

LARA WEISIGER

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 5:14 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Janet Kern; Jill Keimach
Subject: Fwd: Pocket Parks

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Katina Huston <katinahus@gmail.com>
Date: 09/01/2016 3:18 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Pocket Parks

Dear Representatives of Alameda,

I was appalled to hear that residents have encroached on the commons, prevented public use, and worst yet, would possibly benefit from their theft of public property.

What I would like you to do regarding the loss of use of Waterside Terrace on Alameda's East end is this

1. restore access to the public
2. charge the property owners rental rates for use retroactively at three times the going rate (penalty) particularly the resident who put up do not enter signs.

This is your opportunity to demonstrate your understanding of the commons and your opportunity to protect public property.

Selling the land to those squatting on it sells something that is not yours to sell. Sincerely, Katina Huston

LARA WEISIGER

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 5:08 PM
To: Debra Weiss
Cc: Jill Keimach; Janet Kern; LARA WEISIGER
Subject: RE: Public Park Properties at Fernside and High Streets

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Debra Weiss <wssistr@aol.com>
Date: 09/01/2016 4:00 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: ekos@alamedasun.com, editor@alamedasun.com, Frank Sligh <frankcsligh@gmail.com>
Subject: Public Park Properties at Fernside and High Streets

Alameda City Council Members:

I am writing in response to an issue posted in the [Alameda Sun Sept 1](#), 2016 regarding the waterfront parks issue at East Shore Fernside and High Streets. The six public properties in question are not just real estate. The City has been entrusted to care and maintain public properties such as these, for the use and benefit of ALL residents. They provide environmental, aesthetic, and recreation benefits to our city, its residents, and its visitors. They are a source of economic benefit. They are public parks that are owned BY the public, investments made BY the public, and have been a source of property value enhancement for the property owners of Alameda. Property taxes continue to increase because of these highly valued community assets. They should remain as parks, free from obstruction.

As a tax paying property owner, I am asking yet AGAIN why the City has failed to do its job? Why has the City failed to have fences and obstructions removed from those parks at the expense of the adjacent property owners who have encroached into the park public property? So now you wish to have a closed door session so you can "sweep your problem under the rug" again. If this property is to ever be sold, it should be done only with the approval vote of the residents of Alameda. If these properties are to ever be sold, it should be done so at the FULL MARKET VALUE OF WATERFRONT PROPERTY IN ALAMEDA. Any funds generated should be used only for public upgrades, like fixing another Alameda problem: PARKING SHORTAGE AT MAIN FERRY TERMINAL! No sale should ever be made unless the funds are specifically designated for another public project...PERIOD!

Debra Weiss/Frank Sligh
2518 Chester St
Alameda, CA 94501

The Four-Fold Way: "Show Up, Pay Attention, Tell The Truth, Don't Be Attached To The Outcome"

Sent via my Launch Pad!

LARA WEISIGER

From: Nancy Horton <njhorton0120@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 1:58 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Nancy Horton
Subject: Fwd: citizens weigh in on two issues

Dear Ms. Weisiger -- re-sending, due to having misspelled your name in the earlier email.

Nancy Horton

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

From: **Nancy Horton** <njhorton0120@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Sep 1, 2016 at 1:56 PM
Subject: citizens weigh in on two issues
To: fmatarrese@alamedaca.gov, tspencer@alamedaca.gov, joddie@alamedaca.gov,
mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov, tdaysog@alamedaca.gov, lweisinger@alamedaca.gov
Cc: Nancy Horton <njhorton0120@gmail.com>

Dear Mayor and Alameda City Council,

I am writing on behalf of myself, and my neighbor, Mary Ann Quittman, both of Hansen Avenue.

- 1) We are opposed to plans for the Westmont senior assisted and Alzheimer's facility near the Harbor Bay Ferry terminal. We feel the location is not optimal for frail patients due to its proximity to the Oakland Airport.
- 2) We encourage continuing public access at the few remaining sites along Eastshore Drive. Although homeowners have encroached on these small parks, we hope not to lose access entirely.

Many thanks,

Nancy Johnsen Horton

Mary Ann Quittman
Hansen Avenue residents

LARA WEISIGER

From: Janet Kern
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:18 AM
To: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: FW: PLEASE READ before 8/29 meeting re: East End Easements

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:08 AM
To: Janet Kern <JKern@alamedacityattorney.org>
Subject: Fwd: PLEASE READ before 8/29 meeting re: East End Easements

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Bethany Polentz <bethany.polentz@gmail.com>
Date: 08/29/2016 5:26 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: PLEASE READ before 8/29 meeting re: East End Easements

Dear Alameda City Council Members-

It is my understanding that you will be meeting tonight, 8/29, in a closed session to discuss the subject of East End easements. I'm writing as a concerned owner of one of the adjacent properties, 3267 Fernside Boulevard.

My husband and I purchased our home in 2013 and, other than seeing a drawing circulated in June 2016 regarding the transfer of waterfront property from the Army Corps of Engineers to the city of Alameda, we have seen no official documentation that 1) clearly draws property lines, 2) defines specified use for said easements, and 3) clearly details the ownership of responsibility for the maintenance and care of the property in question.

In 2014, when we applied for permits to do construction to our home, city inspectors stated that we would need to remove a gate on the easement in order to receive a building permit. While we felt uneasy, considering the existence of the gate pre-dated our ownership, and we were being asked to remove the gate from public land, we complied with the request. However, when we asked for more information on easement use, property lines and maintenance, they provided no information, nor could they direct us to anyone with the city who might have this information.

While I appreciate Mr. Knox White's civic dedication and enthusiasm for allowing public access to park lands, I'm concerned about the tone and volume of letters you might be receiving "in support of keeping the parks," due to the misinformation in and inaccuracies littered throughout his posts. There is a distinct difference between land co-opted for emergency access and recreational park use. If these areas are truly to be used recreationally as public parks, then provisions need to be made by the city to maintain them as such.

To elaborate, the concrete of the adjacent easement is crumbling and sinking on both sides. There is no official city-maintained lighting (the easement is only to be accessed from dawn 'til dusk), there is no barrier between the easement wall and the water below, nor are the easements on the Alameda Police Department's radar for regular patrol. There are multiple safety issues, both during the day when the public might choose to access the easement, as well as at night (when the easement is technically closed) in terms of the possibility of transients looking for shelter or intruders lying-in-wait for residents or passersby. Presently, with the easements in their current state, I worry about my safety, as well as that of my family and neighbors.

To further that, we have had multiple trespassers on our property- several of whom verbally confronted us (while standing in our backyard, far from the concrete of the easement). One older couple "mistook" our private dock for public access and used our dock for meditation. While we welcome their calm and warm presence on our street, they stepped over a "No Trespassing" sign (which was clearly staked on our property) and entered the private dock at low tide, which is dangerous due to the sharp incline of the ramp. We have had at least three separate homeless people wander onto our property, casing out tools and an existing outbuilding. A contractor in our employ found a man reclined on our lawn, smoking a joint in our backyard, seemingly unaware (or,

unconcerned) that this was private property. On another occasion, an erratic acting woman came down the easement on a bike with bags, asking if she could pay rent and stay because she was "looking for an apartment to rent." In January 2016, one homeless man had begun setting up camp, leaving personal items in the easement and in our backyard over the course of several days. After the second confirmed sighting of him, we called APD and filed a report. These are just the more notable examples of the blurring of lines, literally, in the absence of clear lines.

If the easements are to be considered "parks," provisions should be made for a formal survey to establish clear property lines and the city of Alameda investing in repairs and maintenance. At the very least, a conversation with adjacent homeowners would be a starting point, as we deserve a say in the matter (and other Alameda residents deserve ACCURATE information).

I would urge you to have a discussion with me, my husband, and the five other involved property owners, before you make any decisions about the so-called "pocket parks."

Please feel free to contact me via this e-mail address, or (415) 572-6549. I look forward to a conversation.

Respectfully-

Bethany A. Polentz

LARA WEISIGER

From: William Thur <gwthur@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:20 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: City Waterfront Parks

To the City Council,

As a long-time resident and home owner in Alameda, I am deeply disturbed to learn that existing City of Alameda waterfront pocket park land has been illegally taken over by adjoining private property owners. Even if these lots have not been developed or maintained by the City, there is no excuse for this greedy appropriation of public property. These potential pocket parks belong to all Alamedans, and could enhance Alameda's quality of life by providing valuable informal neighborhood access to the estuary for recreational purposes.

It is outrageous to learn that the City Council is now considering legitimizing these blatant land grabs by some of Alameda's wealthy residents.

This should be stopped, and all private structures, fences, etc. on these lands should be removed. Anything less would be a graphic demonstration of City handouts to private interests at the expense of all Alamedans. Certainly our elected representatives are better than this!

- William Thur, 2114 Pacific Avenue

LARA WEISIGER

From: Claire Bonde <bonde.family.98@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2016 7:10 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Waterfront Land Taken Over by Private Owners

As a resident of the East End of Alameda, I strongly encourage you to stop the wholesale removal of 3 waterfront parks on the East End and ensure that future generations have access to the city's waterways. The City Council should vote to ensure public access to the water, including the future ability to provide fishing and boating docks off Alameda's pocket parks, and the city should retain full rights to the estuary properties that abut the city's existing land.

Thank you for your consideration.



Claire Bonde
3247 Sterling Avenue