

29 MAY, 2020

DEAR MAYOR ASHCRAFT AND CITY COUNCIL,

AS A LONG TIME RESIDENT OF ALAMEDA,  
I AM VERY INTERESTED AND CONCERNED IN DECISIONS  
MADE REGARDING CITY CHARTER ARTICLE 26  
(MEASURE A).

PUBLIC HOUSING AND TRAFFIC DENSITY  
ARE ISSUES IMPORTANT TO MANY ALAMEDIANS, AND  
DESERVE TO BE DISCUSSED BEFORE THE COMMUNITY  
IN AN OPEN FORUM. I WOULD URGE YOU TO  
POSTPONE THIS DISCUSSION UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE  
RESIDENTS OF ALAMEDA CAN ATTEND IN PERSON.

I AM NOT, AND I SUPPOSE MANY OTHERS ARE  
NOT EQUIPT TO PARTICIPATE ELECTRONICALLY. WITH  
THE CRISIS WE ARE IN, THIS IS NOT THE TIME  
TO MAKE CRITICAL DECISIONS WITHOUT COMMUNITY  
INPUT.

AS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES, TRANSPARENCY  
IS VITAL, AND THERE SHOULD BE NO APPEARANCE  
OF BACK ROOM DECISIONS.

SINCERELY,

WARREN ELLIOTT

**Lara Weisiger**

---

**From:** sjslauson <sslau99950@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 3:37 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] June 2, 2020 Regular Council Meetin, Agenda Item 6B

Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members:

This is a request to table Agenda Item 6B due to the current economic crisis and the civil unrest. This subject requires full participation of the public in an open forum which includes direct participation in city council meetings. This item needs to be rescheduled at a future date.

I am in agreement with the letter sent by the Alameda Citizens Task Force Steering Committee to you regarding this subject.

Stephen Slauson  
2426 Otis Drive

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Patricia Baer <2baers@att.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:39 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-B

Hello Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am asking you to delay discussion and decisions on Article 26 until the election of 2022. During this time of pandemic, the voters can't engage with others in public discourse, and this is too important an issue to exclude the public's input.

The City has met our State Housing Element quota until 2023, so there shouldn't be a rush to make such permanent decisions now in our City Charter.

Thank you,

Patsy Baer

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Elizabeth Tuckwell <elizabethtuckwell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2020 8:15 PM  
**To:** John Knox White; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] Meeting June 2, Item 6-B

Thank you, Councilman Knox-White, for your exhaustive response. You obviously have thought about this for a long time.

Nonetheless, I wish to mention an issue that came to my attention after I sent the earlier email. As I'm sure you know, there has been a curfew imposed on the City of Alameda from 8:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. June 1-2. There has also been a curfew imposed on Alameda County for the same hours, but not ending until June 5. The City of Alameda is, of course, subject to a county-wide curfew.

Based on your reply to my email, I'm guessing that you might not see any more reason to take a curfew into consideration when making a major policy decision than to take a shelter-in-place into consideration when making a major policy decision. But I would feel remiss in my responsibility as a long-term resident of Alameda if I didn't call your attention to such major disruptions that will undoubtedly limit the breadth and depth of discussion regarding the future of Measure A.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda Resident

On Mon, Jun 1, 2020, 19:52 John Knox White <[JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov](mailto:JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov)> wrote:

Thank you for your email.

I have heard from a few people about Tomorrow's discussion of Article 26/Measure A. I appreciate your interest in the topic and willingness to share your thoughts.

I know that some people have voiced concerns that Charter Amendment items should not be considered during a time when meetings are being held on-line. Personally, I don't think that city business needs to grind to a halt for the next 6-12 months when we will continue to be social distancing.

Given the amount of discussion on this particular issue, I don't agree that this process has been rushed. There has been, and if it moves forward there will continue to be, a lot of opportunity for community input on the subject.

Alameda has held numerous public input meetings on this issue over the years, the latest was a Planning Board meeting on January 13th where over 100 people attended and a City Council meeting at the beginning of May.

Additionally, the topic has been raised and publicized over the last six months through multiple outlets and I have personally visited and convened multiple organization and group discussions where the topic has been discussed with people on all sides of the issues.

Ultimately, the meeting on Tuesday is not a final decision meeting, the only action (if any) taken by the council will be to provide further direction to City Staff on what information and language they would like to see for consideration in June/July, providing the community nearly 2 months to provide input and comment before returning to the council for consideration, deliberation and decision. Then, if the council ultimately puts the issue on the ballot, there will be months for people to discuss the issue and ultimately, the voters, not the Council, will decide what direction to pursue.

To me, it's important to remain mindful that Article 26 doesn't limit the number of housing units or protect historic housing in Alameda.

State law sets the minimum and the State is increasingly penalizing cities that do not comply. Measure A only impacts the types of buildings that can be built in Alameda and in doing so creates new units that are more expensive, generate more traffic and have higher environmental and climate change impacts. I think we can better maintain the community that we all love with flexibility provided on how we design new residential and mixed-use projects that we are required to approve.

I believe that having a City Charter that is out of compliance with state law and requires the City to turn itself in knots to remain in compliance, while also limiting our ability to address housing affordability, traffic and climate change impacts, is a problem. One that only the voters can solve. Tuesday's discussion is another part of a council discussion on the matter, but it won't be the last.

I respect that we may have different perspectives on this issue, I remain open to hearing your thoughts on the matter and look forward to the opportunity to hearing more about your concerns and any proposed solutions that you would like to share.

I will continue to keep you informed of any next steps on this issue so that you will be able to provide input at all points of action.

Best,

John Knox White

Vice Mayor, Alameda

---

**From:** Elizabeth Tuckwell <[elizabethtuckwell@gmail.com](mailto:elizabethtuckwell@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 1, 2020 11:18 AM

**To:** John Knox White <[JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov](mailto:JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov)>; Tony Daysog <[TDaysog@alamedaca.gov](mailto:TDaysog@alamedaca.gov)>; Malia Vella <[MVella@alamedaca.gov](mailto:MVella@alamedaca.gov)>; Jim Oddie <[JOddie@alamedaca.gov](mailto:JOddie@alamedaca.gov)>

**Cc:** Eric Levitt <[elevitt@alamedaca.gov](mailto:elevitt@alamedaca.gov)>; Lara Weisiger <[lweisiger@alamedaca.gov](mailto:lweisiger@alamedaca.gov)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Meeting June 2, Item 6-B

Please reschedule discussion of changes to Measure A so that concerned citizens can address City Council in person. Measure A is among the important elements that create the "homey" atmosphere of Alameda.

The pandemic has actually heightened the importance of Measure A and possible revisions to it. The overall concept of population density is being reconsidered at all levels nationwide, with the emphasis on social distancing. With the announcement of two options by the newly formed subcommittee including the Mayor and Councilman Oddie, each option deserves the full consideration that requires in-person sharing of ideas. Since Governor Newsom has already started easing of the shelter-in-place, it seems likely that City Council might again be held at City Hall, with social distancing in place.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda Resident

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Donna Fletcher <ohprimadonna@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2020 7:37 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A charter on November ballot

To: Mayor Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council

This email is to respectfully request that the Council delay putting Historic Measure A to a vote in November until it can be considered in the context of a comprehensive general plan review that includes significant public participation.

Other than the filling in of South Shore in the late 50's, Historic Measure A, when voted into existence in the 70's, was one of the single most impactful city planning decisions Alameda has made to date. Reversing the decision will have just as great an impact for future decades; not just in the area of housing density, but on infrastructure, traffic, schools, neighborhood livability, and the character and quality of our city, something we don't always put a high enough value on.

A lot of development is currently under way in Alameda, has just been approved, or is on the boards--housing development, hotels, and possibly a massive reconfiguration and re-orientation of South Shore Center.

Have we really taken a good look at the potential effect of a reversal of Measure A in the context of ALL of this development, what this development means to our City long-term, and how it measures up to our values and quality of life?

Rather than place Historic Measure A on a ballot measure in November, please use your opportunity to educate and involve Alamedans in a general plan review process that enables us to understand the true impact of a Measure A reversal in the context of all current and potential development being considered. The result of that process would be that voters would be able to make enlightened and informed decisions regarding Measure A's relevance to the Alameda of the future. These proactive steps would also serve to reduce controversy and generate more faith and trust in the overall process of improving the City of Alameda.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Donna Fletcher  
112 Centre Court  
Alameda, CA 94502

**From:** [Cathy Leong](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#)  
**Cc:** [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Yibin Shen](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Measure A concerns  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 4:35:53 PM

---

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Due to potential curfew restrictions in our City & County and out of respect for your constituents who may be fearful of attending a meeting due to Covid19,

Concerned about some who appear to be working to get rid Alameda of Measure A (from the 1970's, Article 26) or to render it useless. It is my understanding you, as Council, want the upcoming November ballot to include changes/measures affecting Article 26.

As this would potentially negatively impact Alameda's neighborhoods I just want to share, while sheltering in place staying within the confines of our fair community, we've been able to walk many a street, various neighborhoods, embraced the history this City holds, the pride in which most homeowners and renters take to keep their residences attractive, extolled the virtues of what history we have. It would be a travesty to see these same neighborhoods torn asunder by allowing homes to be torn down and replaced (as previously done prior to Measure A) by questionable architecture.

Please take into consideration some of ACT (Alameda Citizen's Taskforce) information as follows:

1. Object to any consideration of revising Article 26 (Measure A) while the public is prevented from attending meetings in person and distracted by the pandemic from devoting time and energy to this issue. The City has a Housing Element certified by the State as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023. Thus, the revision of Article 26 is not time sensitive.
2. Article 26 is a complex issue which should be submitted to a comprehensive and transparent General Plan revision process with robust public participation, rather than rushed to the ballot in November of 2020.
3. Any modification to be considered for future modification of Article 26-3 (2000 sq ft per unit) must meet two criteria.
  - A. It must clearly identify and distinguish the residential and historic properties that will retain the protection of the current provision and the properties that will be exempted.
  - B. Properties exempt from Article 26-3 must carry a maximum density limit of 30 units per acre unless a greater density is mandated by State law.
4. The proposed Article 26-3 language contained in the subcommittee report does not fully meet either of the above standards. It does not clearly identify the historic properties and leaves the issue of the density limitation on exempted properties to too much Council discretion.

Thanks in advance for your time and consideration.  
Cathy Leong Alameda Resident



**From:** [Patricia Lamborn](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Andrew Thomas](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please delay action tomorrow on Article 26  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 4:14:39 PM

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Knox-White and Council members Oddie, Vella and Daysog,

I am writing to ask that you not take action on revising Article 26 tomorrow night, June 2, 2020. The issues are complex and it is just not possible to have a truly democratic meeting at this time, due to both the shelter in place orders and other issues impacting participation.

There is multifamily development underway in Alameda and our City has a Housing Element certified by the State as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023. Thus, the revision of Article 26 is not time sensitive.

-[if !supportLists]-->2 Article 26 is a complex issue which should be submitted to a comprehensive and transparent General Plan revision process with robust public participation, rather than rushed to the ballot in November of 2020. We should also consider the impact of changes to the economy. I am disturbed by the thousands of square feet of empty office space-- not temporarily vacant -- but permanently vacant-- in Alameda.

We have to find balance once we can evaluate the impact of this epidemic and the economic depression. If eliminating Article 26 contributed to the destruction of older multifamily housing stock the new developments would NOT be subject to rent control. You could be making matters worse, certainly not welcome at a time like this in our country or community.

Sincerely, Pat Lamborn , Alameda Resident

**From:** [Dodi Kelleher](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] In Regard to Article 26, 6-B of the City Council's June 2nd Meeting Agenda  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 3:43:35 PM

---

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft,

We are once again requesting that the Council defer any further consideration of repeal or modification of Article 26 until after the restrictions related to COVID-19 are reduced sufficiently to allow for in-person attendance at City Council meetings so to insure full public participation. As concerned homeowners and long standing members of the Alameda Preservation Society, we also continue to request that any consideration of changes to measure A be deferred until it can be part of the City's comprehensive planning process referred to in the Subcommittee's report.

Sincerely,  
Dolores Kelleher and Floyd Brown  
1816 Encinal Avenue

**From:** [Ann Quintell](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A(Article 26)  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 1:17:50 PM

---

Dear Mayor Ashcraft,

Regarding Measure A our fear in this rushing to do this now is to stop the citizens of Alameda to properly voice their opinions on this landmark decision. We don't need to rush this but it seems that you people of the staff and city council are doing this now because of COVID19 and now all the rioting of cities being torn apart, so no one is paying attention to staff and city council. Well we are and do not want changes to this Measure A. It seems you all want as many TICKY TACKY BOX BUILDINGS in Alameda as you can! This is a charming town and you are all making it ugly. Have you looked at the entrance to the base? I guess not!

How much money from developers are you all getting to create this mess with many more houses that we don't need. You seem to forget we are an island and the water table is rising as you tell us all. Then why for God's sake why do you keep building. We have enough traffic for two cities and can't get out of town in a hurry if we had to. Why is it that Andrew Thomas's wife who works for the Port of Oakland tells anyone that wants to move to Alameda or who lives here her husband will let anyone build pretty much what they want here.

How much money from developers are you all getting anyway? Also, Vella and Oddie should have been gone over the city manager fiasco. Why are they still on the Council?

And I guess since you live in a Victorian you don't really care what anybody builds that maybe could have a vision.

You should all go to Mare Island and see how beautiful it is there, because someone took there time to have a plan preserving the history there, unlike Alameda.

Please do not let any changes happen to Measure A and also not allow this to be on the Ballot in November 2020. TO MUCH RUSH!!

Regards.  
Ann Quintell  
510-521-8117

**From:** [Elizabeth Tuckwell](#)  
**To:** [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Meeting June 2, Item 6-B  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 11:18:05 AM

---

Please reschedule discussion of changes to Measure A so that concerned citizens can address City Council in person. Measure A is among the important elements that create the "homey" atmosphere of Alameda.

The pandemic has actually heightened the importance of Measure A and possible revisions to it. The overall concept of population density is being reconsidered at all levels nationwide, with the emphasis on social distancing. With the announcement of two options by the newly formed subcommittee including the Mayor and Councilman Oddie, each option deserves the full consideration that requires in-person sharing of ideas. Since Governor Newsom has already started easing of the shelter-in-place, it seems likely that City Council might again be held at City Hall, with social distancing in place.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda Resident



May 31, 2020

(By electronic transmission)  
Mayor and Councilmembers  
City of Alameda  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue  
Alameda, CA 94501

**Subject: Recommendation by City Council Subcommittee to consider providing direction to City staff to draft Charter amendment related to Article 26 (commonly known as Measure A)- -Item 6-B on City Council's June 2, 2020 regular agenda.**

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers:

As you know, Article 26 has two main parts: Article 26-1 limits the number of residential units in a building to two; Article 26-3 requires at least 2000 sf of lot area per unit

The Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) agrees with the City Council Subcommittee's recommendation that "the Council discuss delaying asking voters to consider Article 26-3 until 2022" and urges the Council to support this delay. As noted in the Subcommittee report, such deferral would allow "the Council and the community (to) have the benefit of having completed a community wide planning and environmental review process to inform their decisions before crafting a ballot measure to amend or repeal Article 26-3". The report also notes that the question of Article 26-3 is "complex".

The report's "community wide planning and environmental review process" appears to refer to the General Plan revision that is currently underway and the upcoming Housing Element update. The Subcommittee's deferral strategy is similar to what AAPS has been recommending. We continue to believe that any revision of Article 26 should be part of a larger well-analyzed planning process with ample opportunities for public participation of what changes, if any, are needed to the City's development rules in to meet Alameda's overall goals and objectives.

**Therefore, we would be open to considering modification of Article 26-3 as part of this larger planning process. We would also be inclined to not oppose repeal of Article 26-1 if a recommendation for repeal is the result of this same planning process.** Although the Subcommittee recommends that repeal of Article 26-1 be placed on the November, 2020 ballot, we continue to believe that asking the voters to consider repealing Article 26-1 this coming November is premature, pending completion of the planning process.

In addition, we reiterate our June 5 request that the Council defer any further consideration of repeal or modification of Article 26 until after the restrictions related to COVID-19 are reduced sufficiently to allow in-person attendance at City Council meetings. While we appreciate the City's efforts to accommodate public participation at virtual Council meetings and virtual meetings of boards and commissions using the Zoom platform and the City Clerk's very capable reading of submitted comments, these remedies' lack of immediacy and of direct interaction still inhibit full public discourse and do not recognize the difficulties many members of the public have using virtual meeting formats.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please contact me at (510) 523-0411 or [cbuckleyAICP@att.net](mailto:cbuckleyAICP@att.net) if you would like to discuss these comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Buckley, Chair  
Preservation Action Committee  
Alameda Architectural Preservation Society

cc: Eric Levitt, Lara Weisiger and Andrew Thomas (by electronic transmission)  
AAPS Board and Preservation Action Committee (by electronic transmission)

**From:** [Edward Sing](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [tony\\_daysog@alum.berkeley.edu](mailto:tony_daysog@alum.berkeley.edu); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#)  
**Cc:** [Andrew Thomas](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Yibin Shen](#); [Reyla Graber](#); [Peter Fletcher](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] June 2nd City Council Meeting - Discussion of Article 26 (Measure A)  
**Date:** Sunday, May 31, 2020 7:49:14 PM

---

TO THE ALAMEDA CITY COUNCIL:

1. I object to any consideration of revising Article 26 (Measure A) at the June 2, 2020 City Council meeting, including considering placing such revisions on the November 2020 ballot, while the public is prevented from attending meetings in person and distracted by the pandemic from devoting time and energy to this issue. The City has a Housing Element certified by the State as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023. Thus, the revision of Article 26 is not time sensitive.
2. ***Article 26 is a complex issue which should be submitted to a comprehensive and transparent General Plan revision process with robust public participation, rather than rushed to the ballot in November of 2020.***
3. Any modifications to Article 26-3 (2000 sq ft per unit) must meet at least two criteria.
  - A. It must clearly identify and distinguish the residential and historic properties that will retain the protection of the current provision and the properties that will be exempted there from.
  - B. Properties exempt from Article 26-3 must carry a maximum density limit of 30 units per acre unless a greater density is mandated by State law.
4. The proposed Article 26-3 language contained in the subcommittee report does not fully meet either of the above standards. It does not clearly identify the historic properties and leaves the issue of the density limitation on exempted properties to too much Council discretion.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Ed Sing  
Alameda Resident

**From:** [Patricia Gannon](#)  
**To:** [John Knox White](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [City Clerk](#); [Mark Villa](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item - 6-B (Measure A  
**Date:** Sunday, May 31, 2020 2:11:36 PM

---

May 31, 2020

Honorable Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, Mayor of Alameda

Honorable Members of the City Council

RE: Item 6B Amendment to Article 26 (Measure A)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and City Council Members:

On June 2, 2020 your Council will consider asking City staff to address the possible placement of the revision of Charter Article 26 1-on the November 2020 ballot. I appreciate that this discussion will not include any changes modifying 26-3 at this time. I would remind the Council that Article 26 is superseded by the State Housing Element Law; thus, the City can and will extend a multi-family overlay over an inventory of vacant space in Alameda to meet our housing goals. Thus, the revision of Article 26-1 is in no way time-sensitive.

Article 26-1 (Measure A) has been a contentious issue in Alameda since the get-go on myriad sides of the issue. Any possible revision not only deserves but demands extensive public review and comment. For the City to push through any revisions, no matter how minor, in the middle of Shelter in Place Restrictions for possibly the foreseeable future would be a dis-service to the citizens of Alameda. This issue needs thorough and vigorous public debate and discussion in open Council meetings where citizens can discuss their concerns in the context of the entire General Plan. This applies equally to 26-3 when that issue is brought up again for discussion.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my view. Please do the right thing and table this issue until it can be totally and fully discussed without the constraints of shelter in place.

Patricia M. Gannon

[pg3187@gmail.com](mailto:pg3187@gmail.com)

1019 Tobago Lane, 94502



**From:** [John Knox White](#)  
**To:** [T Krysiak](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#)  
**Cc:** [Lara Weisiger](#); [Eric Levitt](#); [Yibin Shen](#); [Andrew Thomas](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Measure A Article 26 Must Not Be Rushed...  
**Date:** Sunday, May 31, 2020 12:08:00 PM

---

Thank you for your email.

I have heard from a few people about Tuesday's discussion of Article 26/Measure A. I appreciate your interest in the topic and willingness to share your thoughts.

I know that some groups have voiced concerns that Charter Amendment items should not be considered during a time when meetings are being held on-line. Personally, I don't think that city business needs to grind to a halt for the next 6-12 months when we will continue to be social distancing.

Given the amount of discussion on this issue, I don't agree that this process has been rushed. There has been, and if it moves forward there will continue to be, a lot of opportunity for community input on the subject.

Alameda has held numerous public input meetings on this issue over the years, the latest was a Planning Board meeting on January 13th where over 100 people attended and a City Council meeting at the beginning of May.

Additionally, the topic has been raised and publicized over the last six months through multiple outlets and I have personally visited and convened multiple organization and group discussions where the topic has been discussed with people on all sides of the issues.

Ultimately, the meeting on Tuesday is not a final decision meeting, the only action (if any) taken by the council will be to provide further direction to City Staff on what information and language they would like to see for consideration in June/July, providing the community nearly 2 months to provide input and comment before returning to the council for consideration, deliberation and decision. Then, if the council ultimately puts the issue on the ballot, there will be months for people to discuss the issue and ultimately, the voters, not the Council, will decide what direction to pursue.

To me, it's important to remain mindful that Article 26 doesn't limit the number of housing units or protect historic housing in Alameda.

State law sets the minimum and the State is increasingly penalizing cities that do not comply. Measure A only impacts the types of buildings that can be built in Alameda and in doing so creates new units that are more expensive, generate more traffic and have higher environmental and climate change impacts. I think we can better maintain the community that we all love with flexibility provided on how we design new residential and mixed-use projects that we are required to approve.

I believe that having a City Charter that is out of compliance with state law and requires the City to turn itself in knots to remain in compliance, while also limiting our ability to address housing

affordability, traffic and climate change impacts, is a problem. One that only the voters can solve. Tuesday's discussion is another part of a council discussion on the matter, but it won't be the last.

I respect that we may have different perspectives on this issue, I remain open to hearing your thoughts on the matter and look forward to the opportunity to hearing more about your concerns and any proposed solutions that you would like to share.

I will continue to keep you informed of any next steps on this issue so that you will be able to provide input at all points of action.

Best,

John Knox White  
Vice Mayor, Alameda

---

**From:** T Krysiak <tsitjk@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2020 2:48 PM

**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>

**Cc:** Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedacityattorney.org>; Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A Article 26 Must Not Be Rushed...

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Members of The Alameda City Council:

I strongly feel that it is not necessary to have the topic of repeal of Measure A up for a vote in November 2020.

Here are my reasons for delaying this:

This epic pandemic has disrupted the norms of discourse on this complex topic.

The entire national economy is dramatically changing and local housing adjustments will undoubtedly follow.

It is best to delay a vote until our City's voters have more time to evaluate and participate under more normal circumstances.

Lastly, there is no need to rush this since The City of Alameda already has a Housing Element certified by the State of California as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023.

It is strongly suggested that voting on this issue by the citizens of Alameda be delayed at least until 2022. Again, we demand more time and the City leaders must allow for further discussions that are not restricted by the pandemic.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tom Krysiak  
308 Sweet Road  
Alameda CA 94502

Sent from my iPhone

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** margie <barongcat@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 30, 2020 1:44 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Totally opposed to any City Charter revision at this time

MAY 30, 2020

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL:

I previously voiced my objections to any revision of Article 26 (Measure A) during the current pandemic. While some members of the Council wrote back, agreeing with me, others somehow think that this matter is urgent enough to plow ahead with non-reversible changes to this City despite the current public health and economic emergency. One would think the Council has enough on its plate, between failing businesses, a precipitous drop in public revenue and rising rates of infection.

I point out the following:

(a) The "housing crisis" is the result of previously affordable housing being turned into unaffordable housing due to the dot com boom of the last ten years. This boom may be over. Whether or not current housing will return to affordability will not be known for several months.

(b) Measure A was the result of indiscriminate tearing down of beautiful and historic Victorian residences and their replacement with ugly boxes. The current proposal does nothing to keep this from happening again.

(c) Prior to the pandemic, City streets, and especially bridges and tunnels, were at capacity. Adding an additional load is unsafe. In case of emergency, we will not be able to evacuate and people will die.

(d) I have seen no evidence that people in apartment buildings have fewer automobiles than people in single family houses, assuming the same income level. The housing proposed to be built is only "affordable" by two people with professional incomes- both of whom will have a car. No one wants to take public transportation at the present time. If you read social media, you will see that street parking is at capacity for many Alameda streets, and people are fighting with their neighbors on street parking issues. The present proposals to erase parking will exacerbate this problem.

The City has a Housing Element certified by the State as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023. The revision of Article 26 is not time sensitive, and does not need to be brought up at this time. Article 26 is a complex issue which should be submitted to a comprehensive and transparent General Plan revision process with robust public participation, rather than rushed to the ballot in November of 2020 while most of the public is locked down and most people are worrying about their health and finances rather than City politics.

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** T Krysiak <tsitjk@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2020 2:48 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A Article 26 Must Not Be Rushed...

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Members of The Alameda City Council:

I strongly feel that it is not necessary to have the topic of repeal of Measure A up for a vote in November 2020.

Here are my reasons for delaying this:

This epic pandemic has disrupted the norms of discourse on this complex topic.

The entire national economy is dramatically changing and local housing adjustments will undoubtedly follow.

It is best to delay a vote until our City's voters have more time to evaluate and participate under more normal circumstances.

Lastly, there is no need to rush this since The City of Alameda already has a Housing Element certified by the State of California as appropriate to meet our housing needs until 2023.

It is strongly suggested that voting on this issue by the citizens of Alameda be delayed at least until 2022. Again, we demand more time and the City leaders must allow for further discussions that are not restricted by the pandemic.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tom Krysiak  
308 Sweet Road  
Alameda CA 94502

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Alameda Citizens Task Force <announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 28, 2020 9:02 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; tdaysog@alamedaca.com  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-B June 2 Council Agenda-Recommendation to Consider Directing City Staff to Draft Charter Amendment to Article 26 (Measure A)

# ACT

## Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

---

RE: Item 6-B June 2 Council Agenda-Recommendation to Consider Directing City Staff to Draft Charter Amendment to Article 26 (Measure A)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers Knox-White, Oddie, Vella & Daysog:

ACT is appreciative of the Ashcraft-Oddie subcommittee recommending addressing possible revision of Charter Article 26 in a measured step by step manner by limiting a November 2020 ballot measure to repeal of Article 26-1. This leaves Article 26-3 to the General Plan revision process before considering modification of the same on the November 2022 ballot. However, we continue to believe very strongly that presentation of any ballot measure modifying Article 26 be delayed until November 2022. Our reasons have been stated before but bear restatement.

1. We are in the midst of one the greatest crises in the history of our country, with our economy and our very lives at stake. People are distracted from serious consideration of any other issue. Thus, this issue will not receive the robust public input it requires. We accept that much of City business cannot wait the abatement of this crises. However, Article 26 is superseded by the State Housing Element Law. Thus, the City can and will extend a multi-family overlay over an inventory of vacant space in Alameda to meet the affordable housing goals set by that law. Thus, the revision of Article 26 is in no way time-sensitive.
2. The sub committee concedes that Art. 26-3 is “complex” and recommends that it be submitted to the General Plan revision process. Article 26-1 is the bedrock protection developed by citizen initiative in 1973. Why should it be not be exposed to that same general plan revision process before being presented to the voters for modification?

If the recommendation to repeal Article 26-1 was the result of an open-process, public-participation, and comprehensive General Plan, ACT would be inclined to accept it, but not now, during a pandemic when there can be no robust public knowledge or participation and before the entire General Plan has been reviewed and considered in its entirety.

ACT would also be open to considering modification of Article 26-3 in that same process. However, we must take issue with the “conceptual modification” presented by Mr. Oddie in the subcommittee report. Mr. Oddie presented this exact language for comment to ACT and AAPS in the persons of Paul Foreman and Christopher Buckley, respectively. Both Mr. Foreman and Mr. Buckley responded on May 20 that they could only present modification of 26-3 to their respective organizations for consideration if the language were as follows:

*“The maximum density for any residential development shall be one housing unit per 2,000 square feet of land within: 1) the R-1 through R-6 Zones, the C-1 Zone, and the NP-R and NP –MU Zones all as shown on the 2020 City of Alameda Zoning Map; 2) the historic portions of the Webster and Park Street Business Districts; and 3) properties that are on the City’s Historical Monument or Historic Building Study Lists. Residential density on all remaining City land shall not exceed 30 units per net acre unless higher density is required to comply with State Law.”*

By the end of the day on May 20 we believed that Mr. Oddie had accepted that change and were surprised to see his original language back in the subcommittee report. The critical distinction between our language and his is two-fold:

1. Our language specifically identifies the protected historic properties.
2. Our language allows Council to increase density beyond the current 30 unit/acre limit provided by State law only if the State enacts laws mandating an increase in the required minimum density, rather than leaving the issue to the subjective determination of Council as to whether increased density is required in the housing element.

We are raising this issue now, because, while the subcommittee does not recommend placing modification of Article 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot, the final line of their report continues to offer it as an option. We want to make it clear that ACT opposes consideration of Mr. Oddie’s “conceptual modification” on any ballot measure but will be open to considering modification in the form outlined above if it comes out of the general plan revision process.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task Force Steering Committee