin Winter	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
David Foote	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Marilyn Pomeroy	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Jane Friedrich	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Luke Szymanski	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021
Alan Pomeroy	Alameda CA	94501 US	11/30/2021

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 263-2911 / FAX (916) 263-7453
www.hcd.ca.gov



November 29, 2021

Andrew Thomas, Director
Planning, Building and Transportation
City of Alameda
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190
Alameda, CA 95401

RE: City of Alameda Measure A Provisions and Housing Element Compliance

Dear Andrew Thomas:

Thank you for your correspondence, dated February 16, 2021, requesting guidance regarding state law and local provisions restricting multifamily uses and allowable densities. In developing this guidance, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has reviewed the City of Alameda's staff report File Number 2021-1017, Item Number 7-B, and generally agrees with the pertinent analysis, including the resolution attached to that item. HCD offers this additional information to assist the City in its decision-making.

In 1973, the voters of Alameda approved an amendment to the City Charter that added Article 26 (Measure A). Measure A added Section 26-1 that states "[t]here shall be no multiple dwelling units built in the city of Alameda." Section 26-3 was adopted in 1991 by a subsequent ballot measure (also Measure A), which sets the maximum residential density of one housing unit per 2,000 square feet (21.78 dwelling units (du)/acre) throughout the City. Each of these provisions is problematic and compromise the City's ability to comply with State Housing Element Law. Collectively, the Measure A Provisions prevent the City from complying with State Housing Element Law and other housing laws, and potentially trigger consequences related to a lack of housing element compliance.

Specifically, HCD finds and agrees with the staff analysis that Alameda City Charter Article 26 conflicts with state housing law and is preempted and unenforceable. Among other things, Article 26 of the City Charter is preempted by Government Code sections 65583.2, subdivision (c), and section 65583, subdivision (c)(1), which require, among other things, zoning for a variety of housing types, including multifamily rental housing. HCD also finds that Article 26 conflicts with Government Code sections 8899.50 and 65583, subdivision (c)(10), in that Article 26 provisions deny fair housing choices and are fundamentally contrary to affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH). HCD offers this additional information to assist the City in its decision-making.

Housing Element Compliance Issues

The Measure A provisions create a conflict with state law and particularly State Housing Element Law, including, but not limited to, the following:

- **Zoning Appropriate to Accommodate Housing for Lower-Income Households:** Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (c)(3), requires jurisdictions to demonstrate that adopted densities accommodate the regional housing need for lower-income households. This analysis must address, but is not limited to, factors such as market demand, financial feasibility, or information based on development project experience within a zone or zones that provide housing for lower-income households. Alternatively, the statute deems specified densities (Default Density) appropriate to accommodate housing for lower-income households. Under these state law provisions, the default density for the City of Alameda is 30 units per acre. The Measure A Provisions cap allowable density at approximately 22 units per acre and, as a result, do not meet default densities. Further, given market demand, financial feasibility and other factors, the allowable densities of the Measure A Provisions would not be adequate to allow the City to demonstrate appropriate densities to accommodate housing for lower-income households. In turn, Alameda City would not be able to demonstrate adequate sites to accommodate housing for lower-income households and would not comply with State Housing Element Law.
- **Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types:** Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(1), requires jurisdictions to identify sites "...to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of types of housing for all income levels, including multifamily rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, supportive housing, single-room occupancy units, emergency shelters, and transitional housing." The Measure A Provisions explicitly prohibit multifamily housing, and as a result, the City of Alameda would not comply with this requirement and would not comply with State Housing Element Law.
- **Governmental Constraints:** Government Code section 65583, subdivision (a)(5), requires an analysis of potential constraints on housing, including the housing types listed above. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(1).) This analysis must address land use controls such as the Measure A Provisions and, among other provisions, must demonstrate efforts to remove governmental constraints that hinder the locality from meeting its share of the regional housing need allocation (RHNA) in accordance with Government Code section 65584. Housing elements must address and remove, where appropriate and legally possible, identified constraints. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(3).) Constraints must be addressed regardless of demonstrating adequate sites to accommodate the regional housing need. The Measure A Provisions would be

deemed a constraint on development and without programs to address and remove the constraint, the housing element would not comply with State Housing Element Law.

- **Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:** Government Code section 8899.50 requires, among other provisions, all state and local agencies to ensure that their laws, programs, and policies affirmatively further fair housing. AFFH means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.” This provision is an independent duty for the City, but it has also been incorporated into State Housing Element Law. In this context, Government Code section 65583, subdivision (c)(10), requires an assessment of fair housing that includes various components, including analyzing socio-economic patterns and trends and identifying contributing factors to fair housing issues. The Measure A Provisions deny fair housing choices and as a result are fundamentally contrary to AFFH. Without significant action to overcome the patterns caused by the Measure A Provisions, the City of Alameda will not comply with these provisions of State Housing Element Law.

HCD understands Alameda has adopted some measures to attempt to address these concerns, including a density bonus ordinance and a Multifamily Residential Combining Zone, but Measure A provisions remain a significant constraint on housing choices, supply, and affordability and conflict with several provisions of State Housing Element Law.

Consequences of a Lack of Compliance with State Housing Element Law

Housing availability is a critical issue with statewide implications, and most housing decisions occur at the local level. Housing elements are essential to developing a blueprint for growth and are a vital tool to address California’s prolonged housing crisis. As such, state law has established clear disincentives for local jurisdictions that fail to comply with State Housing Element Law.

First, noncompliance will result in ineligibility or delay in receiving state funds that require a compliant housing element as a prerequisite, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Permanent Local Housing Allocation,
- Local Housing Trust Fund Program,
- Infill Infrastructure Grant Program,
- SB 1 Caltrans Sustainable Communities Grants, and
- Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program.

Second, jurisdictions that do not meet their housing element requirements may face additional financial and legal ramifications. HCD may notify the California Office of the Attorney General, which may bring suit for violations of State Housing Element Law. Further, statute provides for court-imposed penalties for persistent noncompliance, including financial penalties. Government Code section 65585, subdivision (l)(1), establishes a minimum fine of \$10,000 per month and up to \$100,000 per month. If a jurisdiction continues to remain noncompliant, a court can multiply the penalties up to a factor of six. Other potential ramifications could include the loss of local land use authority to a court-appointed agent.

In addition to these legal remedies available in the courts, under the Housing Accountability Act (Gov. Code § 65589.5, subd. (d)), jurisdictions without a substantially compliant housing element cannot use inconsistency with zoning and general plan standards as reasons for denial of a housing project for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households.¹

Options for Complying with State Housing Element Law

The Measure A provisions are in conflict with state law and should be voided. In addition, the City should take actions, as noted in its resolution, to comply with State Housing Element Law and demonstrate adequate sites to accommodate the regional housing need. For example, the City could rezone sites at appropriate densities, similar to the City's multifamily overlay utilized in the 5th cycle update. These actions should be accompanied by additional and significant actions to address constraints on housing and to affirmatively further fair housing.

HCD appreciates the efforts taken to seek guidance and looks forward to working with the City to comply with State Housing Element Law and other state laws. For additional resources regarding these requirements, visit HCD's website at <https://hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element>. If HCD can provide assistance, please contact me at paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Paul McDougall
Senior Program Manager

¹ For purposes of the Housing Accountability Act, housing for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households is defined as having at least 20% of units set aside for low-income residents or 100% of units set aside for middle-income residents (Gov. Code § 65589.5, subd. (h)(3)).



City of Alameda • California

February 16, 2021

Mr. Paul McDougall
State Department of Housing and Community Development
P.O. Box 278180
Sacramento, California, 95827-8180

RE: City of Alameda Request for Guidance

Dear Mr. McDougall,

On behalf of the City of Alameda (City), I am seeking guidance from the State of California as the City works towards adoption of the 2023-2031 Housing Element. I would also like to thank you for your participation in the February 2, 2021 Alameda City Council workshop on the Housing Element update. Your presence and expertise was appreciated by the Council, staff, and a large number of Alameda citizens.

As discussed at the meeting and in the February 2, 2021 staff report (attached), the City of Alameda City Council, Planning Board, and staff must determine how to reconcile any conflicts between State Law and Alameda City Charter Article 26.

Specifically, the City of Alameda is requesting guidance from the State of California regarding options for how the City Council may adopt a Housing Element consistent with State Housing Law, while still respecting the Alameda City Charter Article 26's citywide prohibition on multifamily housing construction and citywide prohibition on residential densities greater than one unit per 2,000 square feet of land (21 units per acre).

Options and guidance based on your experience and examples from other communities in the State facing similar challenges would be greatly appreciated as the City attempts to determine the best path towards compliance. Thank you for your continued assistance to the City of Alameda. I can always be reached at 510-774-5361 or at athomas@alamedaca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Andrew Thomas". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Andrew Thomas,
Planning, Building and Transportation Director

Attachment(s)

- February 2, 2021 City Council Staff Report – Housing Element Update

From: [Patricia Baer](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); tdaysog@alamedaca.com; [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Yibin Shen](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 7:47:00 AM

Please do not permanently destroy the character of our wonderful city by upzoning its many neighborhoods. New housing construction would make more sense in available open land and Alameda Point, and a large percentage of it should be affordable, not market rate.

Patsy Baer

From: [Elizabeth Kuwada](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Andrew Thomas](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Draft Housing Element, Item 7-B on Nov. 30 City Council Agenda
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 11:18:27 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council,

I am writing to express my support for the Housing Element as drafted thus far. The goals, policies and programs included are both sensible and admirable. If enacted, they will put the City on the right path to do its part to address the housing crisis, equitably create new housing opportunities throughout the entire City, and meet State-mandated RHNA requirements. Thank you to the City staff for their continued hard work. Thank you to the City leaders who believe that housing is a human right and who have championed these necessary efforts.

I support the proposed zoning changes, including increasing density in residential zones R-1 to R-6. Not only is this needed to reverse exclusionary and inequitable land use practices, but I believe these changes will also strengthen the vibrancy and diversity of our city.

Increased density and mixed-use development in commercial areas and along public transit corridors will promote more sustainable, walkable lifestyles and support local businesses. Particularly, I believe there is an opportunity to provide for even greater housing opportunities along Webster and Park Streets. With the number of existing vacant or underutilized parcels on these two streets, I would expect they could accommodate significantly more than 150 units each and encourage staff to further examine increasing density here.

To work towards a more just society, we must make room and I fully support the City's efforts to do so with this Housing Element.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Kuwada

From: [jane peal](#)
To: [jane peal](#)
Cc: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Upzoning Alameda
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 5:28:26 PM

Resending, as pertains to upcoming meeting.

On Nov 16, 2021, at 4:25 PM, jane peal <janepeal@sonic.net> wrote:

Hello, I'm writing because I am deeply concerned and strongly opposed to the proposed massive and indiscriminate upzoning. I urge you to heed the urgent plea of the voters, citizens and AAPS to:

- a. Do not upzone Alameda's residential neighborhoods, the "Stations" and historic parts of the Park Street and Webster Street Business Districts.
- b. To meet the RHNA, instead target underutilized areas like the estuary shopping centers and nonhistoric portions of Park Street and Webster Street.
- c. Immediately direct staff to ask the Federal government to remove the Alameda Point development restrictions. This should have been done right after the November, 2020 election.
- d. If some upzoning is still needed in residential areas to meet the RHNA, target specific subareas that are as small as possible and at more carefully calibrated densities where impacts on parking and historic buildings will be minimized.

Sincerely, Jane Peal

Jane Peal, MFT
Integral Counseling for Individuals,
Couples, & Adult Adoptees
Alameda Office
<http://www.janepeal.com>
jane@janepeal.com
415.902.5761

Notice of Confidentiality: This email, and any attachments, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. Any distribution, reading, copying or use of this communication and any attachments by anyone other than the addressee, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by email (by replying to this message), and permanently destroy or delete the original and any copies or printouts of this email and any attachments.

From: [Kay Weinstein](#)
To: [Alan Teague](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 3:03:10 PM
Attachments: [icon.png](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mail Delivery Subsystem** <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
Date: Mon, Nov 29, 2021 at 2:58 PM
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
To: <kayweinstein@gmail.com>



Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to **lweisiger@alameda.gov** because the domain alameda.gov couldn't be found. Check for typos or unnecessary spaces and try again.

The response was:

DNS Error: 46872802 DNS type 'mx' lookup of alameda.gov responded with code NXDOMAIN Domain name not found: alameda.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kay Weinstein <kayweinstein@gmail.com>
To: Mezzy Ashcroft <mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White <jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, Tday Sog <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Tspencer@alamedaca.gov
Cc: Rcurtis@alamedaca.gov, ateague@alamedca.gov, rrothenberg@alamedaca.gov, asaheba@alamedaca.gov, truiz@alamedaca.gov, hhom@alamedaca.gov, xcisneros@alamedaca.gov, elevitt@alameaca.gov, gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov, lweisiger@alameda.gov, ATai@alamedaca.gov, Christopher Buckley <cbuckleyaicp@att.net>
Bcc:
Date: Mon, 29 Nov 2021 14:58:22 -0800
Subject: Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B-Housing Element
Dear Mayor, City Council Members, Planning Board, and Staff,

I support the four positions of Alameda Architectural Preservation Association:

1. Do not upzone Alameda's residential neighborhoods, the "Stations" and historic parts of the Park Street and Webster Street Business Districts.
2. To meet the RHNA, instead target the under-utilized areas like the estuary shopping centers and non-historic portions of Park Street and Webster Street.
3. Immediately direct staff to ask the Federal government to remove the Alameda Point development restrictions. This should have been done right after the November, 2020 election.
4. If some upzoning is still needed in residential areas to meet the RHNA, target specific sub-areas that are as small as possible and at more carefully calibrated densities where impacts on parking and historic buildings will be minimized.

Sincerely,

Kay Weinstein
1809 Central Ave., Apt E
Alameda, CA 94501

From: [Devon Westerholm](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#)
Cc: kevin@kevinkennedyllc.com; cpakearney@sbcglobal.net; [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Devon Westerholm](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concern on proposed housing element - please don't up-zone R2-R6
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 9:33:05 AM

Alameda Council,

My name is Devon Westerholm and I've lived in Alameda for eight years. I have a child in the local high school. My family chose to move to Alameda for similar reasons to many – friendly neighbors, walkable town, good schools and lovely historical homes. In particular, the beauty and history in Alameda stands out in contrast to most of the Bay Area which to say nicely; lacks charm. In regard to the housing element, while I recognize that the number of units is mandated – the WAY that we get to that number is up to us. It is the responsibility of this council to ensure that while growth is pushed on us, SMART GROWTH is a choice we make and a responsibility of the people on this council. Without good choices at this critical juncture, it will undermine the very livability of Alameda that brought us here.

The council owes it to our city to pursue raising the limits on housing at Alameda Point. Where is the action on this? Additionally, I believe that our shopping centers which are distributed across the island are under-utilized – they have ample parking, and most of them are single story – a design that makes no sense in today's atmosphere. I suggest that we maximize those spaces and build up. Even consider raising the current height limits in order to ensure we fully leverage the space in these centers and their parking.

There is already significant density in our R2-R6 neighborhoods as a result of current rules and policies. As such, neighborhoods are tight, parking is scarce. We have an obligation to fully maximize the shopping centers and Alameda point as first priority. Only if we fall short in a significant way should we begin to discuss raising density within R2-R5. Previous elections have shown the citizens here want to protect the Alameda we have today. Touching the primary neighborhoods in Alameda should be *an action of last resort*. If this council wants to touch those neighborhoods, prove to the citizens that it is necessary – run the studies, do the numbers, show us data. Until then – please do not touch R2-R6.

Thank you,

Devon Westerholm

Clinton Ave

From: [James Hudkins](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); cbuckleyaicp@att.net
Cc: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [Ronald Curtis](#); [Alan Teague](#); [Rona Rothenberg](#); [Asheshh Saheba](#); [Teresa Ruiz](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#); [James Hudkins](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B-Housing Element
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 3:13:16 AM

Please give careful thought to the initial draft Housing Element of the Alameda General Plan to be considered November 30, 2021.

The draft Housing Element irresponsibly and unnecessarily doubles and in some cases triples or quadruples Alameda's housing density. This would have an adverse impact on our neighborhoods and the health, safety, and welfare of Alameda residents.

Please say NO!! to this massive and indiscriminate upzoning. The draft fails to adequately justify the need for such massive and indiscriminate upzoning. Do not upzone Alameda's residential neighborhoods.

It seems each complaint about living in Alameda directly or indirectly has more people being the cause of the problem. The problem is at its core there being too many people who want to live here.

This increase in density by upzoning will make so many people worse off. It will compound our various concerns. Traffic, Bike Paths, Parking will all get worse. The pleasant place people stay here for and move to will be destroyed.

Greater density will increase the value of property. It will benefit people who own property. Investors will do better. There will be much more Property Tax Revenue. The rest of us will suffer.

Vote against it!

Jim Hudkins

From: [margie](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Yibin Shen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Why We Don't Need More Market Rate Housing – Second Update
Date: Sunday, November 28, 2021 8:23:25 PM

-- New York Times article, October 11, 2021 – “They Can’t Leave the Bay Area Fast Enough”
-- November 2021, Apartment Owners Journal: Rentals are rebounding in all areas – except the San Francisco Bay Area.
-- I regularly go past two new Oakland luxury rentals: 13th and Clay Street and “The Broadway” on Pill Hill. Months after both were completed, these apartment buildings are struggling to attract renters. Both have huge for rent signs that have been up for months.
-- KCBS News, 2PM today: People are buying houses in the Lake Tahoe and Truckee area.
-- A friend recently moved from one Alameda apartment to another. He attempted to bargain on the rent. Although the rental agency had numerous vacancies in the building, and was willing to give six weeks free rent to this qualified individual, they refused to lower the rent. My theory is that bank financing is dependent on renting units at a certain price.

I strongly believe that new market rate construction will lead to more gentrification and not more affordable housing. I OBJECT to the General Plan Housing element

From: [Cynthia Grady](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B-Housing Element
Date: Sunday, November 28, 2021 7:23:29 PM

This proposal will ultimately destroy the character of Alameda by ultimately destroying the neighbors that make Alameda what it is.

Please do not change the zoning for Alameda residential neighborhoods and historic parts of Park Street and Webster Street Business districts. Instead, you should target the underutilized areas like estuary shopping centers and non-historic portions of Park and Webster Streets. Please insist that the Federal govt remove the Alameda Pointe development restrictions.

Don't use a sledge hammer to meet RHNA restrictions but rather use a delicate scapple to target specific areas as small as possible.

Please vote no an Item 7-B.

Walt and Cindy Grady
Third generation Alamedans.

From: [Karen Miller](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Allen Tai](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Nov. 30 City Council Agenda Item 7-B-Housing Element
Date: Sunday, November 28, 2021 3:08:01 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I strongly oppose the upzoning of R-1-R6 zones. I realize that the state with the passage of SB9 and 10 have mandated changes but cities have some discretion in how they implement the changes. The citizens of Alameda overwhelmingly rejected Measure Z by 60% which would have eliminated Article 26 from the charter JUST last year. This City has been through this before, in the 70's, which is why Article 26 was passed in the first place. The additional units created by upzoning is minimal and will not solve the housing shortage nor does it create one unit of affordable housing which is the segment of housing that we need most. Any new housing built with this proposal will be market rate strictly due to the cost of building. I know that a lot of work went in to this proposal but I think that it needs to be reconsidered especially with the recent rejection of Measure Z by 60% of the citizenry. Thank you.

Regards,

Karen Miller



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

From: [Patricia Gannon](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: RHNA Mandate Housing Element
Date: Saturday, November 27, 2021 2:31:14 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and City Council Members:

On November 30th the City Council will consider and vote on the RHNA Mandates I am strongly opposed to the upzoning of the R-2 through R-6 districts for the following reasons:

It repeals Article 6 despite the overwhelming defeat of Measure Z in 2020;
Most importantly no affordable housing is required for projects proposing less than five units, resulting in gentrification;
It does not consider the increased need for water these additional units will require;
It does not consider the safety of our children walking and biking to school;
It fails to consider the potential availability of large underdeveloped sites such as Alameda Point, the Estuary Shopping Center and Park and Webster Streets;

Please oppose the RHNA mandates as proposed for the above reasons. Thank you.

Patricia M. Gannon
1019 Tobago Lane
94502
pg3187@gmail.com

cc lweisiger@alamedaca.gov
cc elevitt@alamedaca.gov
cc Alameda Planning Board

From: [Geoffrey](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Special council session on housing needs to focus on controlling our destiny
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 12:48:29 PM

Dear Mayor, Council Members and Staff

We are required by law to grow housing. I think most fair-minded people will agree that it can be beneficial to both Alameda and our near neighbors.

However, the current approach can have dire consequences unless we control our destiny.

We must proactively plan for growth by realistically addressing transportation and service impacts. Concentrating growth in already dense corridors, such as Park and Webster can alleviate those concerns far more effectively address those concerns by leveraging existing public transportation infrastructure

The alternative of making legacy SFR neighborhoods more dense will not solve the problem. Additionally, there is a possibility that what makes Alameda unique will get lost in the process.

Please reorganize the plans to make dense growth occur where it makes the most sense.

Geoff Dalander
215 Hudson Bay

From: ps4man@comcast.net
To: [Andrew Thomas](#)
Cc: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, Nov. 16 City Council Agenda Postponed to Nov. 30-Please add this to correspondence file.
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 11:18:20 AM

Andrew,

This article should be of interest to you and City Council.

<https://marinpost.org/blog/2021/11/17/unintended-consequences-of-sb-9-rhna-quotas-fulfilled-without-local-rezoning>

I do not agree with the suggestion of the article that SB-9 by itself has opened the door to meeting every city's RHNA. However there is no question that SB-9 has provided new housing opportunity sites to help meet our RHNA. The only question is what HCD will allow as the "reasonable capacity" of our current R-1 districts to provide new housing. I would also point out that the SB-9 max capacity of 4 units with a minimum size of 1200 sq. ft. per dwelling does exceed the 30 unit per acre minimum density to qualify a property for the lower income housing category.

The article states:

"At this time, cities and counties are in the process of submitting comments to HCD about their requirement to conform to SB 9 by the beginning of next year. They should include in their comments that the additional development potential that resulted from rezoning under SB 9 (and the ADU laws) must count toward a city's RHNA quota. I would urge anyone reading this to immediately ask their city or county to do this as soon as possible..."

"HCD will be the first arbiter of this issue, sometime in the beginning of next year when they provide "guidance" on how SB 9 should be interpreted."

All of this is very relevant to the statement in the ACT letter to Council asserting that our R-1 zoning district, now superseded by SB-9, may be enough to cover much and maybe all of your 520 unit allocation to our residential zoning districts, thus obviating the need to upzone any of them. Of course we don't know how many units can be allocated to R-1 until HCD provides the above mentioned guidance".

Paul

From: [Andrew Thomas](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#); [CityCouncil-List](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Yibin Shen](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Can we count splittable lots under SB9 to meet our RHNA allotment?
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 4:40:28 PM

All: Per HCD requirements and standards, the City of Alameda will need to estimate how many units we expect to be generated during 8 years as the result of SB 9. SB 9 allows up to 4 units. Today, under existing AMC code, up to one unit and two accessory units (total of three) are allowed. So staff is not expecting a huge increase in production as the result of SB9.

But we could be wrong, but the good news is that SB 9 takes effect on January 1, 2022. This gives us one year to see exactly how much will be produced in a year as the result of SB 9. Based upon this year of experience, we will be able to accurately predict production over the next 8 year period for the Housing Element.

- Andrew

From: Lara Weisiger
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:02 PM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedacityattorney.org>; Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Can we count splittable lots under SB9 to meet our RHNA allotment?

Forwarding as requested.

From: Jay [<mailto:garsurg@comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:35 PM
To: Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Can we count splittable lots under SB9 to meet our RHNA allotment?

Madam Clerk,

This the link below is to a current article taken from the Marin Post that suggests the concept that since SB9 requires that owners of single-family parcels must, by right, be allowed to split their property into parcels that would provide up to five or more additional living units. This would mean that if we count the eligible S-F parcels in Alameda, we already have met our RHNA allotment.

Please forward this link to the members of the City Council, Planning Board, and Executive Staff.

Thanks.

Jay Garfinkle

<https://marinpost.org/blog/2021/11/17/unintended-consequences-of-sb-9-rhna-quotas-fulfilled-without-local-rezoning>

From: ps4man@comcast.net
To: [Andrew Thomas](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); ["Christopher Buckley"](#); ["Donna Fletcher"](#); [Hanson Hom](#); [Xiomara Cisneros](#); [Alan Teague](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]-Draft Housing Element - Fair Housing - Alameda Point
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 11:51:21 AM

Andrew,

I am very appreciative of you taking the time to write to me. I am sure you are super busy. I was careful not to include the AP reference because my comment is directed to the issue of whether there is a resource discrepancy between east and west Alameda, not on AP in particular. I certainly understand that, regardless of the resource issue, it would not be good city planning to put all of our new housing at AP.

The underlying intent which I should have disclosed was to counter that a resource area discrepancy justifies the need for upzoning all of the residential zoning districts. I hope you will agree that resource discrepancy should not be a factor in that decision.

I do think that the UDP concern about gentrification is ironic. It is yet another instance where these various agencies reach conclusions without any factoring of the contribution to gentrification made by the primary funding formula for building affordable housing, the density bonus, which is state-wide producing higher density leading to higher land value combined with 85% of the new housing being market rate, all of which creates a perfect storm for gentrification. Even Site A at AP which gives us only 75% market rate and no increase in density is leading UDP to conclude that AP has advanced signs of gentrification!

Talk about Catch 22! The east end has built no affordable housing and is cited for gentrification, while Site A is the poster child for a high affordable housing rate, also gets cited for gentrification!

As you probably guessed, I am the primary drafter of the ACT letter to Council. Mr. Knox-White has sent ACT a letter copied to you and other staff which claims the ACT letter, "includes a host of unsubstantiated statements, I won't be able to address the specifics." I certainly do not want to mislead anyone and would appreciate you identifying any issues that you have with the letter. If I have made any misstatements, they were not intended, and I am very open writing corrections to Council and to any others who have seen the letter.

Finally, I would point out that the ACT letter takes issue with less than 10% of the proposed housing inventory, specifically the upzoning of residential neighborhoods. Therefore, we see ourselves as being supportive of your efforts.

With a 5 o'clock start, this old guy should be able to stay awake, so see you then.

Paul

From: Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:30 AM

To: ps4man@comcast.net; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; Christopher Buckley <cbuckleyaicp@att.net>; Donna Fletcher <ohprimadonna@gmail.com>; Hanson Hom <hhom@alamedaca.gov>; Xiomara Cisneros <xcisneros@alamedaca.gov>; Alan Teague <ateague@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]-Draft Housing Element - Fair Housing - Alameda Point

Dear Mr. Foreman.

Thank you for your attached email to the City Council regarding fair housing in Alameda and your continued interest in the Housing Element. I always appreciate your critical analysis of my recommendations. I hope to see you at the Council meeting on Nov. 30th, where we can continue this discussion. In the meantime, as you are probably aware, all Housing Element updates throughout California must complete a Fair Housing Analysis. We are doing that work now. It will be published in January. But, as a sneak preview, here is some info for you to help you understand why staff has been arguing publically that Alameda cannot put all its RHNA at Alameda Point.

While ABAG's map designates Alameda as a high resource area, HCD uses the TCAC/HCD maps as the basis for resource designations and concentrations of housing. The TCAC/HCD maps do not designate all of Alameda as a high resource area. Instead, Alameda Point is low resource, the east end is high/highest resource, and there's some moderate resource mixed in the middle. While this is the basis for the assessment of fair housing, analysis of specific indicators of fair housing issues and feedback received during consultations also suggest concerns about east v. west integration patterns. For example, the Urban Displacement Project shows that Alameda Point has advanced signs of gentrification and east Alameda is at risk of/becoming exclusive and service providers and legal assistance providers discussed that recent trends have pushed many lower-income and minority populations out of the City, therefore a decrease in segregation may not necessarily be a sign of integration.

Given these early findings and feedback, the Housing Element would have a much stronger case for affirmatively furthering fair housing if the City does not place all of its housing in West Alameda and Alameda Point. If all sites are located in Alameda Point, there are limited housing mobility opportunities for lower-income households in high opportunity areas to the east and the inventory may be a barrier to facilitating future integration.

These are the maps that we using for the fair housing analysis, the "AFFH Viewer" includes layers that have been pre-approved by HCD for this analysis, many of which will be exported to be included in the element.

- TCAC/HCD 2021 Opportunity Areas: <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/2021-tcac-opportunity-map>
- HCD AFFH Data Viewer: <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?>

[id=4d43b384957d4366b09aeae3c5a1f60](#)

- Urban Displacement Project: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/maps/sf-bay-area-gentrification-and-displacement/>

I hope this information is helpful to you. I look forward to working with you to get a certified Housing Element for Alameda.

-Andrew

From: ps4man@comcast.net [<mailto:ps4man@comcast.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 1:28 PM

To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>; Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-B, Nov. 16, 2021, City Council Agenda-Draft Housing Element

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Vella, and Council Members Knox-White, Daysog, and Herrera Spencer:

I have seen an email that Andrew Thomas sent to an Alameda Citizen part of which I contest. He asserts that:

“HCD is going to require that we show how we are putting new housing in “high opportunity areas” of Alameda, as well as “low opportunity areas”. In Alameda, the ‘high opportunity areas’ are east Alameda and Bay Farm Island. The “low opportunity areas” are in West Alameda.”

In the past we did have discrete pockets of segregation and poverty, but I don’t think it is present now. HCD lists as one of the strategies for providing fair housing is for the city to assert that it, “does not have moderate or low resource opportunity areas or areas of high segregation and poverty.”

<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/cdbg/gmm/docs/4.02-hcd-sample-affh-activities.pdf>

ABAG has its own data which supports the above conclusion. See the High Resource Opportunity Map at: https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/factor_e1_access_to_high_resources_v2.pdf

The map legend indicates the factors for determining high resource opportunity areas and shows the entire city as being highly ranked in this regard.

I believe this high ranking is due to two factors:

1. Alameda has a very tiny land area, so every resident has easy access to all the city’s resources.
2. The recent development of combined market rate/affordable housing in the west end at Alameda Point and Alameda Landing has mitigated income differences between the east and west ends.

Unless Mr. Thomas can produce clear data to support his statement, I do not think the high opportunity resource issue should be a factor in your determination of the content of our housing inventory. Instead, the primary factor should be good city planning such as traffic/parking congestion, environmental issues, avoiding displacement of low-income tenants, etc.

Sincerely,

Paul S Foreman