

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Ashley Mullins <amullins00@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:35 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting: Agenda Item 6A

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to encourage you to direct staff to draft ballot language to repeal Article 26 in full from our city's charter (26-1, 26-2, and 26-3). The entirety of the article was designed to prevent black and brown people from living in Alameda, and it is time for such policies to go. By putting a full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot, you will enable the city to vote our values all at once in a clean, straightforward, cost-effective way.

If you seek to eliminate racism from our community, then you must start with eliminating racism from our policies and systems. This is one small step you can take to show our community that you are wholly committed to making Alameda a truly inclusive, antiracist city.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Mullins

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** sjslauson <sslau99950@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:49 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda item 6-A, Alameda City Council Meeting July 7, 2020

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

There is strong opposition to Planning Director Andrew Thomas's recommendation that you reverse your decision of June 2, 2020 to place only the repeal of Charter Sec. 26-1 on the November ballot and, instead place the repeal of all Article 26 on the ballot.

Speaking on behalf of several groups of people who have lived in Alameda for a period of time, we consider Article 26 sacred and will fight anyone that tries to repeal Article 26, including removing from office any member of the council who votes to place the full repeal of Article 26 on the November ballot. You have already charted a course of action on Charter Sec. 26-1 and must stay the course.

Mr. Thomas is out of line with his request and his views on housing for Alameda. He has no respect for Article 26 and the character of the housing in Alameda. His services are no longer needed for the City of Alameda. We respectfully request you terminate his employment.

Thank You

Stephen Slauson  
2426 Otis Drive

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** User <budesign@att.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:36 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the draconian step of placing full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic will reverse your earnest attempts to regain already eroded public trust.

**It is not right that a paid staff member, at the last minute, without cause, is trying to change our elected officials' June 2nd decision. This is be a very consequential change for Alameda and the citizen of Alameda need more time to fully understand it's intended and unintended consequences.**

We hate these back alley last minute political deals the council continues to try to pull off without allowing the citizens, who have a vested and active interest in these issues, to get actively involved and express their opinions and desires. This would be a very consequential vote for Alameda and we need more time to fully understand it's intended and unintended consequences. There are no new substantial, urgent facts in evidence demanding such a change.

Sincerely,

Gabriele Bungardt  
Alameda Resident

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Mike <miker@merrillresearch.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:56 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A: Article 26.1 and 26.3 of the Alameda City Charter

I do not agree that the City Council should to try and get 26.1 – 26.3 repealed on the November ballot. I don't think it is in the best interest of ALL of Alameda.

I can see allowing build apartments, condos and single family homes all over Alameda Point but not on the main island.

Do you expect to tear down old Victorians and historical buildings to make room for multi-unit apartments? I fell in love with this city because of its attachment to its historical buildings.

I can understand and accept removing 26.1 from the City Charter, but please leave 26.3 in the City Charter.

Michael Rinck (homeowner and resident of Alameda for over 35 years)

Alameda Justice Alliance Statement: Charter Amendment A26  
Alameda City Council Meeting July 7, 2020, 6 A

Good evening Madame Mayor, City Council, and staff.

The Alameda Justice Alliance is speaking tonight to urge you to place the repeal of the full Article 26 of the Alameda City charter on the ballot this November. This provision, which has banned the building of a legitimate and much needed form of housing in Alameda for the last 47 years, should have been removed years ago.

Instead, it blocked the building of housing that could have allowed hundreds of working class Alameda families to remain as they were pushed out by rising rents from the tech boom or when 400 mostly poor and minority families from the Harbor Island apartments were evicted in 2004. Article 26 -- or Measure A as most long-time Alamedans call it -- has been used as a battering ram against those brave enough to call out these injustices over the decades. It cemented the notion of homeowners being a superior and privileged class in Alameda, a division that makes a mockery of the city's aspirations to being a decent and welcoming community.

As our nation begins to wake up and acknowledge institutional racism in all its forms, we Alamedans cannot ignore the discriminatory legacy of Article 26. There is no more room for excuses and selfishness. The young people in our town are asking us for justice and the opportunity to fashion a new future not built on these false divisions. And it begins with reconciling our past. It begins with dumping the entire Article 26.

Respectfully,  
Alameda Justice Alliance representing:

Renewed Hope Housing Advocates,  
Buena Vista United Methodist Church,  
Alameda Fire Local 689,  
Alameda Progressives,  
Alameda Renters Coalition,  
Alameda Labor Council,  
Teamsters local 853

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Ann Quintell <annmq60@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:29 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A- July 7 City Council

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

We urge you to stand by your June 2nd vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1. To do otherwise, would be manifestly unwarranted and would betray the remaining public trust this Council enjoys.

We have lived in Alameda for all of our lives, and to my knowledge this is the first time, a PAID staff member has tried to undo a vote of elected Council Members.

And, the reasoning for this late request is specious!! There are no new substantial urgent facts in evidence demanding such a change.

Please ignore this staff request and continue with placing Article 26.1 on the ballot---if you need to put anything on!!

Victor and Ann Quintell

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Bronwyn Harris <bronwynharrisauthor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Repeal Article 26

Dear City Council,

I would like to ask you to put a full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot this fall.

As we in Alameda are grappling with our racist past and proclaiming "This is not who we are," we need to take direct action to make sure that, while this is who we have been, this is no longer who we are. We can't just say this; we need to act.

If we are a city that believes that everyone belongs here, as we say in signs with that slogan, it is time to prove it.

Article 26 was not added only to preserve Victorians, and there are plenty of other measures that do so. It was also added to prevent people who are not white from being able to live in Alameda. We must face this fact and remedy it, and we must do it now.

Let's be the city we should be. Let's repeal Article 26 in full.

Thank you,

**Bronwyn Harris**

*Author of [Literally Unbelievable: Stories from an East Oakland Classroom](http://www.bronwynharrisauthor.com)*  
[www.bronwynharrisauthor.com](http://www.bronwynharrisauthor.com)

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Therese Hall <theresemhall@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 12:46 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
**Cc:** elevitt@almedaca.gov; Lara Weisiger; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A - July 7 City Council Agenda- Charter Article 26 Ballot Measure

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

I strongly oppose Planning Director Andrew Thomas's recommendation that you reverse your decision of June 2, 2020.

Your decision to constrain the repeal of Article 26 to Charter Section 26-1 on the November 2020 ballot should be maintained. Any further modifications may be placed on the 2022 ballot and still afford the Planning Department the time to identify parcels to meet the RNHA requirements. Per those requirements, the subsequent rezoning is allowed to take up to three years.

The pandemic has permanently changed our lives, from how we live and work to how we do business. More and more people are working from home, and those that do commute, do not use public transportation for fear of COVID-19 exposure. As a result, future housing and transportation needs are not yet well understood as I am sure the Planning Department is well aware.

The Planning Department needs to consider this changing landscape in future urban designs to insure that public safety requirements, housing, business and educational needs are met while the architectural aesthetic and small town feel for which Alameda is most beloved is maintained. Today's world is not business as usual.

To now reverse and reconsider your decision to place a portion of Article 26 on the ballot will erode public trust in your ability to govern. Those who wish to repeal Article 26 in its entirety claim this to be a racial issue. The passage of Measure A in 1973 had no such intention. Painting the Measure as a racial issue is, in fact, a marketing ploy that fans the flames of hatred and divisiveness in a town that prides itself on welcoming everyone. Indeed, "Everyone is Welcome Here".

Strong leadership is needed to guide us through this difficult time.

Sincerely,

Therese M. Hall



## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Heather Little <heatherlittle9691@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 12:17 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; John Knox White; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for the repeal of Article 26

Good morning Mayor Ashcraft and members of the City Council,

When Alameda approved Article 26 as part of our City Charter, it prevented multi-housing development within the city, limited density, and ultimately contributed to a cycle of systemic racism that has prevented black and brown people from purchasing homes within Alameda. For decades, this has been an acceptable practice but the time for change is now.

I am sharing my support for you to direct staff to draft ballot language to repeal Article 26 in full from our city's charter (26-1, 26-2, and 26-3) and allow our city to vote on our values and repeal this racist Article all at once. This is one measurable step towards supporting the anti-racist stance that I value and would like to see demonstrated by the elected officials of our city.

Thanks,  
Heather Little  
PLAN! Alameda Co-Founder

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Cathy Leong <gocathyl@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 9:24 AM  
**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

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, let this email letter of record show cause to leave Measure A alone. If you feel you must ignore the will of Alamedans, I at the least urge you to stand by your June 2nd vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1.

There are concerns 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.

Please include this letter in the meeting record after reading aloud.

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

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Susannah Hufstader <susannah.hufstader@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 9:06 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on City Council item 6-A, July 7, 2020- support of full repeal

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and City Council,

I am writing in support of staff alternative #3 for this evening's City Council meeting: to direct staff to revise the proposed ballot measure to include a full repeal of Article 26, including a full repeal of section 26-3. I support a full repeal for the reasons outlined in the staff recommendation. Moreover, repealing the entirety of Article 26 is an important step in ensuring a sustainable, inclusive city while maintaining our planning and building standards in the General Plan. It's time to completely remove this racist and exclusionary stain on our City Charter.

Thank you as always for your thoughtful consideration.

Warmly,  
Susie Hufstader  
1815 Broadway, Alameda  
860-455-5861

**Lara Weisiger**

---

**From:** cjlacroix@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 8:55 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Article 26 of the Charter of the City of Alameda

**To the members of our city council:**

**We the undersigned citizens of the City of Alameda concur with the below statement and believe allowing this to proceed is an infringement of our rights to have our duly ELECTED officials to act in good faith:**

**"It is clear that Mr. Thomas's recommendation is not motivated by any material change in circumstances since June 2.** The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the draconian step of placing full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic will reverse your earnest attempts to regain public trust.

**We strongly oppose placing the repeal of the remaining Article 26-3 on the ballot. Its repeal would place the entire city, included our established built up neighborhoods and retail commercial districts at risk of high density development.**

**Sincerely,**

**Alameda residents:**

**James N Snider  
Sharon K Snider  
Cynthia La Croix**

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Beth Cote <bbhmrc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 8:13 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda 6-A

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and City Council members,

It comes to our attention that the Council plans to vote on whether or not to place the repeal of Article 26 from the City Charter on the November ballot. We consider this an underhanded move during the pandemic when we are confined to our homes and cannot attend the Council Meeting to voice our opinions in person. We cannot understand the rush and lack of communication to all Amedans on this issue. This is totally irresponsible and underhanded on the Council's part.

We have been in Alameda since 1979, raised our children here and watched the growth that we consider too much, too fast with lack of forethought. Before more housing, let's concentrate on traffic, infrastructure, and our new homeless. If the City has a mandate for affordable housing, address it now without building "affordable cookie cutter housing" first.

We urge you to vote no on placing the repeal of Article 26 on the November ballot.

Respectfully,  
Bob and Beth Cote

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Martha McCune <martitout@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 7:55 AM  
**To:** John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; mezzyashcraft@alameda.gov  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] A-6

“Please do not include repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on the November 2020.

Martha McCune

Martha Tout Interior Design

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Laurel Williams <laurelandrandy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2020 7:38 AM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Do Not Repeal Article 26-3

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

From: **Laurel Williams** <[laurelandrandy@gmail.com](mailto:laurelandrandy@gmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, Jul 7, 2020 at 7:30 AM  
Subject: Do Not Repeal Article 26-3  
To: <[mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov](mailto:mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov)>, <[jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov](mailto:jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov)>, <[tdaysog@alamedaca.gov](mailto:tdaysog@alamedaca.gov)>, <[mvella@alamedaca.gov](mailto:mvella@alamedaca.gov)>, <[joddie@alamedaca.gov](mailto:joddie@alamedaca.gov)>  
Cc: <[elevitt@alamedaca.gov](mailto:elevitt@alamedaca.gov)>

As homeowners and residents of Alameda, please note our opposition to the proposed repeal of Article 26-3 being placed on the November ballot.  
We are concerned, as are many of our neighbors and friends, about the negative impacts this change would have on our island home,  
from more traffic and pollution, to potential destruction of unique housing stock.

Laurel Williams and Randall Reed

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Pat Cronin <patcronin@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 10:39 PM  
**To:** Malia Vella  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6-A

Please do not include repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on November 2020 ballot.

Pat Cronin  
2619 Washington St

Sent from my iPhone





July 6, 2020

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

**Subject: Planning staff recommendation that the City Council place full repeal of City Charter Article 26 (commonly known as Measure A) on the November, 2020 ballot- - Item 6-A on City Council's July 7, 2020 regular agenda.**

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers:

**The Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) strongly opposes planning staff's recommendation that the Council reverse its June 2, 2020 decision to place only repeal of Charter Section 26-1 on the November 2020 ballot and to instead place full repeal of ALL of Article 26 on the ballot.**

Although AAPS had recommended deferring placement of any Article 26 changes on the November ballot until after completion of the General Plan revisions, Council's action proceeding with repeal of just Section 26-1 for November 2020 seemed to be a reasonable strategy to address some of the more immediate concerns regarding Article 26 while deferring consideration of changes to Section 26-3 until after completion of the General Plan process. **We would like to thank the Mayor and Councilmembers who supported this approach.**

AAPS is therefore surprised that staff is now recommending full repeal of Article 26 in response to the release of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers. The doubling of the RHNA numbers was expected well before the June 2, 2020 City Council meeting and is actually less than some of the numbers that staff told us were possible. Why is staff now so concerned about the RHNA numbers relative to Article 26 and did not express this concern as strongly as part of the June 2 Council discussions as well as previous discussions?

AAPS is also surprised that staff now seems much more concerned than up to and including the City Council's June 2, 2020 meeting that the upcoming Housing Element revision to reflect the RHNA mandate and resulting rezonings "may be in direct conflict with Section 26-3". Our understanding is that: (a) state law preempts Section 26-3 and other Charter provisions and that the City appears to have accepted this preemption since at least the initial adoption of the current Housing Element and the related adoption of the MF zone in 2012; and (b) the City Attorney appears to have determined that this preemption applies, based on

their signing off the current Housing Element and the 2012 MF zoning text and map changes. In addition, such preemption of Article 26 also appears to apply to the State density bonus law and the City's implementing 2009 and 2010 zoning text changes.

**Again, we urge you to not proceed with the staff recommendation to place full repeal of Article 26 of the City Charter on the November, 2020 ballot.**

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  
AAPS Preservation Action Committee

cc: City Manager, City Clerk and Planning, Building and Transportation Director (by electronic transmission)  
AAPS Board and Preservation Action Committee (by electronic transmission)

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Brian Schumacher <bdschumacher@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 9:13 PM  
**To:** John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please limit your November ballot measure to Article 26.1

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

We urge you to stand by your June 2nd vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1.

We moved to Alameda 43 years ago, and to our knowledge, this is the first time that a paid staff member has tried to undo a vote of elected Council Members.

The reason for this late request is plausible but it's misleading, and it's wrong because no new substantial, urgent facts are apparent.

Please ignore this staff request, and continue with placing Article 26.1 on the ballot-- if you need to put anything on!

Thank you.

Brian and Kathy Schumacher

July 6, 2020

To: The Alameda City Council and City Attorney  
From: Robert Farrar, resident, homeowner  
Subject: Article 26.1 and 26.3 of the Alameda City Charter

Here is the future of Alameda: Welcome to the Northern City of Los Angeles, be prepared to wait in long lines of traffic as you traverse this once great city. Our City Council has decided to try and get 26.1 – 26.3 repealed on the November ballot.

I have said all along, please leave the City of Alameda and Bay Farm alone. You can go ahead and build apartments, condos and single family homes all over Alameda Point.

The State Of California says the City of Alameda has to come up with additional housing or face reduction of State transportation funds. Has the City of Alameda asked the State why it is mandatory for a small island to build so many units when the infrastructure is not up to par? What does the State of California want the City of Alameda do, tear down old Victorians and historical buildings to make room for multi-unit apartments? How do other cities like Piedmont, Woodside, Hillsborough, and Atherton comply with mandates to build housing? I'm talking about cities. Did these cities receive exemptions, and if they did, why doesn't our city apply for the same exemptions?

I can understand and accept removing 26.1 from the City Charter, but please leave 26.3 in the City Charter.

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Molly Hollis <marywhollis1982@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 8:00 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Meeting Scheduled for July 7, 2020 , Agenda 6-A

Dear Mayor Ezzy-Ashcraft and City Council Members:

It's come to our attention the Alameda City Council is scheduled to vote tomorrow night, Tuesday, July 7th, on whether to put a complete repeal of Measure A (Article 26) on the November 2020 ballot. We're unable to attend the City Council meeting to voice our opinions of dissent due to COVID-19's mandate to socially distance for health and safety reasons. My husband, Michael, and I have lived in since 1982. We raised our three children in Alameda, and our daughter, Elizabeth, has chosen Alameda as home to raise her young family. Elizabeth and her husband just purchased their first house in Alameda in March 2020. Before building more living spaces in Alameda, we are asking the city to first tackle the growing traffic issues, infrastructure and alarming environmental problems we face. Unfortunately, an extra bike bridge and/or ferry will not ease our already growing concerns (although I wish it would and could). Please let the Community come together on these plans and decisions.

We are requesting the City Council to not include the repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot.

Thank you,

Molly and Michael Hollis  
510-917-6608

**From:** David Burton <dburton@burtonarchitect.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 7:58 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Special City Council Meeting of 7/07/20 - Regular Agenda Item 6-A

Mayor Ashcraft and members of the City Council,

My name is David Burton, Alameda resident since 2001.

Through my Planning Board experience, and being an architect involved in numerous projects in the City, I am very familiar with Article 26 and its impacts.

I am writing to urge you to place on the fall ballot a charter amendment striking the entirety of Article 26 from the charter. Be bold, simple, and clear.

The reasons for taking this action are:

1. It is inappropriate to codify in a city charter something most appropriately placed in the Zoning Ordinance. Issues around residential densities grow and change as a city does. Cementing zoning in the Charter was a mistake we must correct.
2. The State of California is in the midst of a housing crisis that is decades in the making. Alameda must be part of the solution to this crisis. An effective way for us to do this is to strike Article 26 from the charter and restore to the city an ability to adapt to changing times and circumstances with responsive zoning.
3. Our nation is in the midst of tremendous turmoil specifically around the issue of state violence against black citizens; this is part and parcel of a centuries long campaign of enslavement, intimidation, and violence by the white community. Alameda has its own shameful history around this subject, including city policies such as Article 26. Many of the present day supporters of Article 26 don't want to talk about how it was, in part, an attempt to keep blacks, and other non-white citizens, from moving to Alameda. This is a terrible stain on our city's history and we must take this chance to strike the article from our charter and ensure that we are a community where everyone belongs.

Amending the charter does NOTHING to change the actual zoning ordinance of the city. Any such change will require extensive public hearings – exactly the

public process that opponents say is needed. Be bold, place repeal of the entirety of Article 26 on the ballot now.

Respectfully,

David Burton

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Maggie Maiers <maggiemaiers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 7:08 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Repeal of Article 26

I am in favor of putting a full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot, not just a partial repeal.

Retaining a minimum lot size means a continuation of barriers to creating multi family and affordable housing.

Retaining that restriction will perpetuate the racist and exclusionary history of Article 26.

Regards,  
H Margaret Maiers



## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Marc Ribaud <mar@marmeo.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 6:34 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] record of 7/3 Mayor's Town Hall ?

Hello

I'm inquiring about the Mayor's Town Hall Meeting that took place on July 3 re. the CAHOOTS program in Eugene, OR. Is there a video, audio or transcript record that can be accessed?

Thanks very much,  
Marc Ribaud

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Alexandra Saikley <asaikley@saikleyarchitects.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 6:33 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Article 26 repeal comment

To Alameda City Councilmembers:

I support putting the full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot. Removing minimum lot size requirements would lift barriers to creating affordable housing and would help homeowners to stay in their homes by monetizing their properties.

Thank you,  
Alexandra Saikley

**Alexandra Sheets Saikley, AIA**

President

**SAIKLEY ARCHITECTS**

*A California Corporation*

2533 Clement Avenue, Alameda CA 94501

O: (510) 420-1234 | C: (510) 407-0413 | F: (877) 880-9730

[asaikley@saikleyarchitects.com](mailto:asaikley@saikleyarchitects.com)

[www.saikleyarchitects.com](http://www.saikleyarchitects.com)

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** Donna Fletcher <ohprimadonna@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 6:33 PM  
**To:** John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] November Ballot measure

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I urge you to stand by your June 2nd vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1.

To do otherwise, would be manifestly unwarranted, and would betray the remaining public trust this Council enjoys. I've lived in Alameda 35 years, and to my knowledge, this is the first time, a paid staff member has tried to undo a vote of elected Council Members.

And, the reasoning for this late request is questionable: There are no new substantial, urgent facts in evidence demanding such a change.

Please ignore this staff request, and continue with placing Article 26.1 on the ballot-- if you need to put anything on!

Thank you,  
Donna and Peter Fletcher  
112 Centre Court  
Alameda

## Lara Weisiger

---

**From:** John Medulan <aj72267@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2020 4:53 PM  
**To:** mezztashcraft@alamedaca.gov; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda 6-A

Dear City councils members and City manager and City Clerk, and Mr. Buckley, Please do not include repeal of City Charter on Article. 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot. We are both opposed to repealing this measure to add more multi unit housing in the city of Alameda. We have been homeowners since 1979 and have been watched as new developers come in and add multi units increasing the traffic on this small island and changing makeup of our town.

Andrea and John Medulan  
1315 Lafayette St.  
Alameda, CA. 94501

Sent from my iPad  
Andrea Medulan

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Edward Sing <singtam168@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 4:19 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella;  
tony\_daysog@alum.berkeley.edu; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas; Nancy McPeak; Reyla Graber; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] July 7, 2020 Alameda City Council Agenda Item 6A (Repeal of Article 26)

Comment on this agenda item follows:

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

The proposed reversal at the upcoming subject meeting of your June 2nd decision on repeal of Article 26.1 by taking the draconian step of instead placing repeal of all of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute before Council recesses for the summer and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic is unconscionable and will reverse your earnest attempts to regain public trust.

You previously decided to place repeal of only Article 26.1 on November's ballot. The public does not like nor appreciate last minute politically motivated actions which the Council continues to try to execute without allowing the citizens, who have a vested and active interest in these issues, to be actively involved in deliberative conversations in shaping such important decisions.

**Please limit the proposed ballot measure to Article 26.1, only, as you previously decided.**

Ed Sing  
Alameda Resident

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Marie Kane <mariekane94502@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 4:13 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] November Ballot Measure Regarding Measure A

Dear Mayor, Council, and City Staff,

I would like to register my opposition to expanding the scope of the proposed ballot measure regarding changing the protections of the 1976 Measure A. You voted on it on June 2nd. Please stick to your vote. As a realtor, I am concerned about the overall look of our city, property values, traffic and quality of life for our residents.

Also, an unintended consequence could be to open up room for more opposition and the ballot measure having a much less chance of passing in that expanded form. If you want it to pass, please maintain your integrity and do not alter it.

Marie Kane

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Nancy Gordon <revnjoy@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 3:57 PM  
**To:** John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 7/6 Nancy Gordon re URGENT MESSAGE to City Council before Tuesday's 7/7 mtg re November ballot

7/6/20 – 4 pm

Dear Mayor and Council Members,  
(copy to Clerk's office)

I've sent email letters to all of you before, and again **STRONGLY** urge you to stand by your June 2nd commitment and your vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1. To do otherwise, would certainly be a betrayal of the remaining public trust this Council enjoys. Especially during this challenging time with the pandemic and people's attention diverted to caring for themselves and others, staying safe, alive and able to make a living, it is uncalled for to do this "bait and switch!":

I've been a resident here in Alameda 47 years, and the information at hand is that this is the first time a paid staff member has tried to undo a vote of elected Council Members! This is unacceptable.

And, the reasoning for this late request is wrong: There are no new substantial, urgent facts in evidence demanding such a change.

Please ignore this staff request, and continue with placing Article 26.1 on the ballot—which is what I thought your decision was going to be!

Citizens have a serious interest in these issues and deserve to be heard and have discussions in a large setting, not have decisions made via zoom and/or behind closed doors.

Sincerely and very seriously,

Nancy J. Gordon  
1021 Union St.  
Alameda, CA 94501

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Jim Anderson <jim.anderson@jathcoinc.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 3:39 PM  
**To:** mezzashcroft@alamedaca.gov; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda 6-A Letter

I am a 25 year resident of Alameda. I am very concerned that City Charter Article 26-3 is being considered for repeal.

Please do not include repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot

Jim Anderson



## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Reyla Graber <reylagraber@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 3:05 PM  
**To:** John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Urge the Council to Limit November Ballot Measure to Article 26.1

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I urge you to stand by your June 2nd vote to limit your ballot measure for November to Article 26.1.

To do otherwise, would be manifestly unwarranted, and would betray the remaining public trust this Council enjoys.

I've lived in Alameda 45 years, and to my knowledge, this is the first time, a paid staff member has tried to undo a vote of elected Council Members.

And, the reasoning for this late request is specious: There are no new substantial, urgent facts in evidence demanding such a change.

Please ignore this "last minute" staff request, and continue with placing Article 26.1 on the ballot-- if you must put anything on!

Thank you,  
Reyla Graber

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Patricia Lamborn <patricia.lamborn@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 2:28 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] July 7 City Council Meeting Item 6-A Ballot Measure

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

I am writing to ask that you respectfully defer repealing Article 26-3 at this time. I believe the ballot language you approved at your previous Council meeting represents a measured ( pun intended ! ) approach to very important issues--

- how to defend and advance affordable housing in Alameda
- how to deal with sea level rise- defense and mitigation.

If you make the discussion of next steps part of a thorough review of Alameda's Housing Element, you will respect public participation and create a plan that represents our community's interest--- not a developer dash to build the most units at the highest profit.

I am concerned that developers will tear down older multi-family units currently subject to rent control. I'm also concerned that developers will build dense housing units near the water's edge. We have not figured out a comprehensive approach to sea level rise-- mitigation, defense, and cost. That must be part of our Housing Element.

If the November 2020 Ballot Measure is limited to repeal of Article 26-1 it will face much less opposition than eliminating the entire Article.

Sincerely,

Patricia Lamborn  
Alameda resident 29 years  
[patricia.lamborn@aol.com](mailto:patricia.lamborn@aol.com)



## East Bay Housing Organizations

---

July 6, 2020

Dear Councilmembers and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft,

On behalf of the membership base of East Bay Housing Organizations, which includes residents of affordable housing, providers of affordable housing, and East Bay residents committed to housing justice, we ask that you reconsider your June 2nd decision to divide the repeal of Article 26 into two parts and put the full article on the November ballot for a full repeal.

Our 500+ members are committed to ensuring affordable housing opportunities for low-income people in the East Bay. Low-income East Bay residents are overwhelmingly elders, children, people with disabilities, and because of widespread racial inequity, are too often Black, Brown, and new immigrant residents. Article 26 is one of the discriminatory zoning laws put in place in the 1970's during a backlash against the racial integration of public housing, fair housing laws, and the unraveling of our social safety nets.

While the State affordable housing overlay has enabled the production of some affordable housing in Alameda despite the exclusionary zoning in Alameda's charter, Article 26 drives up the cost of each unit that the community has invested in to provide housing to low-income people. In doing so, it reduces the total possible number of affordable homes on a plot of land zoned for housing, driving up the cost of all housing. However, these increases particularly limit the housing we can make available for the 200+ currently unhoused residents of Alameda and elders living off of social security, two groups that require units affordable to very-low-income people.

Building multi-story town homes has been another technique to create more housing in Alameda despite Article 26; These townhouses all have stairs, resulting in far too few homes that are accessible for people that use wheelchairs and other mobility assistance devices. People with disabilities have extremely limited affordable housing options, and Article 26 continues to limit the availability of low- and median income housing that is accessible to people using wheelchairs and other assistance devices.

Now - in the middle of a housing crisis-- an economic crisis that will push many more thousands of East Bay residents into low-income and poverty brackets than a few months ago-- and a local and national reckoning with structural racism - is the time to do everything possible to create more permanent affordable housing and to proactively repeal the rules that have exacerbated structural racism in our communities.

Splitting the repeal of Article 26 into two ballot measures increases the education and campaign cost for the city and supporting organizations, is confusing for voters, and is unnecessary. We can create zoning rules through the Planning Board that fulfil Alameda's preservation and environmental needs. Please, make the right decision for the future of Alameda and put a full repeal on the November Ballot.

Thank you,

Dr. Grover Wehman-Brown  
Communications Manager  
East Bay Housing Organizations

**Ashley Zieba**

---

**From:** T Krysiak <tsitjk@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 1:33 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Lara Weisiger; Eric Levitt; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I'm opposed to Article 26-3

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Members of The Alameda City Council:

Placing Article 26-3 on the ballot this November will split our City in many undesirable ways and will have long term ugly consequences.

It's obvious that Alameda has a limited supply of vacant land outside of Alameda Point, so even if Article 26 were repealed, our Housing Element would likely identify the same tracts for the high density overlay. The high density overlay troubles me and the fact that Andrew Thomas is inducing the City Council to even further expand and promote this is an outrage.

There is now strong evidence of dramatic housing changes in the state where rents in the Bay Area are dropping. Tech workers are moving to inexpensive outlying locations because of the new widely accepted premise of work at home. SF and Oakland City Center office buildings may soon need to be converted to housing units and this may result in a glut of housing units in Alameda.

Accommodating pandemic related housing changes demands a **gradual** approach and rushing the high density overlay is irresponsible.

Mr. Thomas states that the added multi-family overlay zoning ordinances will have to be in place within the next 12 to 18 months. I've learned that this is not the case. The parcels will have to be identified in the inventory by then and the law gives the City three years after adoption of the Housing Element to complete the zoning. Therefore, it could be accomplished after the November 2022 election.

The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the alarming step of placing a full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of the Pandemic will seriously dilute the public's trust in The City Council.

Don't allow this and vote to oppose article 26-3. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tom Krysiak  
Sweet Road

Sent from my iPhone

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** John Platt <johntplatt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 1:00 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella  
**Cc:** City Clerk; Eric Levitt; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] item 6-a on this Tuesday's agenda,

Dear Council members,

I support the putting on the November ballot the repeal of item 26-1.

I don't support putting the repeal of 26-3 on November's ballot without a thorough public discussion. This is a very important subject, but currently with Covid-19, black live matters, police controversy and the general uncertainty in our community I do not think this is the appropriate time for this popularly elected and controversial measure to be put up for a vote. This will only help to divide our community when we need to address the major challenges that are hitting Alameda.

I am not sure how I would vote on this issue today, but if I was cynical I might think this is a way to sneak this past the general public without an open public discussion..

Sincerely yours,

John Platt

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** RNesel <rnesel@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 12:52 PM  
**To:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item #6-A at July 7 City Council mtg

TO: M.Levitt, M.Weisiger

For your information, I have just sent the message below to each of the City Council members at the following addresses: [mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov](mailto:mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov); [jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov](mailto:jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov); [tdaysog@alamedaca.gov](mailto:tdaysog@alamedaca.gov); [mvella@alamedaca.gov](mailto:mvella@alamedaca.gov); [joddie@alamedaca.gov](mailto:joddie@alamedaca.gov).

As a long time Alameda resident (since 1982), I wholeheartedly OPPOSE the City Council placing a measure to repeal Article 26 (Measure A) on the November 2020 ballot.

While Measure A is not perfect, it serves a valuable purpose which does NOT lend itself to a wholesale repeal. When I first heard the Alameda City Council was considering this, I fully expected they would delay any significant action during the current tight restrictions imposed by COVID19.

Unfortunately, the Council has chosen to take this matter to a vote NOW, with hopes of placing the issue on the NOV ballot. REVISING this measure requires broad consideration and discussion *throughout* the community; NOT just those people able to tap into the less than reliable patchwork of online resources.

We need person to person discussion, to outline what works and what doesn't, and how to keep what's good while fixing what does NOT.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT THIS Issue ON THE BALLOT this NOVEMBER. It may need to go on a ballot eventually, but now is NOT that time. Ballot measures, all too often, cave to political agendas which are NOT in the best interests of the community.

Sincerely,  
Rita Nesel  
Alameda resident

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Doug Biggs <DBiggs@apcollaborative.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 12:15 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] repeal of A26

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members Knox White, Vella, Oddie and Daysog;

It is time to repeal the 1973 charter amendment measure A. Often times intent does not matter as much as impact, and that is clearly the case with A26. The impact has been to cement in place racial inequity by stopping multifamily development. In the last few years many changes at the state level have rendered such attempts at exclusionary zoning moot, however actively seeking to keep the measure on the books does impact those it seeks to exclude and those who seek to address this inequity. Last year the City in partnership with the collaborative partners sought to apply for infrastructure funds to fast track development of the RESHAP project. The presence of exclusionary anti-housing laws was a key determinant in failing to meet the threshold requirements for applying for those funds. Eliminating part of A26 won't solve the problem. Please vote to place A26 in its entirety on the ballot. In exchange, I pledge to engage our community to actively participate in the campaign for voter approval of its elimination. Thank you very much.

Doug Biggs  
Executive Director  
Alameda Point Collaborative  
677 W. Ranger Ave.  
Alameda, CA 94501  
(510)898-7849  
[www.apcollaborative.org](http://www.apcollaborative.org)

Check out [www.caringalameda.org](http://www.caringalameda.org) for information on our exciting new project!



## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** KURT W LIBBY <klibby@berkeley.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 12:05 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie;  
tdaysog@alamedaca.com  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas; Reyla Graber  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A - July 7 City Council Agenda- Charter Article 26 Ballot Measure

The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the draconian step of placing full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic will reverse your earnest attempts to regain public trust.

We hate these back alley last minute political deals the council continues to try to pull off without allowing the citizens, who have a vested and active interest in these issues, to get actively involved and express their opinions and desires.

Janet and Kurt Libby

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Marilyn Pomeroy <marilypomeroy21@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 9:09 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A /article 26

I strongly oppose placing the repeal of the remaining Article 26-3 on the ballot. Its repeal would place the entire city, included our established built up neighborhoods and retail commercial districts at risk of high density development.

If the pending revision of our General Plan leads to the conclusion that modifications of Art. 26-3 are needed, they can be placed on the November 2022 ballot. If the ballot measure receives voter approval, the Housing Element Law allows Council to supplant any parcels in the inventory with new parcels freed up by the ballot measure.

The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the draconian step of placing full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic will reverse your earnest attempts to regain public trust.

Trying to rush this through during this very stressful and uncertain time will result in strong divisions within our community, just at a time we should be finding common ground.

Sincerely  
Marilyn Pomeroy

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** DENINE KELTNER <deekeltner@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 5, 2020 7:30 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 6-A July 7 2020

Major, City Council Members, City Manager and City Clerk...  
Planning Staff has asked or suggested Article 26-3 be placed on the November ballot.

The City Staff has previously said there is no need to change Article 26, as the mandate from RHNA can be met without any change..... So WHY has the opinion changed?  
Measure A was a Charter Amendment for a very good reason.....and should not be changed. if an change should be discussed, it should be after any revisions to the Alameda General Plan occur.

As a Lifetime Alamedan, I have watched the growth, increased congestion and traffic. Measure A (Article 26) were voted on for a very important reason ..."Do not destroy Alameda by tearing down beautiful buildings, building boxes and losing the special character and charm of the city". Our earlier leaders and citizens were concerned enough to make the decision for a Charter amendment (Measure A). Removing Measure A (Article 26) could possibly destroy our environment and really increase traffic.

**Key observation!!!! Our former leaders and citizens were concerned enough to make a decision for a Charter Amendment (Measure A).**

Our City and Community have made inroads with many developments over the years since the 1960's, 70's and especially 90's and 2010's/ We, the city and its citizens have given enough. Do not FOREVER destroy our City of Alameda.

Lifetime Alamedan,  
Denine Hilbish (Prado) Keltner  
H 510-865-0479  
deekeltner@comcast.net

**Dee Keltner**

**H 510-865-0479**

**C 510-409-6657**

**Family & Friends Multiply Joy!**

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

Subject: Item 6-A on City Council's July 7th, 2020 regular agenda.

Dear Madam Mayor and City Council members,

I urge you to defer the removal or alteration of Article 26-3 on the November ballot until after the completion of the upcoming General Plan discussions. The density restrictions in this Measure are necessary in certain parts of the city to protect the aesthetic and livable features of our historic neighborhoods. It was these density restrictions that shielded our irreplaceable vintage homes from the ongoing destruction by greedy developers wanting to get rich with ugly, boxy multi-unit buildings; taking advantage of those seeking affordable homes. **I do not trust this current city council with the responsibility of maintaining zoning and tear-down restrictions to protect our treasured vintage properties. We need the firewall of Article 26.**

I understand that the council equates large developments with the potential for providing "affordable" housing for a lucky few, but if you were to go out now and survey the offerings among the newly-built housing projects, all you'd find is sky-high prices for densely packed townhomes. The long-awaited Site A project, for example, offers up a half dozen townhouse models to purchase **starting at \$1MM**. Don't bother asking where the "affordable" units are, the sales people don't know. The newly-refurbished Admirals Cove townhomes for rent on the old base, **start at \$4K a month**. No affordable housing over here.

So where is the affordable housing now? It's located in the mom and pop-owned rentals in our vintage homes. Check out Craigslist and you will see that the \$1,600 a month rental I have available in my Victorian is one of the most affordable units in town. And yet landlords in Alameda have been vilified as greedy and subjected to the type of restrictions leading many landlords to permanently remove rental units from their building or sell outright to owner occupants. These more affordable units are shrinking in number, as a result of misguided council actions.

What disgusts me the most, beyond this city council's inability to provide actual affordable units in a timely manner, is the current efforts by some of you to recast support for Article 26 as a racist endeavor. **What you're doing is playing the race card, from the bottom of the deck, in a self-centered attempt to enhance your political careers on the backs of people struggling for respect and equality.** Have some respect for the truth, and have an honest discussion of what you are trying to do and why.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please contact me at (510) 846-7288 or karenlithgow@sbcglobal.net if you would like to discuss these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Lithgow

Alameda resident, landlord and protector of vintage homes

cc: Eric Levitt, Lara Weisiger and Andrew Thomas (by electronic transmission)

AAPS Board and Preservation Action Committee (by electronic transmission)

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** em kelle <emkelle@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 5, 2020 2:49 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A - July 7 City Council Agenda- Charter Article 26 Ballot Measure

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

I am in agreement with Alameda Citizen's Task Force and strongly oppose Planning Director Andrew Thomas's recommendation that you reverse your decision of June 2, 2020 to place only the repeal of Charter Sec. 26-1 on the November 2020 ballot and, instead place the repeal of all of Article 26 on the ballot.

Sincerely,

Eileen Kelleher  
Resident of Alameda

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Ron Kamangar <ronkamangar@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 4, 2020 3:33 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] We strongly oppose placing the repeal of the remaining Article 26-3 on the ballot.  
**Importance:** High

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

We strongly oppose Planning Director Andrew Thomas's recommendation that you reverse your decision of June 2, 2020 to place only the repeal of Charter Sec. 26-1 on the November 2020 ballot and, instead place the repeal of all of Article 26 on the ballot.

Placing 26-3 on the ballot this November will trigger full out opposition from ACT and others. This will split the City in ways that will have longtime consequences and greatly increase the risk that the Measure will be defeated. On the other hand, having Article 26-3 reviewed in the process of General Plan revision will increase the chances of November 2022 voter approval of modifications to Article 26-3 warranted by said review.

Mr. Thomas states that since June 2 the State has published the Bay Area 2023-2031 RHNA which is twice the current RHNA (a 100% increase, not 200% as claimed by Mr. Thomas), thus creating the probability that our housing allocation could double, which would require Council to extend the multi-family overlay over additional parcels. Mr. Thomas then moves from facts to his opinion that the extension of the overlay would place Council in the position of acting in "conflict" with the Charter, which can only be avoided by repealing all of Article 26. Mr. Thomas's argument, simply put, is that there has been a material change in circumstances since your June 2 decision. However, that is clearly not the case as illustrated by the points below:

1. City Council will not be acting in conflict with Charter Sec. 26-3 when it places a high density overlay on additional parcels to satisfy our 2023- 2031 Housing Element. On the contrary, Council will be honoring its oath to uphold the law by acting in concert with both State law and our Charter by identifying enough parcels for the overlay to satisfy the State requirement while leaving all other parcels under the protection of Charter Sec. 26-3.
2. The larger RHNA numbers are no surprise. Mr. Thomas has been predicting even larger numbers.
3. The Housing Element Law primarily tasks cities with finding vacant sites. Alameda has a limited supply of vacant land outside of Alameda Point, so even if Article 26 were repealed our Housing Element would likely identify the same tracts for the high density overlay.
4. If the pending revision of our General Plan leads to the conclusion that modifications of Art. 26-3 are needed, they can be placed on the November 2022 ballot. If the ballot measure receives voter approval, the Housing Element Law allows Council to supplant any parcels in the inventory with new parcels freed up by the ballot measure.
5. Mr. Thomas states that the added multi-family overlay zoning ordinances will have to be in place within the next 12 to 18 months. This is not the case. The parcels will have to be identified in the inventory by then, but the law gives the City three years after adoption of the Housing Element to complete the zoning (CA Govt. Code Sec 65583 (c) (1) (a)), thus it could be accomplished after the November 2022 election in the light of any Article 26-3 modification ballot measure approved by the voters, thereby avoiding any "conflict".

Sincerely,

Ron Kaman  
22 Year resident of Alameda



## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Kay Zehnder <kayzehnder@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 4, 2020 9:57 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6-A

Please do not include repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot.

Thank you.  
Kay Zehnder  
Alameda CA

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** P Moore <444pmoore@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 3, 2020 12:54 PM  
**To:** mezzzyashcraft@alamadaca.gov; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda 6-A

"Please do not include repeal of City Charter Article 26-3 on the November 2020 ballot"

**Pierrette Moore**  
[444pmoore@gmail.com](mailto:444pmoore@gmail.com)

| | *You cannot do a kindness too soon for you never know how soon it will be too late"- Ralph Waldo Emerson*

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Patricia Baer <2baers@att.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 3, 2020 11:06 AM  
**To:** John Knox White; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 6-A

Councilmembers

I am very disturbed that you are even considering a complete repeal of Article 26. Just a month ago you voted 4-1 with your individual convictions to just put 26-1 on the ballot. Now it appears you've been influenced to put the whole Article on the ballot. This will greatly influence the public's trust in our leadership.

Patsy Baer

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** PatMarty Butensky <patmarty60@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 3, 2020 9:45 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Article 26-3

To the Mayor, Vice Mayor and City Council:

I am strongly opposed to the repeal of Article 26-3 of the City Charter for the following reasons:

1. There is plenty of space available on the former navy base and in the industrial area along the estuary to build the housing needed to meet our state mandated requirements.
2. Although much new housing is already in the works, most of it is not being directed to "affordable housing", which is what is most needed.
3. Alameda is in a special situation relative to other Bay Area cities in that it is an island with limited access and would suffer greatly from an extensive further population increase.

Thank you.  
Martin Butensky

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** margie <barongcat@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 7:58 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Strongly Opposed to Repeal of measure A

I strongly oppose placing the repeal of Measure A- any part of same- on the ballot. Its repeal would place the entire city, including our established built up neighborhoods and retail commercial districts at risk of high density development.

why?

(1) Lack of Infrastructure to Support - Alameda's Public Works Director recently submitted an article to the Alameda Sun, where he explains that his staff is working miracles every day to keep the City running smoothly. Our streets, sewers, telephone line and power lines are in need of constant maintenance, not to mention the chronic lack of water. Our police force is understaffed. Adding more people will, of course, stretch the present infrastructure to the breaking point.

(2) Lack of Safe Exits in Case of Emergency - There are only 4 ways off the island. On a normal work day, these are backed up from 7 AM. In case of major fire, earthquake or tsunami, people will die.

(3) Danger to Trees and Ecology. Tall buildings will shade trees and interfere with their roots. There is no tree ordinance in Alameda: people are already cutting down mature trees on their property to gain more parking space.

(4) Alameda is Dense Enough - Alameda is one of the most densely populated areas in the San Francisco Bay Area.

(5) The proposed density is NOT affordable by the people who need affordable housing. Developers are building luxury housing for the wealthy - who don't need extra assistance.

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Elizabeth Tuckwell <elizabethtuckwell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 6:15 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Measure A

Please do NOT fulfill the "sneak attack" of which you've been accused. The "sneak attack" is, of course, including all of Measure A in a ballot measure seeking its repeal on the November ballot.

There has been almost no opportunity for community input to consideration of even part of Measure A, much less to all of it. If the City Council does carry through with this "sneak attack," at least part of the Alameda community will remember.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Tuckwell

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Rasheed El Shabazz <rasheed@berkeley.edu>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:53 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Equity Analysis of Measure A (Article 26)  
**Attachments:** analysis\_measureA\_shabazz\_rasheed.pdf

Peace Lara,

I submitted this to the planning board earlier this year and would like to share with the Council for the 7/7 meeting.

I would also like to lift up the suggestion to, “Consult organizations like Policylink, Government Alliance for Racial Equity, or the Othering and Belonging Institute to obtain an in-depth equity analysis of Measure A, seeking solutions to affirmatively further fair housing and racial diversity in Alameda.”

Rasheed

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

**From:** Rasheed Shabazz <[rasheed@berkeley.edu](mailto:rasheed@berkeley.edu)>  
**Date:** Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 4:35 PM  
**Subject:** Equity Analysis of Measure A (Article 26)  
**To:** ANDREW THOMAS <[athomas@alamedaca.gov](mailto:athomas@alamedaca.gov)>, City Clerk <[clerk@alamedaca.gov](mailto:clerk@alamedaca.gov)>, [EGARCIA@alamedaca.gov](mailto:EGARCIA@alamedaca.gov) <[EGARCIA@alamedaca.gov](mailto:EGARCIA@alamedaca.gov)>

Greetings,

Please receive the attached equity analysis of Measure A and share with Planning Board members.

Thank you.

Rasheed Shabazz

To: Planning Board Department

From: Rasheed Shabazz, Masters of City Planning student, University of California, Berkeley

RE: Equity Analysis of Alameda’s Exclusionary Zoning Ordinance: Measure A (1973)

Date: January 13, 2020

## Summary

California has experienced ongoing housing crises. In the past five years, the City of Alameda has experienced increased concerns of rent increases, evictions, and homelessness. This past summer, a subcommittee of Alameda's City Council requested staff evaluate Article 26 of the City Charter, known as "Measure A." Measure A is an exclusionary zoning charter amendment adopted by the Alameda electorate in 1973 which banned construction of multifamily housing. Proponents framed growth controls as necessary for the environment and in response to a city council and "power structure" unresponsive to residents' concerns with overdevelopment (Shabazz, 2018). Measure A has faced multiple legal challenges for its racially and economically exclusionary impacts. A staff evaluation found Measure A contrary to the general welfare of Alameda, not supportive of the city's goals, and inequitable. This analysis examines Measure A from an equity lens and calls for the Planning Board to recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal, in order to empower the city to provide its fair share of housing, including the "missing middle," and further fair housing.

## Analysis

- Measure A emerged as one example of the postwar suburban tax revolt and exclusionary growth controls (Self, 2004). Frieden (1979) argued that different groups, under the auspices of "environmental protection," adopted a "no-growth politics" for suburbs. The result: limited housing for low- and middle-income families, increased home prices, increased sprawl as families migrated to exurbs, and a lack of housing development planning.
- Racialized segregation is not simply de facto, but in fact the intentional policy of local, state, and federal government (Rothstein, 2014). Predominantly white jurisdictions and neighborhoods used various strategies, tactics, and methods to maintain racial exclusivity and segregation (Jackson, 1985; Massey and Denton, 1993; Rothstein, 2014). While various non-white groups have experienced residential segregation, Black or African Americans are consistently the most segregated in metropolitan areas (Massey and Denton, 1993). The national history of racially restrictive covenants, redlining, public housing segregation, urban renewal, rental housing discrimination, gentrification, and displacement have all taken place in Alameda (James, 2013).
- An analysis of the demographic changes in Alameda after Measure A demonstrate links in what scholar Rolf Pendall called the "chain of exclusion." Exclusionary zoning reduces housing stock, which excludes multifamily housing, and raises the proportion of single-family detached dwellings. This all reduces affordability and indirectly excludes low-income families and people of color, particularly Black people.
- Growth controls, specifically the "low density zoning" led to a "chain of exclusion. Low-density zoning reduced housing stock, excluded multifamily housing and raised the proportion of single-family detached dwellings. This all reduced affordability and indirectly excluded low-income families and people of color. Additionally, the longer moratoriums on buildings stayed in place, the more exclusion occurred (Pendall, 1993).
- Measure A opponents expressed concerns Measure A leading to the "damaging effects" in Alameda and beyond. Mayor Terry LaCroix wrote that, "By creating an artificial scarcity, [Measure A] would increase the cost of housing and deny people of modest income the opportunity to live or remain in Alameda." Fair housing advocates opposed Measure A, as well as representatives and members of the island chapter of the national racial justice organization, the Alameda NAACP (Shabazz, 2018).



Measure A experienced three legal challenges on the basis of racial exclusion.

- In 1980, three tenants and Alamedans with HOPE sued the city of Alameda, alleging the “actions of the City alleged to frustrate the development of low-income housing in Alameda and to perpetuate the non-Black character of Alameda.” This case was dismissed but without prejudice.
- In 1989, two Black tenants sued the City of Alameda again. A judge ruled that Alameda’s land-use policies discriminated against poor people in the region. Before a judgement was reached on whether Measure A was racially discriminatory, the parties settled. The “Guyton settlement” permitted a 325 unit exemption to Measure A.
- In 2012, the threat of a lawsuit by Renewed Hope and Public Advocates led the City of Alameda to adopt its first compliant housing element in twenty years. “Creating affordable homes for lower-income households in the Bay Area almost always requires building “multifamily” rental housing, such as apartment buildings. In the face of high land and construction costs, multifamily housing creates economies of scale that can translate into lower rents,” according to Public Advocates.

An analysis of Alameda’s housing stock and demographics since the passage of Measure A both affirms and complicates claims that Measure A has increased “diversity.”

- Alameda’s population was 90 percent white in 1970 and shrank to 79 percent by 1980.
- Alameda’s housing tenure shifted from 38 percent to 41 percent owner-occupied from 1970 to 1980, and 46 percent in 1990.
- Black residents became more segregated after Measure A and less likely to own their own homes. Alameda’s Black proportion is smaller than other nearby cities and has a high proportion of renters, 93 percent (U.S. Census).
- Alameda’s white population decreased, although those who remained and moved to the island have been of higher socioeconomic group status. White Alamedans have become more likely to own their own homes (U.S. Census).
- As exemplified by a comparison between Census Tracts 4271 and 4276, Measure A has prolonged racial exclusion and exacerbated racialized disparities in housing tenure and poverty rates, and the concentrations of different types of housing structures. Black Alamedans have been most likely to live in denser communities with more multifamily housing (Shabazz, 2019).

## Options

The planning board can:

- Adopt the staff report and recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal.
- Consult organizations like Policylink, Government Alliance for Racial Equity, or the Othering and Belonging Institute to obtain an in-depth equity analysis of Measure A, seeking solutions to affirmatively further fair housing and racial diversity in Alameda.
- Uphold the status quo and maintain Measure A

## Recommendations

Based on the above analysis, I recommend the Planning Board adopt the staff report and recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal.

### **Selected References**

- Field, B. (1993). Why Our Fair Share Housing Laws Fail. Santa Clara L. Rev., 34, 35.
- Massey and Denton. (1993) American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.
- James, R. L. (2013). 'Alameda is our Home': African Americans and the Struggle for Housing in Alameda, California, 1860-present. UC Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7pp2q0gh>
- Shabazz, R. (2018, April 24). The Contentious History of Measure A. Alameda Free Library. In possession of author.
- Rothstein, R. (2017). The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America.
- Self, R. (2004) American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland.
- Shabazz, R. (2018, April 24). The Contentious History of Measure A. Alameda Free Library. In possession of author.
- Silver, Christopher. (1991) The racial origins of zoning: Southern cities from 1910–40, Planning Perspectives, 6:2, 189-205, DOI: 10.1080/02665439108725726.
- <https://missingmiddlehousing.com/>

--

**Rasheed El Shabazz**

Masters of City Planning | Class of 2021

UC BERKELEY | COLLEGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

[rasheed@berkeley.edu](mailto:rasheed@berkeley.edu) | (510) 520-6519

To: Planning Board Department

From: Rasheed Shabazz, Masters of City Planning student, University of California, Berkeley

RE: Equity Analysis of Alameda's Exclusionary Zoning Ordinance: Measure A (1973)

Date: January 13, 2020

## Summary

California has experienced ongoing housing crises. In the past five years, the City of Alameda has experienced increased concerns of rent increases, evictions, and homelessness. This past summer, a subcommittee of Alameda's City Council requested staff evaluate Article 26 of the City Charter, known as "Measure A." Measure A is an exclusionary zoning charter amendment adopted by the Alameda electorate in 1973 which banned construction of multifamily housing. Proponents framed growth controls as necessary for the environment and in response to a city council and "power structure" unresponsive to residents' concerns with overdevelopment (Shabazz, 2018). Measure A has faced multiple legal challenges for its racially and economically exclusionary impacts. A staff evaluation found Measure A contrary to the general welfare of Alameda, not supportive of the city's goals, and inequitable. This analysis examines Measure A from an equity lens and calls for the Planning Board to recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal, in order to empower the city to provide its fair share of housing, including the "missing middle," and further fair housing.

## Analysis

- Measure A emerged as one example of the postwar suburban tax revolt and exclusionary growth controls (Self, 2004). Frieden (1979) argued that different groups, under the auspices of "environmental protection," adopted a "no-growth politics" for suburbs. The result: limited housing for low- and middle-income families, increased home prices, increased sprawl as families migrated to exurbs, and a lack of housing development planning.
- Racialized segregation is not simply de facto, but in fact the intentional policy of local, state, and federal government (Rothstein, 2014). Predominantly white jurisdictions and neighborhoods used various strategies, tactics, and methods to maintain racial exclusivity and segregation (Jackson, 1985; Massey and Denton, 1993; Rothstein, 2014). While various non-white groups have experienced residential segregation, Black or African Americans are consistently the most segregated in metropolitan areas (Massey and Denton, 1993). The national history of racially restrictive covenants, redlining, public housing segregation, urban renewal, rental housing discrimination, gentrification, and displacement have all taken place in Alameda (James, 2013).
- An analysis of the demographic changes in Alameda after Measure A demonstrate links in what scholar Rolf Pendall called the "chain of exclusion." Exclusionary zoning reduces housing stock, which excludes multifamily housing, and raises the proportion of single-family detached dwellings. This all reduces affordability and indirectly excludes low-income families and people of color, particularly Black people.
- Growth controls, specifically the "low density zoning" led to a "chain of exclusion. Low-density zoning reduced housing stock, excluded multifamily housing and raised the proportion of single-family detached dwellings. This all reduced affordability and indirectly excluded low-income families and people of color. Additionally, the longer moratoriums on buildings stayed in place, the more exclusion occurred (Pendall, 1993).
- Measure A opponents expressed concerns Measure A leading to the "damaging effects" in Alameda and beyond. Mayor Terry LaCroix wrote that, "By creating an artificial scarcity,

[Measure A] would increase the cost of housing and deny people of modest income the opportunity to live or remain in Alameda.” Fair housing advocates opposed Measure A, as well as representatives and members of the island chapter of the national racial justice organization, the Alameda NAACP (Shabazz, 2018).

Measure A experienced three legal challenges on the basis of racial exclusion.

- In 1980, three tenants and Alamedans with HOPE sued the city of Alameda, alleging the “actions of the City alleged to frustrate the development of low-income housing in Alameda and to perpetuate the non-Black character of Alameda.” This case was dismissed but without prejudice.
- In 1989, two Black tenants sued the City of Alameda again. A judge ruled that Alameda’s land-use policies discriminated against poor people in the region. Before a judgement was reached on whether Measure A was racially discriminatory, the parties settled. The “Guyton settlement” permitted a 325 unit exemption to Measure A.
- In 2012, the threat of a lawsuit by Renewed Hope and Public Advocates led the City of Alameda to adopt its first compliant housing element in twenty years. “Creating affordable homes for lower-income households in the Bay Area almost always requires building “multifamily” rental housing, such as apartment buildings. In the face of high land and construction costs, multifamily housing creates economies of scale that can translate into lower rents,” according to Public Advocates.

An analysis of Alameda’s housing stock and demographics since the passage of Measure A both affirms and complicates claims that Measure A has increased “diversity.”

- Alameda’s population was 90 percent white in 1970 and shrank to 79 percent by 1980.
- Alameda’s housing tenure shifted from 38 percent to 41 percent owner-occupied from 1970 to 1980, and 46 percent in 1990.
- Alameda’s Black population grew from
- Black residents became more segregated after Measure A and less likely to own their own homes. Alameda’s Black proportion is smaller than other nearby cities and has a high proportion of renters, 93 percent (U.S. Census).
- Alameda’s white population decreased, although those who remained and moved to the island have been of higher socioeconomic group status. White Alamedans have become more likely to own their own homes (U.S. Census).
- As exemplified by a comparison between Census Tracts 4271 and 4276, Measure A has prolonged racial exclusion and exacerbated racialized disparities in housing tenure and poverty rates, and the concentrations of different types of housing structures. Black Alamedans have been most likely to live in denser communities with more multifamily housing (Shabazz, 2019).

## **Options**

The planning board can:

- Adopt the staff report and recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal.
- Consult organizations like Policylink, Government Alliance for Racial Equity, or the Othering and Belonging Institute to obtain an in-depth equity analysis of Measure A, seeking solutions to affirmatively further fair housing and racial diversity in Alameda.
- Uphold the status quo and maintain Measure A

## **Recommendations**

Based on the above analysis, I recommend the Planning Board adopt the staff report and recommend the City Council place Measure A on the November 2020 ballot for repeal.

### **Selected References**

- Field, B. (1993). Why Our Fair Share Housing Laws Fail. Santa Clara L. Rev., 34, 35.
- Massey and Denton. (1993) American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.
- James, R. L. (2013). 'Alameda is our Home': African Americans and the Struggle for Housing in Alameda, California, 1860-present. UC Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7pp2q0gh>
- Shabazz, R. (2018, April 24). The Contentious History of Measure A. Alameda Free Library. In possession of author.
- Rothstein, R. (2017). The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America.
- Self, R. (2004) American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland.
- Shabazz, R. (2018, April 24). The Contentious History of Measure A. Alameda Free Library. In possession of author.
- Silver, Christopher. (1991) The racial origins of zoning: Southern cities from 1910–40, Planning Perspectives, 6:2, 189-205, DOI: 10.1080/02665439108725726.
- <https://missingmiddlehousing.com/>

**From:** Alameda Citizens Task Force <announcements@alamedacitizenstaskforce.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 11:09 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie;  
tdaysog@alamedaca.com  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger; Yibin Shen; Andrew Thomas  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A - July 7 City Council Agenda- Charter Article 26 Ballot Measure

# ACT

## Alameda Citizens Task Force

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

---

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

We strongly oppose Planning Director Andrew Thomas's recommendation that you reverse your decision of June 2, 2020 to place only the repeal of Charter Sec. 26-1 on the November 2020 ballot and, instead place the repeal of all of Article 26 on the ballot.

Placing 26-3 on the ballot this November will trigger full out opposition from ACT and others. This will split the City in ways that will have longtime consequences and greatly increase the risk that the Measure will be defeated. On the other hand, having Article 26-3 reviewed in the process of General Plan revision will increase the chances of November 2022 voter approval of modifications to Article 26-3 warranted by said review.

Mr. Thomas states that since June 2 the State has published the Bay Area 2023-2031 RHNA which is twice the current RHNA (a 100% increase, not 200% as claimed by Mr. Thomas), thus creating the probability that our housing allocation could double, which would require Council to extend the multi-family overlay over additional parcels. Mr. Thomas then moves from facts to his opinion that the extension of the overlay would place Council in the position of acting in "conflict" with the Charter, which can only be avoided by repealing all of Article 26. Mr. Thomas's argument, simply put, is that there has been a material change in circumstances since your June 2 decision. However, that is clearly not the case as illustrated by the points below:

1. City Council will not be acting in conflict with Charter Sec. 26-3 when it places a high density overlay on additional parcels to satisfy our 2023- 2031 Housing Element. On the contrary, Council will be honoring its oath to uphold the law by acting in concert with both State law and our Charter by identifying enough parcels for the overlay to satisfy the State requirement while leaving all other parcels under the protection of Charter Sec. 26-3.
2. The larger RHNA numbers are no surprise. Mr. Thomas has been predicting even larger numbers.
3. The Housing Element Law primarily tasks cities with finding vacant sites. Alameda has a limited supply of vacant land outside of Alameda Point, so even if Article 26 were repealed our Housing Element would likely identify the same tracts for the high density overlay.

4. If the pending revision of our General Plan leads to the conclusion that modifications of Art. 26-3 are needed, they can be placed on the November 2022 ballot. If the ballot measure receives voter approval, the Housing Element Law allows Council to supplant any parcels in the inventory with new parcels freed up by the ballot measure.

5. Mr. Thomas states that the added multi-family overlay zoning ordinances will have to be in place within the next 12 to 18 months. This is not the case. The parcels will have to be identified in the inventory by then, but the law gives the City three years after adoption of the Housing Element to complete the zoning (CA Govt. Code Sec 65583 (c) (1) (a)), thus it could be accomplished after the November 2022 election in the light of any Article 26-3 modification ballot measure approved by the voters, thereby avoiding any “conflict”.

**It is clear that Mr. Thomas’s recommendation is not motivated by any material change in circumstances since June 2, but on his desire to get a last minute second bite of the apple on this issue.** The reversal of your 4-1 June 2 decision by taking the draconian step of placing full repeal of Article 26 on the ballot at the last minute and in the midst of an attention diverting Pandemic will reverse your earnest attempts to regain public trust.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task Force Steering Committee

**Ashley Zieba**

---

**From:** Kay Weinstein <kayweinstein@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:51 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog  
**Cc:** Eric Levitt; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A on July 7 Council's Regular Agenda

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

As a resident and member of Alameda Architectural Preservation Society, I am opposed to the repeal of Article 26-3.

REJECT placing Article 26-3 on the November ballot.

Sincerely,

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



## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** gaylon parsons <gaylon.parsons@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 1, 2020 2:08 PM  
**To:** City Clerk; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; John Knox White; Malia Vella  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 6-A on July 7 agenda. Repeal of Article 26 in full, please

Dear mayor and council members,

In 1973, Measure A was passed by the voters of Alameda and became part of our city charter: Article 26. The impact of this was to preserve Victorians, to prevent multifamily housing in the city, to limit density, and to prevent Black and Brown people from calling Alameda home. At a recent Black Lives Matter protest here in Alameda, a former resident of the BVs took the microphone and said: "You say Black lives matter. SHOW me" and told the story of the BVs and of Clayton Guyton. The trajectory of this person's life was negatively altered by Article 26; that is the impact, too. Alameda does not need to retain any portion of Article 26 in our city charter any longer. Those racist impacts are enough reason to repeal the Article in full.

I strongly encourage you to direct staff to draft ballot language to repeal Article 26 in full from our city's charter (26-1, 26-2, **and** 26-3). We can do this with a clean process that enables the city to vote our values all at once, not in a messy piecemeal fashion that will be more expensive. Let the voters have their say, to decide whether we want to keep a demonstrably racist Article in the charter or to repeal it.

Let the Article 26 era end in 2020. There are many of us who will work hard to ensure that voters are well-informed and able to make a decision that aligns with who we are as a city today.

Finally, for those members of council actively seeking to be antiracist, this is a tangible step and a powerfully positive one. Another step could be to purchase a copy of *How to Be an Antiracist* by Ibram X. Kendi from Books, Inc here in Alameda. I own the audio version and listen in the car, and have learned so much.

Thank you.

--

Gaylon Parsons

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** James Hudkins <jimhudkinscpa@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 11:24 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; elevitt@alamedaaca.gov; Lara Weisiger; CBuckleyaicp@att.net; James Hudkins  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Reject placing Article 26-3 on the November ballot.

Please reject placing Article 26-3 on the November ballot.

I am opposed to this change.

Jim Hudkins

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** Dorothy Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 4:31 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting July 7, 2020 Agenda Item 6A

June 29, 2020

City Council Meeting July 7th, Item 6A

Honorable Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members,

Measure A has not stopped Alameda from approving many housing developments during the present housing element. Our 2012 RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation) requirements were set at 1723 housing units and yet Alameda has managed to approve nearly 5000 new housing units, including many apartments, but has not managed to provide the required units for very low and low income units, nor has the very much needed moderate income (work force) housing been provided.

Supply and demand is not for market rate units which have disproportionately been approved by Alameda City Councils. Alameda's problem with providing affordable house is because Alameda has allowed, by rezoning actions, most of the available land to be build out as market rate, leaving less available land for the very needed affordable housing. Measure A (Article 26-1) has allowed the mom and pop units to remain a major portion of Alameda's lower cost housing units because they were not replaced by corporate landlords building out Alameda with large multi unit apartment buildings. Lower rents in Alameda have allowed the city to become a much more diverse community than it was in the early 1970's. Preserving our neighborhood mom & pop rental units, with their lower than average rents, has and will keep Alameda more diverse than continuing to build large apartment buildings with their corporate landlords who charge market rate rents. At present higher income wage earners who can afford market rate units are predominantly white. Removing Measure A from the City Charter may lead to large, corporate run apartment buildings in our neighborhoods, replacing the mom & pop units.

The incidences of discrimination that Council Member Odie referenced at the City Council meeting of June 2nd, did not include any in Alameda. Prior to the passage of Measure A there were large developments on Bay Farm Island. As he stated he was not able to find any reference to non-white people being pushed out of Alameda, but by his report, he implied that was the case. If additional large developments had been allowed to continuing to build here, then there might have been some of the same discriminator problems Council Member Odie mentioned. But since the large developments were kept out of Alameda by Measure A (Article 26-1), as previously mentioned, Alameda's change to a very diverse community implies it did not become a problem.

Measure A, Articles 26-1 & 26-2 are very important within our city's population. That's why they became part of the City Charter. Time has not made them less relevant. It may be that changes to these articles should be made but now is not the time for this decision to be made. We are in a time that has disrupted everything about our daily lives. People are concerned about other things than what is happening at City Hall. Many people are just trying to find a way to survive.

Forcing these decisions to be made now is improper governance. A decision of both items should be delayed until the 2022 election. There is nothing pressing in the next housing element that makes a need for an imminent decision. There is plenty of time to wait until there can be full community involvement. I employ the full council to vote to delay any decisions regarding Measure A until the general election of 2022.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

cc: Lara Weisiger, City of Alameda Clerk

## Ashley Zieba

---

**From:** jwoodard@jwoodardmedia.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 3:18 PM  
**To:** Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please don't put Measure A changes on Nov 2020 ballot

Dear Alameda City Council members;

I understand that the council is considering removing Measure A from the city charter by putting that issue on the November 2020 Alameda City ballot. If the removal is successful then multi-unit buildings can be built, especially along Park and Webster streets. This drastic change may happen if a poorly informed public, preoccupied by the threats of a major pandemic, is unable to grasp the consequences of voting approval. Such an alteration to our community would have drastic effects and be the result of a poorly informed electorate, understandably distracted by the time and efforts to protect their lives threatened by the coronavirus plague.

We can have time to evaluate the values of Measure A and the possible need to alter this law if, as a ballot measure, if the removal of Measure A could be delayed until the 2022 election. To make sure that we are all laboring for the common good, don't hurry. Give us all time to study and understand the consequences of changing Measure A so that we can act as a unified community, one now majorly engaged in defending life itself.

Please don't rush to remove Measure A by putting such a proposal on this November's election ballot.

Thank you for your consideration of our community welfare.

Joseph Woodard  
2050 Eagle Avenue, #3  
Alameda, CA 94501

**From:** [steveaced@aol.com](mailto:steveaced@aol.com)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Levitt](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] placing article 26-3 on the November ballot  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 11:51:34 AM

---

Members of the City Council,

During the June City Council meeting the council voted 4-1 to place Article 26-1 of the City Charter on the November 2020 ballot and an attempt to place a repeal of Article 26-3 on the same ballot failed due to a lack of a second. Now you are apparently ignoring this vote and the rationale used earlier this month. Until the scheduled General Plan review is completed any Article 26 changes will be premature.

If the large increase in the RHNA Mandate is the basis for including consideration of these items on the agenda please remember that staff has stated previously that a large increase in the RHNA Mandate has been expected for quite a while and that it can be accommodated with no changes to Article 26 and that the mandated units can be accommodated at Alameda Point.

Clearly, the most appropriate time to consider these changes are during the scheduled General Plan revision review. Making changes now and then revising them later when you can look at the full extent of the impact these changes will have makes no sense.

Thank you.

Steve Aced