From:	Dan Tuazon
To:	Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tony Daysog; Tracy Jensen
Cc:	Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] 7-D: Eliminating Elected Financial Oversight
Date:	Tuesday, July 7, 2026 1:37:50 PM

Dear Madam Mayor and Alameda City Council Members

As a 65-year resident of Alameda, I have been involved in our community and must speak up when certain issues arise. On July 7, you will hold a meeting and perhaps decide on placing on the November 2026 election the elimination of the Elected Financial Oversight currently held by Mr Kevin Kennedy and Mr Kevin Kearney commonly referred to as "The Kevins"

Awhile back there was an election to replace The Kevins whose sole purpose was to eliminate the Elected positions. The citizens of Alameda voted and The Kevins won in a landslide. I believe if this is put on the November 2026 ballot the result will be overwhelmingly the same. Alamedans do not want to lose their voting rights.
And Alamedans must have an independent oversight on how we should spend our tax dollars.

The Constitution of the United States starts up with "We the People". We the People reserves the right to vote for our Mayor and our Council Members. We the People reserves the right to also vote for our City Treasurer and our City Auditor.

Sincerely and Thank you for your time.

Dan Tuazon
Concern Citizen

July 6, 2026

Re: July 7, 2026 City Council Meeting, Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C and 7-D

Greetings Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers Daysog, Boller, Jensen, and Pryor,

Your dedication to serving our community and carefully considering the goals and desires of your constituents is commendable. I am appealing to this deep commitment to public service as I request that you pause and invest more thought into the highly consequential decisions on the July 7, 2026 City Council meeting agenda related to proposed Charter amendments.

Every Alameda resident will be affected by these measures, as each will have direct and permanent bearing on how Alameda is governed. I request that you **VOTE NO on Agenda Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, and 7-D**. These items all require additional public review, and therefore any decision on them should be postponed.

Agenda Item 7-A — Proposed $300M Infrastructure Bond

While it is critical that we invest in Alameda's infrastructure, the current language of the proposed bond measure is perilously vague about how our funds would be allocated or prioritized. It is irresponsible to ask taxpayers to take on the enormity of a $300 million bond without presenting an itemized, in-depth, and transparent project list that identifies which projects will be funded first, the estimated costs of each project, and the criteria that will be used to allocate the funds.

We as a community face an urgent need to adjust for sea level rise across the city, and to take robust action toward strengthening the deteriorating sidewalks, potholes, and other fundamental components of our neighborhoods' existing infrastructure. These are fundamental municipal responsibilities. Such routine maintenance expenses should be cared for within the Alameda's General Fund and ongoing capital planning, rather than relying primarily on broad borrowing authority without clearly defined spending commitments.

Item 7-A will affect the budgets of Alamedans in a very tangible way. The Bay Area is facing a housing affordability crisis, and the proposed bond measure would put further financial constraints on families and individuals, including renters who would also likely see an increase in their rents as a result. Voters deserve more information and greater certainty before being asked to approve a bond of this magnitude.

Agenda Item 7-B — Charter "Cleanup" Measure

Item 7-B should be removed from consideration at this time; it is a hodgepodge of different issues that must be re-worked to address each one coherently.

The proposal combines two repeals and nineteen separate Charter amendments into a single ballot measure. Many of the proposed changes address entirely different subjects. Packaging so many unrelated amendments together makes it difficult for both the Council and the public to thoughtfully evaluate each proposal on its own merits. Additionally, public trust is weakened because this conglomeration approach gives an uneasy sense that bad ideas are being swept in along with the good.

Particularly concerning is the proposed modification to qualification requirements for members of important advisory boards and commissions. Alameda should not join the flight from expertise that has become sadly prevalent in our national government. Our city benefits from having qualified professionals—including engineers, architects, contractors, and subject matter experts who help guide decisions affecting our infrastructure, utilities, and historic resources. We must not weaken those qualifications.

Charter amendments are serious agreements that we make with our neighbors about how we wish Alameda to be governed. Each one merits its own thorough analysis and independent public debate rather than being lumped into a single catch-all measure. Please separate these issues to promote transparency, encourage informed public participation, and strengthen confidence in the process.

Agenda Item 7-C — Changes to Public Land Approval Requirements

I strongly encourage the Council to vote No on this proposal.

Public lands are not a trivial asset to be bought and sold on a whim. These lands are *public* and therefore belong to all Alameda residents. Decisions involving the sale or long-term lease of public property must continue to require broad consensus.

Currently, the requirement of a supermajority vote and multiple public meetings provides an important safeguard that encourages research, transparency, deliberation, and community participation before irreversible decisions are made. Lowering the voting threshold while reducing opportunities for public review endangers those protections.

The existing requirements should be maintained (or even strengthened!) to help ensure that significant decisions involving public assets receive broad public support and reasoned consideration.

Agenda Item 7-D — Elimination of the Elected Auditor and Treasurer

Item 7-D should be removed from consideration.

The elected Auditor and Treasurer positions play critical roles in providing independent financial oversight, which is a cornerstone of good governance. These experts provide accountability directly to Alameda voters and serve as important checks within the City's financial management structure. Eliminating independently elected financial oversight raises legitimate concerns about transparency and accountability.

Alameda depends on the Auditor and Treasurer for independent review to help reduce the risk of financial errors, conflicts of interest, and potential fraud while strengthening public confidence in the stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Our community deserves a comprehensive public discussion evaluating the long-term implications and possible alternatives to these positions, before such a significant change is considered. While administrative efficiencies may be worth discussing, outright elimination of the roles is ill-advised.

In summary, these proposed Charter amendments would permanently alter important aspects of Alameda's government, and so deserve much greater public engagement and analysis before they are considered for a vote.

As longtime homeowners in Alameda, we urge the Council to *vote NO on all of these agenda items*, so that each proposal can be re-evaluated through in-depth public review and independent evaluation. The City Charter should be treated with greater care and consensus.

Thank you for serving Alameda faithfully and listening to the citizens whom you represent.

Respectfully,

Mary Levy and
Steven Levy

Alameda Residents

July 7, 2026

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council:

Re: Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D – Proposed Charter Amendments and Ballot Measures

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

Alameda Citizens Task Force respectfully urges the Council to postpone consideration of Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D, and defer placing these measures before the voters until the City has provided a more deliberate, transparent, and legally defensible public process.

The Alameda City Charter is not an ordinary policy document. It functions as the City's constitution. Amendments should therefore be considered only after the public has received clear notice of the specific changes under consideration and a meaningful opportunity to evaluate their legal and practical consequences.

Although the Council possesses the authority to propose Charter amendments, that authority carries a corresponding obligation to ensure that the legislative process satisfies the fundamental principles of transparency, informed public participation, and procedural fairness. When government proposes permanent structural changes to its governing framework, the public process should *exceed* the minimum legal requirements rather than merely satisfy them.

Several of the proposed Charter amendments appear to have developed through an accelerated internal staff process that has not afforded residents sufficient time to review the legal ramifications of each proposal. The agenda materials describe these measures as routine updates or administrative improvements, yet several provisions would substantially alter the allocation of governmental authority, public oversight, and voter protections. Characterizing significant structural revisions as "housekeeping" risks obscuring their true legal effect.

Moreover, presenting numerous Charter revisions simultaneously places an unreasonable burden on the electorate. Even if each proposal is individually lawful, the cumulative effect is to require voters to evaluate multiple fundamental governmental changes within a compressed timeframe. Sound public administration favors incremental reform supported by extensive public engagement rather than wholesale revision under ordinary legislative scheduling.

ACT is also concerned that the Council has not adequately demonstrated *why* these amendments require immediate placement on the November ballot. Charter amendments are intended to endure for decades. A delay of several months to permit additional study, public workshops, and independent legal review would not prejudice the City's interests but would materially improve public confidence in the outcome.

From a legal perspective, California courts have long recognized that open government depends not only upon technical compliance with statutory notice requirements but also upon ensuring that citizens receive meaningful notice sufficient to understand the matters upon which their elected representatives intend to act. When **significant governmental restructuring** is proposed, transparency requires more than publication of agenda packets shortly before a meeting. It requires a process that genuinely facilitates informed civic participation.

Accordingly, Alameda Citizens Task Force respectfully requests that the Council:

1. Withdraw Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D from consideration at this time;
2. Direct the City Attorney to prepare a comprehensive **legal analysis explaining the practical effect of each proposed Charter amendment;**
3. Conduct a series of **publicly noticed community workshops devoted exclusively to Charter reform**;
4. Allow sufficient time for written public comment before any future vote to place Charter amendments on the ballot; and

5. Consider each substantive Charter amendment independently rather than as part of broader omnibus measures whenever practicable.

The legitimacy of our City's governing Charter depends as much upon the fairness of the amendment process as upon the substance of the amendments themselves. Alameda residents deserve an open, deliberate, and transparent process before being asked to approve permanent changes to the City's foundational governing document.

Respectfully submitted,
Alameda Citizens Task Force

From:	Reyla Graber
To:	Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] Do not approve Charter Changes Tuesday- please
Date:	Monday, July 6, 2026 6:07:17 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,
I disagree with your attempt to seek approval Tuesday of several ballot measures which would change our City Charter without adequate discussion or input from residents.Yes, it will be on the November ballot and still without adequate analysis or feedback from residents.
I don't believe this is good government practice, I'm shocked and I hope and trust it will not be approve
tomorrow evening.

Reyla Graber
Alameda Resident

From: rob_hough_alameda@yahoo.com
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Cc: announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Why not drop Charter Amendment proposal 7/7/2026 item 7-D file 2026-6080: elimination of elected office of Treasurer & Auditor
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 5:25:12 AM

Mayor Ezzy-Ashcraft & Council Members,

Salary increases above inflation for Executive Management Employees (EXME) Salary Schedule from 6% to 14.85% (nothing personal but are Santa Monica and Pasadena really in the "market area"?) on the consent calendar AND at the same time working to eliminate the Treasurer and Auditor from their status as elected officials is **not a good look**!

Justifying a November ballot initiative to remove the Treasurer and Auditor from elected status because you get a deal from the registrar-of-voters in a 2-for-one initiative price? That is a terrific example of why elected financial officers are needed: to see the bigger picture.
In my opinion, elected Treasurer and

Auditor officials as representative of Alameda can more independently evaluate economic issues that affect the **Quality of Life** both now and for future generations. For example, bay shoreline commercial usage (did BCDC OK?), retail rezoning for housing on fill, and irreversible park privatization schemes all involve economic guesses as to future benefits vs the real costs to present residents including their future loss of options. Having knowledgeable and experienced review of the analysis of these projects could enhance the council's decision-making and public confidence.

Unfortunately I didn't follow the supposed economic savings from reduced payroll which appeared to claim 31k$ each. Was an "AI" program the supposed replacement?

By the way, democratic Athens, designed by Cleisthenes, only elected a few types of officers one of which was Treasurer. (Military officers and water managers were other elected officers.)

Please drop the item 7D proposal from your agenda.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Roberta Hough
911 San Antonio Ave

July 5, 2026

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers Pryor, Boller, Daysog and Jensen,

Re: July 7, 2026 City Council Meeting, Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C and 7-D

I appreciate the many hours of work that the City Council, staff, and commissions dedicate to serving our community. The decisions before you regarding the proposed Charter amendments are among the **most significant that Alameda residents will consider in many years**. Because these measures could permanently change how our city is governed, I respectfully ask that you **vote No on Agenda Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, and 7-D**, and postpone these items that require additional public review.

Agenda Item 7-A — Proposed $300M Infrastructure Bond

I support investing in Alameda's infrastructure, but I do not believe the proposed bond measure provides voters with sufficient clarity regarding how the proceeds would be allocated or prioritized.

A $300 million bond represents a substantial long-term financial commitment for Alameda taxpayers. Before asking residents to approve borrowing of this magnitude, the City should present a clear, detailed, and transparent project list that identifies which projects will be funded first, the estimated costs of each project, and the criteria that will be used to allocate the funds.

If Alameda's most pressing infrastructure needs are to be addressed, I believe the highest priorities should include preparing for sea level rise and maintaining the city's existing infrastructure, particularly repairing deteriorating sidewalks and potholes throughout our neighborhoods. These are fundamental municipal responsibilities that residents experience every day. Routine maintenance should remain a priority within the City's General Fund and ongoing capital planning rather than relying primarily on broad borrowing authority without clearly defined spending commitments. Considering the Bay Area is facing a housing affordability crisis, the proposed bond measure would also put further financial constraints on families and individuals, including renters who would also likely see an increase in their rents as a result.

Voters deserve greater certainty before being asked to approve a bond of this size.

Agenda Item 7-B — Charter "Cleanup" Measure

I respectfully request that Item 7-B be removed from consideration at this time.

This proposal combines two repeals and nineteen separate Charter amendments into a single ballot measure despite the fact that many of the proposed changes address entirely different subjects. Bundling numerous unrelated amendments together makes it difficult for both the Council and the public to thoughtfully evaluate each proposal on its own merits.

Some of these changes, including modifications to qualification requirements for members of important advisory boards and commissions, deserve independent public discussion. Alameda benefits from having qualified professionals—including engineers, architects, contractors, and subject matter experts who help guide decisions affecting our infrastructure, utilities, and historic resources.

Each proposed Charter amendment should receive its own careful analysis and public debate rather than being grouped into one comprehensive measure. Separating these issues would promote transparency, encourage informed public participation, and strengthen confidence in the process.

Agenda Item 7-C — Changes to Public Land Approval Requirements

I respectfully urge the Council to vote No on this proposal.

Public lands belong to all Alameda residents. Decisions involving the sale or long-term lease of public property should continue to require broad consensus.

The existing requirement of a supermajority vote and multiple public meetings provides an important safeguard that encourages transparency, deliberation, and community participation before irreversible decisions are made. Lowering the voting threshold while reducing opportunities for public review diminishes those protections.

Maintaining the current requirements helps ensure that significant decisions involving public assets receive broad public support and careful consideration.

Agenda Item 7-D — Elimination of the Elected Auditor and Treasurer

I respectfully request that this item also be removed from consideration.

Independent financial oversight is a cornerstone of good government. The elected Auditor and Treasurer provide accountability directly to Alameda voters and serve as important checks within the City's financial management structure.

While administrative efficiencies may be worth discussing, eliminating independently elected financial oversight raises legitimate concerns about transparency and accountability. Independent review helps reduce the risk of financial errors, conflicts of interest, and potential fraud while strengthening public confidence in the stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Before considering such a significant governance change, I believe the community deserves a comprehensive public discussion evaluating the long-term implications and possible alternatives.

These proposed Charter amendments would permanently alter important aspects of Alameda's government. Changes of this magnitude should proceed only after robust public engagement, careful analysis, and broad community consensus.

I respectfully ask the Council to v**ote No on all of these agenda items** until each proposal has received the level of public review and independent evaluation that changes to our City Charter deserve.

Thank you for your service to Alameda and for considering the views of residents who value transparency, accountability, and thoughtful governance.

Respectfully,

Carmen Reid

Alameda Resident

From: Steve Slauson
To: CITYCOUNCIL-List
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Regular Agenda Items 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 4:20:35 PM

Honorable Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and Council Members Michele Pryor, Greg Boller, Tony Daysog, Tracy Jensen

I object to the Regular Agenda Items 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D as follows:

Item 7A is a $300 million bond with no information on the projects or needs for the projects explained.

Item 7B bundles numerous City Charter amendments into a single ballot measure preventing thoughtful individual consideration of individual changes.

Item 7C appears in violation of Alameda's Measure D

Item 7D proposes eliminating the elected positions of City auditor and City Treasurer, thereby removing independent financial oversite.

I respectfully request these items be removed from the July 7, 2026 Regular Agenda and be placed on a future Regular Agenda with at least 90
Days allowed for full public review and participation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Slauson
2426 Otis Drive
Alameda

From: Dorothy Freeman
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller
Cc: Lara Weisiger; Manager Manager
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Agenda July 7, 2026 Item 7D
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 3:26:50 PM

Alameda City Council Agenda July 7, 2026 Item 7D

July 3, 2026

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Pryor and Council Members Daysog, Boller, and Jensen;

I am writing to oppose the proposal to convert the City Auditor and City Treasurer from elected to appointed positions. These roles require a high level of specialized expertise, have a clearly defined scope, and should not be subject to term limits.

Although appointed officials may act with good intentions, they ultimately report to those who appoint them. In contrast, an elected Auditor and Treasurer are accountable solely to the voters. This independence is essential to maintaining strong checks and balances and ensuring public trust in financial reporting and oversight.

Comparisons to governance structures in other Bay Area cities should not determine how Alameda governs itself. Alamedaï¿½s system should reflect the needs and values of its own residents.

The cost of maintaining these elected positions is relatively small compared to overall city staffing expenses. Reassigning these responsibilities to existing staff would dilute the importance and effectiveness of the work, while creating a new appointed position would likely increase costs significantly. Presenting the total cost of these roles over a 15-year period is misleading and does not provide a fair comparison; salaries should be evaluated on an annual basis, consistent with how other city positions are presented.

For these reasons, I strongly recommend that the offices of City Treasurer and City Auditor remain elected positions.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

Cc: City Manager
City Clerk

From: margie
To: CITYCOUNCIL-List
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objections to items on the July 7 agenda
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 2:55:00 PM

First of all, I object to consideration of major changes when many Alamedans are on vacation.

Specific objections:
I OBJECT to:

Item 7A ($300 million bond) The bond is for "infrastructure," however, no specific projects are budgeted. The funds could be used for anything. Further, many homeowners in Alameda are seniors on fixed incomes. Additional property tax may be unaffordable.

Item 7B bundles numerous City Charter amendments into a single ballot measure. This approach forces voters into an all-or-nothing decision, preventing thoughtful consideration of individual changes.

Item 7C would make it easier for the City Council to approve the sale or lease of city property by allowing approval via simple majority resolution rather than a super majority ordinance. This change may weaken existing protections, including those established under Measure D.

Item 7D proposes eliminating the elected positions of City Auditor and Treasurer. This proposal, combined with the very vague proposal for a $300 million bond, is very problematic. I am in favor of independent oversight, not dependent on the approval of the Council.

From:	Marian Breitbart
To:	Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] Charter Amendments and Elected Treasurer and Auditor Positions- Council Item 7B and 7D
Date:	Saturday, July 4, 2026 5:39:52 PM

If the Council approves items 7C and 7D as presented, it will be extremely disappointing.

There does not seem to be a staff report explaining the rationale for these items. Clean up changes to the charter should be voted on separately for each major change.

So far as eliminating the Auditor and Treasurer as elected positions seems to follow the new federal model of minimizing or eliminating any independent oversight of the Council, Finance Director and budget. Is the reason to eliminate the relatively low costs of these positions or because they ask uncomfortable questions. These people were the only ones to identify and push for pension reform…a pressure point for most public entities that have been saved from catastrophe by atypically high investment returns over the past few years..

Please reconsider!
Thank you

From: patricia.lamborn@aol.com
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Subject: Item 7-D Re: City Auditor and Treasurer elected positions
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:34:09 AM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, and City Council Members Pryor, Boller, Jensen, and Daysog,

I am writing to oppose the proposal in Agenda 7D as I believe it is a dangerous step backward. It would destroy independent oversight. It appears the City wants to turn the Auditor and Treasurer into appointed roles. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money.

At this moment in history under President Trumps " regime" our federal government is wiping out historical checks and balances and placing power solely in the executive branch. Thank goodness for our system of judicial oversight! Our state governments, courts and city government are also critical in maintaining the checks and balances that preserve democracy in our country.

This amendment would permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars.

Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust. I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let’s keep Alameda’s government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Sincerely,
Patricia Lamborn
Alameda Resident 34 years

From: Roxanne Clement
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Charter Amendment on 7/7/26
Date: Monday, June 29, 2026 9:15:47 AM

Mayor Ashcraft & Council Members ;

This proposal is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons: **First, <u>it destroys independent oversight</u>.** It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money. **Second, <u>it strips power from the voters.</u>** This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars. **Third, <u>it discards vital institutional knowledge which between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, who bring over 60 years of combined experience.</u>** At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability. Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust. I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let's keep Alameda's government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Roxanne Clement
124 Cork Rd
Alameda, Ca,

From:	Alice Dockter
To:	Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] Please vote “no” on proposal to change auditor and treasurer jobs to appointed positions
Date:	Sunday, June 28, 2026 6:15:29 PM

After watching two city council members and Rob Bonta pressure an Alameda city manager to hire an under-qualified candidate for fire chief at the bidding of the firefighters' union, I do not trust having the City Auditor and Treasurer appointed rather than elected.

Please vote "no."

Thank you,
Alice Dockter

From: Edward Sing
To: Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Meeting on June 30, 2026 - Item 7D
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2026 2:29:18 PM

Mayor Ashcraft & Council Members:

The proposal in Agenda 7D is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons:

First, it destroys independent oversight. It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money.

Second, it strips power from the voters. This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars.

Third, it discards vital institutional knowledge which, between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, bring over 60 years of combined experience. At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability.

Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust.

I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let's keep Alameda's government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Respectfully,

Ed Sing
Alameda Resident for 30 years

From: Karen Miller
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tony Daysog; Tracy Jensen; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on a ballot measure to eliminate the election of Auditor and Treasurer
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2026 1:54:50 PM

Dear Mayor and Council members,

The proposal to eliminate the election of the Treasurer and Auditor is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons: First, it destroys independent oversight. It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money. Second, it strips power from the voters. This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars. Third, it discards vital institutional knowledge that ,which between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, bring over 60 years of combined experience. At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability. Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust. I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let's keep Alameda's government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Regards,
Karen Miller
Keith Miller
720 Paru St

Virus-free.www.avast.com

From:	Karen Park
To:	Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] City Charter to eliminate the Treasurer and Auditor positions
Date:	Sunday, June 28, 2026 12:26:19 PM

Mayor Ashcraft & Council Members ;

This proposal is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons:First, it destroys independent oversight. It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money. Second, it strips power from the voters. This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars. Third, it discards vital institutional knowledge which between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, who bring over 60 years of combined experience. At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability. Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust. I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let's keep Alameda's government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Yours truly,

Karen Park
9 Coleport Landing
Alameda 94502

From:	Cathy Leong
To:	Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Tony Daysog; Tracy Jensen; Greg Boller
Cc:	Lara Weisiger
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] Response in concern over Proposed Charter Amendment on 7/7 City Council Agenda
Date:	Sunday, June 28, 2026 8:44:05 AM

Mayor Ashcraft & Council Members;
This proposal is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons:First, it destroys independent oversight. It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy. We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money. Second, it strips power from the voters. This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars. Third, it discards vital institutional knowledge between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, who bring over 60 years of combined experience. At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability. Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust. I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let’s keep Alameda’s government transparent, accountable, and independent.
Yours truly, Cathy Leong

From: Pamela Joyce
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Michele Pryor; Greg Boller; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Keep City Auditor & City Treasurer elected positions
Date: Saturday, June 27, 2026 2:57:10 PM

Mayor Ashcraft & Council Members ;

This proposal is a dangerous step backward for three critical reasons:

First, it destroys independent oversight.

It appears the City wants to turn these into appointed roles, likely absorbing them under the Finance Director. But the Finance Director answers to the City Manager, who answers to you, the Council. Any suggestion of independence under that structure is a fallacy.

We need checks and balances, not financial watchdogs who report to the very people spending the money.

Second, it strips power from the voters. This amendment permanently deprives Alameda citizens of their democratic right to directly elect the people who safeguard their tax dollars.

Third, it discards vital institutional knowledge which between Auditor Kearney & Treasurer Kennedy, who bring over 60 years of combined experience. At a time when the Alameda government has seen significant turnover, throwing away this deep institutional knowledge harms city stability. Independent oversight is not administrative red tape—it is the foundation of public trust.

> I urge the Council to vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot. Let's keep Alameda's government transparent, accountable, and independent.

Alameda Citizen & voter since 1981

Pam Joyce
150 Basinside Way, Alameda