

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Dodi Kelleher <dodikelleher@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 5:08 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please read our submitted email during the Council meeting-Thanks you

In Regard to Article 26, 6-B of the City Council's June 2nd Meeting Agenda

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

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Tuckwell <elizabethtuckwell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 5:22 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting 6/2 Item 6-B (Measure A)

Please read my following comment into the record:

"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 to ease the shelter-in-place, it seems likely that City Council meetings might soon again be held at City Hall, with social distancing in place.

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.

Such major disruptions as coronavirus and curfews will undoubtedly limit the breadth and depth of discussion regarding the future of Measure A. The robust discussion and broad-based community input that should precede any policy action by City Council regarding Measure A will not be possible under present circumstances.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Tuckwell, Alameda Resident



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

June 2, 2020

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.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Karen Lithgow, President  
Alameda Architectural Preservation Society

Cc: City Manager: [lweisiger@alamedaca.gov](mailto:lweisiger@alamedaca.gov)  
City Clerk: [elevitt@alamedaca.gov](mailto:elevitt@alamedaca.gov)

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Greene <ekg777@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:00 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 6-B of the City Council's June 2, 2020 regular agenda: recommendation by City Council Subcommittee to draft Charter amendment related to Article 26 (Measure A)

Madam Mayor and City Council members,

I urge you to delay an election on a Charter Amendment to eliminate Article 26 of the City Charter.

Since we are in the midst of a pandemic, the likes of which we have not seen in 100 years, civil unrest, and the most serious economic downturn since the Great Depression, now is not the time to tinker with the city charter's Article 26 (formerly Measure A).

To move forward with this effort will be seen as a cold-blooded attempt to sneak legislation through while the public's attention is understandably distracted.

As this proposed charter amendment could affect Alameda's housing stock for a generation or more, this is too significant an issue to move forward without considered public attention and an open discussion at a city council meeting which citizens can attend to voice their opinions.

Elizabeth Greene  
2520 Chester Street, Alameda  
(510) 814-9431

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** conchita <conchita@eyeline.tv>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:06 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-B on Council's agenda

All of us in Alameda are very concerned about Mayor Ashcraft and the Council's relentless focus in removing Measure A – articles 26-1 and 26-3 - from the City Charter. Measure A stands as the only control we have to control Alameda's density and congestion problems.

But Mayor Ashcraft, who served for six years in the Planning Department along with current planning director Andrew Thomas, seem to be addicted to development tax dollars and insist on adding more housing while completely disregarding population density and its effect on our quality of life. And they do absolutely nothing for infrastructure! In their lofty plans to remove the constraints they feel by Measure A, they continue to ignore the 100 year old bridges and tunnel!

With the City Council's 2012 new housing element that approved the construction of over 4,500 new units – including multiple and affordable – they're effectively adding close to fifteen thousand new people to the island without addressing the obvious: access and egress. It's not about public transit, it's about our safety! It's about traffic, congestion and density! It's not about "State mandates". It's a fact that out of the 36,000 zip codes in the United States, Alameda's 94501 is ranked in the top one thousandth in regards to population density. What – is – the - limit - Mayor? Alameda is an island and we don't need more people. We need a Council that cares about our safety, about our history, about our quality of life.

Preserve Alameda, keep Measure A!

Sincerely,  
Maria Perales  
Alameda, 94501

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Patricia Lamborn <patricia.lamborn@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:07 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6 B : Please delay action on Article 26

Dear Ms. Weisiger,

It is my understanding that letters received once Council is in session are read aloud. If so, I would greatly appreciate if my letter regarding Item 6B were read aloud,

Thank you!

Patricia Lamborn  
patricia.lamborn@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia Lamborn <patricia.lamborn@aol.com>  
To: mezzashcraft@alamedaca.gov <mezzashcraft@alamedaca.gov>; jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov <jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov>; joddie@alamedaca.gov <joddie@alamedaca.gov>; mvella@alamedaca.gov <mvella@alamedaca.gov>; tdaysog@alamedaca.gov <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>  
Cc: elevitt@alamedaca.gov <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; lweisiger@alamedaca.gov <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; athomas@alamedaca.gov <athomas@alamedaca.gov>  
Sent: Mon, Jun 1, 2020 4:14 pm  
Subject: Please delay action tomorrow on Article 26

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.

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

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Gretchen Lipow <gretchenlipow@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:12 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda item dealing with Measure A

To Mayor Ashcraft and members of the Alameda City Council;  
I wish to weigh in on the issue concerning Measure A. If there ever was a time to pause and exercise patience it is now. Don't we want the public citizens to be a part of the discussion? We see as part of our public duty to involve the the members of our community. Let us be prudent, thoughtful and democratic. Let us wait until the virus and the rebellion outside our door has calmed down so we can engage in civil discussions. This matter is too important to rush it to conclusion.

Gretchen Lipow  
2242 San Antonio Avenue  
Alameda

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** steveaced@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:13 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] item 6-B

Members of the City Council,

It is inappropriate to ask the citizens of Alameda to consider changes to the current development guidelines without presenting them with a thorough review and public discussion of the impact and consequences these changes will have on the existing character of our town, its traffic, and the city's ability to provide its current level of public services, emergency response, city staffing, etc. Consideration of these changes does not have to be completed immediately. Please postpone and decisions on these matters to a time when in person attendance of council meetings is appropriate.

Thank you.

Steve Aced



## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Ann Quintell <annmq60@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 8:20 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Measure A(Article 26)

Hi Ms. Weisiger,  
Would you please read my letter on 6B. A lady called me and asked me to email this letter.  
Regards,,  
Ann Quintell

----- Original Message -----

From: Ann Quintell <annmq60@comcast.net>  
To: mezzashcraft@alamedaca.gov, lweisiger@alamedaca.gov  
Date: June 1, 2020 at 1:15 PM  
Subject: Measure A(Article 26)

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

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Patricia Baer <2baers@att.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 8:55 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-B

Good evening 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

Birgitt Evans

2829 San Jose Ave.  
Alameda, CA 94501

---

(510) 521-9177

June 2, 2020

(By electronic transmission)  
Mayor and City Council  
City of Alameda  
2263 Santa Clara Ave.  
Alameda, CA 94501

Subject: Comments on Item 6-B of the City Council's June 2, 2020 regular agenda.  
Recommendation by City Council Subcommittee to draft Charter amendment related to  
Article 26/Measure A

Mayor Ashcraft and City Council,

Please postpone an election on a Charter Amendment to eliminate Article 26 of the City Charter until such a time as a full and robust discussion about not only the future of Measure A, but about the future of our island can be openly conducted and a complete course of action can be agreed upon by a majority of residents and voters.

This is the wrong time to be addressing this fragment of this issue. Due to the events of the past three months, we are all riding a roller coaster, sitting here poised at the top of the hill, holding our breaths, about to plunge downward. While much of the future is still murky, it is clear that both housing prices and rents are about to take a drastic tumble, many people will have mortgages that are underwater, others will not be able to repay back rent even with the generous six month negotiating period passed by this council, jobs will not be coming back soon or fully, many people will be forced to leave the Bay Area and the fate of the tens of thousands of new units under construction in the East Bay is uncertain. Will they be completed? Will they sit empty?

Many of the assumptions in January's "An Evaluation of City Charter Article 26 "Measure A" by City staff either are not or will no longer be valid. The assumption that building large multi-unit building such as the beautiful historic properties shown in the Evaluation with per acre equivalents "San Antonio Ave. - 68 units per acre" will bring the public transportation that we need is wishful thinking at best. How many historic houses would have to be purchased and demolished, their clear heart redwood beams consigned to landfills, in order to construct a 68 unit apartment building? How high would it be? Fifty feet? Eighty feet? Looming over the surrounding neighborhood. How

long would the neighbors have to live in a construction zone? Two years?

After all of that, would the units be affordable? The Evaluation states that the average price of a multi-family unit in Alameda in August, 2019 was \$742,000 or 30% less than a single family home at \$1.03 million. Both of those numbers have gone down in the current economy, but probably not enough. As Alamedan Margie Siegal wrote in her letter to the Alameda Sun, someone earning Alameda's \$15 minimum wage and working full time (2,080 hours/year) would earn \$31,200 per year. Thirty percent of that, the amount considered reasonable for housing, is \$9,360 or \$780 per month. No one buying multiple houses, demolishing them and constructing a new building is going to offer apartments at that price.

In addition, this project is hugely carbon negative, releasing vast amounts of greenhouse gasses *and* there is absolutely no guarantee that we would get increased transit as a result. In fact, how many units like this, how much destruction of existing infrastructure would be required to attract additional public transit. Which will be dangerous for most people to ride until we have found a solution to the novel coronavirus.

It is also wholly inappropriate to eliminate Measure A without adequate safeguards to Alameda's 40,000 pre-1940 structures. Both City staff and council members have claimed that there are other provisions in the city charter that will protect our historic housing. Only the buildings included on the 1979 Study List have specific protections and they constitute about one quarter of the 40,000 pre-1940 structures. Buildings that had asbestos siding or substantial remodeling (which may have been reversed since then), in 1979 were excluded from the Study List. So my 1910 Colonial Cottage has no protection because it once had asbestos shingles. This means that, without Measure A, many beautifully restored structures do not have protection and could be torn down to make way for dense infill housing. Just as was happening in the 1970s.

Alas, you have only to look at what happened to the highly historic Second Avenue Station (now 500 Central Ave.) where 90% of the historic fabric of the building was destroyed to see that the Historic Advisory Board and code compliance do not provide adequate protection.

Please choose to postpone your recommendation to city staff until such time as you have been able to solicit public input from all who might wish to provide it. We need to take a look at our Brave New World and what it will require before we know what future city planning needs to look like. And once we know, let's make the future of Article 26 part of a complete plan that will preserve historic neighborhoods, provide truly affordable housing and provide the additional transportation that we need..

Very truly yours,

Birgitt Evans

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Zac Bowling <zac@zacbowling.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 9:22 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6/2/2020 Council public comment

For item 6-B:

I'm strongly in favor of putting on the ballot a measure to remove Article 26 from the charter on the November ballot. Article 26 of the charter is in conflict with state law and regional housing objectives. It creates a mess for city staff to improve our general plan and how we zone to meet our housing and density requirements given that conflict. Almost none of the additional protections we have currently in place to protect historic homes existed when this amendment was added in 1973 but now historic homes are protected so I believe this charter amendment has far outlasted its usefulness in 2020. We should stop binding city staff and the planning board so that they can adapt, within reasonable limits, to come up with real solutions to this housing crisis. All housing policy, as a rule, should only exist in the Alameda municipal code and never in the charter.

Zac Bowling

**Irma Glidden**

---

**From:** Jono Soglin <jsoglin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 9:36 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment on Item 6-B

Madame Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am a 20-year resident of Alameda and I am a homeowner. I support the Council moving forward with asking staff to draft ballot measures to repeal Articles 26-1 and 26-3. Now is the time.

Now is the time because so many of our neighbors have been hit hard with economic uncertainty and this comes on top of an unprecedented housing crisis.

Now is the time because we must eliminate racial injustice. And racial injustice cannot be remedied without creating more affordable housing.

Now is the time because there has been plenty of process and we can have plenty more public participation in the coming 5 months.

Now is the time because the Council is not changing the charter tonight; the Council is merely moving the conversation along and opening the door to more public participation. There is nothing more democratic than finally bringing the issue to the voters.

And now is the time because in November progressive voters will come to the polls in unprecedented numbers, ready for change and ready to seek justice.

So please do the compassionate, forward-thinking, and just thing and move us closer to eliminating the blunt instrument of Article 26. Our architecture and the character of our community will be preserved and enhanced by our zoning laws, our boards and commissions, and our elected officials being held accountable by voters.

Finally, COVID-19 is not a reason to postpone. COVID-19 is the reason to act now.

Thank you.

Jono Soglin

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Jim Strehlow <jimhstrehlow@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 10:20 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6-B

What if you build it and noone comes?

The City's policies tend to not be business friendly, removing parking, taxing businesses for public transportation, narrowing lanes that can lead to MORE accidents and injuries, getting rid of traffic by the magic year 2035, etc.

If the jobs are in Fremont, San Jose, Mountain View, etc. the businesses are not going to move to Alameda.

Move the Tesla plant to Alameda? Not going to happen.

Move Bank of America headquarters to Alameda? Not going to happen.

Unless you make Alameda "business friendly", when it comes to having housing closer to where businesses are located, changing Measure A in the long run is not going to achieve your desired end goal.

Jim Strehlow, pro-business, life long Alameda resident