

---

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

From: Patricia Baer [mailto:2baers@att.net]

Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 12:56 PM

To: Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Wellness Center

Dear Board Members,

I have previously written to express my displeasure with the LOCATION of the proposed center, and not because I'm a NIMBY. If it's to serve the entire Alameda County, there couldn't be a more remote location from those other cities than the extreme south side of our island.

Now I understand there is a new plot to delist the Federal property from the Historical Advisory Board Study List which would allow the current buildings to be torn down and much large ones built.

This project has escalated far beyond what is right for our island city. Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you,

Patricia Baer

---

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

It was recently brought to my attention that Alameda Point Collaborative has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant is not the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.  
Thank you.

**Jennifer Cianciulli, CPA, MST**  
Resident and Business Owner  
510-867-6458

---

Alvin Lau  
Thomas Saxby  
Lynn Jones  
Norman Sanchez  
Jenn Witt

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

It was recently brought to my attention that Alameda Point Collaborative has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant is not the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.

Thank you.

Kathleen Egan  
812 Paru Street  
Alameda, CA 94501

---

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

It was recently brought to my attention that Alameda Point Collaborative has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant IS NOT the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully OBJECT to the property being delisted.

Thank you.  
Beth Peterson

**From:** [Karen Miller](#)  
**To:** [Allen Tai](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] McKay project  
**Date:** Saturday, February 27, 2021 6:07:18 PM

---

While I am for helping the homeless I believe this site is not located in an area conducive for either the homeless to find services or the neighborhood so I am opposed to delisting the buildings from the historical list.

Regards  
Karen Miller  
720 Paru.

**From:** [Gig Codiga](#)  
**To:** [Allen Tai](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] APC/Wellness Center - Should Remain Under Study by Alameda Historical Advisory Board  
**Date:** Saturday, February 27, 2021 9:07:40 AM

---

Dear,  
Alvin Lau, Thomas Saxby, Lynn Jones, Norman Sanchez, Jenn Witt

I can understand the attempt by APC/Wellness Center to de-list 620 McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board Study list. However, this property truly played a history role for Alameda and our country. The demolition of these historical and classic buildings would seem to be in contradiction to the goals and objectives of the Historical Advisory Board to preserve physical reminders of Alameda's history and heritage.

As other historical property owners, though I understand APC/Wellness Center is only a tenant, not an owner, make great effort to comply with the rules and obligations towards preserving our history, they too must follow the rules and laws as to compliance. I understand the additional efforts necessary, but those are the accepted and implied responsibilities when involved with historical assets.

Another great example of why preservation is so cool comes from the efforts that San Francisco and State officials went through to preserve the Presidio buildings.

Please retain 620 McKay Avenue on the Study List. And see what we can do to comply with CEQA and the Historical Review Board, and take the steps to finish the study of this valuable Alameda property.

Best Regards  
Be Well

Gig Codiga

**From:** [sfsugatoralum](#)  
**To:** [Allen Tai](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection to removal of 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List  
**Date:** Sunday, February 28, 2021 9:43:20 AM

---

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

**Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431**

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC/Biggs does not have standing for the property as a leasee. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency. Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you,

Jeff Franco

Alameda resident

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Scott Hamilton](#)  
**To:** [Allen Tai](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please do not remove this building  
**Date:** Saturday, February 27, 2021 8:57:37 PM

---

Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

If Alameda Point Collaborative turns this building into a homeless shelter this historical building and the neighboring parks will become next tent city. APC has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant is not the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.

Thank you,  
Scott Hamilton



---

**From:** harveyzu@yahoo.com [mailto:harveyzu@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 10:23 AM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: delisting federal property from historical study list. Mar 4, 2021 Historical Advisory Board public hearing.

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members:

Architectural vestiges of our nation's heroic efforts during the World War 2 are rapidly vanishing. The proposed re-design and conversion of the WW2-era buildings at the McKay Ave. site into a 149-bed County homeless facility will conceal these buildings' military history and significance beneath a flashy new veneer and will diminish the memory and sacrifices of those who served the country in the war. It will permanently visually erase from public memory the historical and military significance of the site.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel is on Alameda's Historical Study List with an S designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to buildings with an S designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historical review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and the City Council went ahead anyway to approve the proposed re-design of the property.

In the middle of ongoing litigation, Mr. Biggs is now finally contacting the Historical Advisory Board to change the S designation of the property. This will allow him to avoid completing the requirement of an environmental analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act. Since his proposal

is for a health facility for the County's medically-vulnerable homeless population, a heightened level of environmental analysis is needed and a CEQA review is warranted.

An earlier incomplete, unsigned environmental assessment that clearly identified itself as only a draft was adopted by the City as part of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

There are a number of reasons that the historical review board should reject Mr. Biggs attempt to delist the McKay Avenue property from the historical study list. A request for the delisting needs to be made by the owner of the property. Mr. Biggs is not the owner of the property. The federal government is the owner.

As the sole evidence presented to support delisting of the S designation, Mr. Biggs supplies a 17 year old letter exchange in which the General Services Administration writes that " Because of its age and the significant activities that transpired on this property during World War II, the possibility exists that this facility could qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places." However, it was not the opinion of the GSA to support Historic Register listing for the property at that time based on 2 reports enclosed with that letter and sent to the California Office of Historic Preservation for review and comment. Unfortunately, these reports are absent from the evidence presented for the March 4, 2021 Historical Review Board public hearing. OHP's response to GSA after review of the reports indicates that a number of buildings had been demolished on the original 32-acre Maritime Officers' School property. The property had subsequently been reduced to only a 7.6 acre site at the time of the letter exchange. However, the site currently being considered for delisting is different from the 7.6 acre site evaluated over 25 years ago and it deserves a new review to assess it's current historical significance. Instead of the former large site with a few sparsely-spaced buildings, the current more compact site is densely packed with buildings close to one another that together form a cohesive subset of historical and architectural value. The 2003 OHP letter suggests that since some buildings at the original larger complex had been demolished, there is less historical value in preserving those buildings that remained. It seems that the opposite should be the case. The OHP response also indicated it initiated no independent investigation or site visit prior to rendering its opinion about the

site's historic significance. The OHP opinion was based solely on the now-missing reports.

Given the missing 25 year old reports that both the GSA and OHP relied upon to base their opinions regarding the property's historical significance and the lack of any other independent investigation undertaken by either agency, there is not sufficient justification to remove the property's historic study listing at this time. The size, age and characteristics of the property under current review differ from that described in the 25 year old report. Additionally, any request for such delisting requires the participation the the property's owner, not the lessee.

I thank you for your consideration of the issues I have raised in this letter.

Respectfully,

Harvey Rosenthal

---

**From:** Laura Gamble [mailto:lgamble05@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 12:09 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] HAB Correspondance - Delist 620 Central

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board At your March 4th meeting, you will be hearing a request to delist buildings at 620 Central, which used to be a USDA office, from the historical buildings study list, which was created in 1978. These buildings are classified as S category, which means "A historic resource distinguished by its architectural, historical, or environmental significance, eligible for inclusion in the State Historic Resources Inventory". Subsequently to this listing in the mid-2000s, the bulk of the buildings were torn down. At that time, no protest was submitted, nor did HAB take any action. Also at that time, The State Office of Historic Preservation determined that the site is not eligible for inclusion. Based on that fact alone, the only credible action for the HAB to take is to delist the site from the Historical Building Study List as it no longer qualifies. Opposition to this action is coming from a predictable group of people who don't oppose the demolition of the buildings, as many of them have previously called for the property to be demolished and used as "open space", but their opposition is to the use of the facilities to serve frail homeless elders. This group continues to waste city resources through planning board appeals and special elections to keep sick seniors living on the street. It is violence through bureaucracy. Please accept staff recommendations, and delist these properties.

Thank you, Laura Gamble

---

**From:** Ezra Denney [mailto:ezradenney@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 12:34 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter to the Historical Advisory Board

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,

At your next meeting, a request will be before you to delist buildings at the old USDA site that is to be the home of Alameda's Wellness Center from the historical buildings study list. In the mid 2000's the State Office of Historic Preservation declined to include these buildings under their aegis. That alone is enough to delist the buildings on the local level.

It is amusing (and telling) to note how many of the names we see opposing the delisting are names that we also saw on petitions and letters enthusiastically supporting tearing down these buildings for a park or even a parking lot. The opposition to this delisting is not based on any sense of historical preservation, but on a cynical campaign against the much-needed Wellness Center.

I urge the members to accept the staff recommendations and delist these properties.

Thanks,

Ezra Denney

---

**From:** Mike Fennelly [mailto:crankyrigger@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 12:12 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 620 McKay Ave.

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC does not have standing for the property. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you.  
Mike Fennelly

---

**From:** Gerri Ginsburg [mailto:writer1256@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 1:07 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A, March 4, 2021 - Comments

As an Alameda resident and property owner, I object to the proposal for the Federal Property at [620 Central Ave.](#) to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

You are considering a proposal from an entity (APC) that does not have title to the property, which is absolutely inappropriate. This is federal property that is currently being litigated for not adhering to CEQA state mandates. If I understand correctly, a communication forwarded by the complainant to support the request is 18 years old and invalid by law that states the evaluation must be current within 5 years.

By agreeing to a request for the property to be removed from the Historical Advisory Board Study List, you are participating in a scheme intended to be a work-around this pending litigation.

This property has historical significance and should remain on the Study List at this time.

In no case should an Alameda government entity or entity appointed by the government abet an endeavor to sidestep litigation or bend the law.

Thank you.

Gerri Ginsburg  
12 Cove Rd.  
Alameda, CA

---

**From:** Jason Buckley [mailto:jason.buckley@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 1:28 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] HAB - Delist 620 Central

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,

At your meeting tomorrow (Mar 4) you will hear a request to delist buildings at 620 Central. They are formerly government administrative buildings that the Federal Government has given to our city specifically to create a center to help provide medical care to homeless seniors. The State Office of Historic Preservation determined that the site is not eligible for inclusion in the S Category.

The people opposing this delisting have already cost the city nearly one million dollars to run a special election that confirmed that this project is a done deal. Yet they still continue to file various nuisance lawsuits, and try every means they can to stop this project (a medical respite center for homeless seniors - they are literally trying to stop our community from helping people direly in need of help!) from happening. I'm not going to mince words about this. What they are doing is pure evil. Before they wanted to preserve these buildings, they wanted to tear them down to build parks, which the East Bay Regional Park Service had no interest in doing on that site.

Please accept city staff recommendations to delist these buildings.

Thank you,  
Jason Buckley



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)



---

**From:** Ammonitee [mailto:fey.adelstein@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] March 4th HAB meeting - status of 620 Central Ave

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

it has come to my attention that, the attempt to de-list 620 Central Ave. is being initiated to avoid CEQA regulation (pending litigation).

Furthermore, APC, as leasee (not owner), has no standing to apply for removal of the site from the HAB study list.

I ask each of you to please consider that,

*"The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered."*

As a result, the historical significance of the site has been ignored, and the Historical Review Board's authority has been undermined.

I request the site's current 'S' rating be maintained, and the impropriety of the Planning Dept in this aspect be addressed.

Sincerely,  
Fey Adelstein

---

**From:** gaylon parsons [mailto:gaylon.parsons@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 2:22 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>; atai@alameda.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] HAB, Item 7-A March 4 2021

Dear members of the Historic Advisory Board,

I am writing to ask you to accept your competent and professional city staff recommendation regarding the properties referenced in Item 7-A. These properties should be delisted from the Historical Buildings Study List. If you do not trust staff, or wish to mollify constituents with a habitual distrust of city staff, I would point to this evaluation of the site on page 3 of Exhibit 4:

*"Although the property has associations with World War II-era training of officers associated with the U.S. Maritime Service, it has lost considerable integrity of design, materials, setting, feeling, and association with its historic period of significance (1942-1957). Those structures that remain do not convey the special nature of the property's historic maritime training mission during and after World War II."*

I would encourage the members to resist the bad faith arguments from those who wish to weaponize Preservation in service of exclusion and withholding needed services from the most vulnerable. I can't imagine that any member of the HAB would be comfortable with such an impact.

Thank you for your service,  
Gaylon

--

Gaylon Parsons

March 3, 2021

RE: March 4, 2021 Agenda Item 7-A

Honorable members of the Alameda Historic Advisory Board:

Having grown up here and having had personal familiarity with the property, currently under consideration by the Board, during the late 1940s and 1950s, I have a personal affinity for the ambiance of the area and remain hopeful that at some future date the ARPD and/or EBRPD will develop it into an attractive historic educational and visitors' center that can supplement the telling of our military history that now relies entirely on the continued presence of the USS Hornet now docked at Alameda Point.

I feel strongly that we should not be in a hurry to abandon the reminders of our history here in what was once a bustling Navy Town.

I respectfully request that the Board not remove the Federal Center located at McKay and Central Avenues from Alameda's list of historic sites and structures.

Jay Garfinkle

---

**From:** Janet Lee [mailto:janetislee@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:15 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC does not have standing for the property. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you

Imsook Lee

.

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members:

Subject: HAB Meeting 03/04/2021; Item 7-A / PLN 20-0431

I am a long-time Alameda resident.

I am writing to oppose the proposal to remove the Federal property at 620 Central Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

- 1) The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the HAB Study List is motivated by the pending lawsuit.
- 2) The applicant seeking this change is not the property owner and has no legal standing to request that the property to be removed from the HAB Study List.
- 3) The property does have historical significance to warrant its being on the HAB Study List, since the Alameda Navy Base was an important part of Alameda history. It was a Maritime Officers School from 1942-1947 and then served as a Maritime Service Training Station from 1947-1957.
- 4) The OHP letter posted as Exhibit 4 to this Item is outdated (17 years old).

The property should stay on the HAB Study List as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.

Thank you,

*Ted McGavin*

[mcgavin\\_ted@comcast.net](mailto:mcgavin_ted@comcast.net)

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Kristin Welch <kwelchamed@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 7:43 PM  
**To:** Lara Weisiger; Allen Tai  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] March 4th Meeting: Delisting 620 Central Ave.

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,

I am writing in reference to the request to delist buildings at 620 Central Ave., a former USDA office, from the Historical Buildings Study List that was created in 1978.

In the mid 2000's, the bulk of these S category buildings were torn down. At that time, nobody protested nor did HAB take any action. In fact, the state office of historical preservation determined then that the site is not suitable for inclusion on the HBS list. Based on both counts, the buildings at 620 Central Ave. should absolutely be delisted, as previously decided.

As a resident who lives on the west end in close proximity of 620 Central Ave., I walk to Crab Cove with my kids frequently. I can assure you there is nothing noteworthy or remarkable about the structures. Please accept staff recommendations and delist this property.

Sincerely,  
Kristin Welch

---

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC/Biggs does not have standing for the property as a leasee. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you.

Lis Cox

516 Taylor Ave.  
Alameda, CA  
94501  
510-701-7669



---

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

At your March 4th meeting, you will be hearing a request to delist buildings at 620 Central, which used to be a USDA office, from the historical buildings study list. I am asking the Board to please accept city staff recommendations to delist these buildings.

You will hear from individuals who insist that these buildings hold historical significance and should be preserved to honor our military history. Yet, just two years ago during Alameda's 2019 special election, some of these very same individuals were demanding that these buildings be razed down to make way for a park or an auxiliary parking lot. Now, these same individuals want to drape themselves in the American flag and claim that preserving the buildings would be a tribute to veterans who served in our armed forces. Well, there are roughly 70,000 veterans in America who are currently experiencing homelessness tonight. I believe a way to honor their service is not by farcically propping up derelict buildings that have become an eyesore, but by breathing new life into the land and providing critical services for medically frail homeless seniors – including veterans.

I ask that you please accept staff recommendations and delist this property. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Thanks,

Jason Biggs  
Alameda Resident

---

**From:** Kevin D Peterson [mailto:kevin.d.peterson@mlcampbell.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 4:37 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC does not have standing for the property. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you.

Kevin D Peterson

3349 Fernside Blvd.  
Alameda, CA 94501  
C (510) 915-3901  
F (216) 830-5257  
[kevin.d.peterson@mlcampbell.com](mailto:kevin.d.peterson@mlcampbell.com)

---

**From:** Conchita Perales [mailto:conchita@eyeline.tv]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 8:41 AM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>  
**Cc:** City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at [620 McKay Ave.](#) from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify Mr. Biggs proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project.

Alameda Point Cooperative does not have standing for the property. The property is deeded to the Federal Government and pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. As you know, the property served as army training barracks in the 1940s, one of the very few remaining buildings of this type in the Bay Area.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can't endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Conchita Perales  
Alameda Resident and  
AAPS Board Member  
(Alameda Architectural Preservation Society)

---

**From:** MARGARET HALL <mdphall@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 9:34 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 620 McKay Avenue

Hello HAB,

First of all, thank you for volunteering for the Historical Advisory Board, your work is very important and appreciated.

Please do not take 620 McKay Ave off the Historical Study List, it will certainly be demolished!

As a third generation Alamedan, I grew up knowing the military significance of that property during the early 1940's. My Father was a Naval Officer in World War II and my grandfather was a Army Pilot in World War I. It is important to have past reminders of our honorable service. We, the voters, were led to believe the Wellness Center would re-purpose the property, but I believe we have been hoodwinked.

Furthermore, I understand there is a court action for attempting to skirt CEQA mandates. What kind of organization would try to avoid adhering to environmental laws? Aren't those laws for the benefit of humankind ? Crab Cove is a treasure for all of us, please keep the property on the Historical Advisory Study List!

Thank you,  
Margaret Hall

---

**From:** Jenny Sui <jennysui@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:33 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] APC/ Wellness Center - Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

It was recently brought to my attention that Alameda Point Collaborative has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant is not the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.

Thank you,

Jenny Sui



March 4, 2021

(By electronic transmission)  
Historical Advisory Board  
City of Alameda  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue  
Alameda, CA 94501

**Subject: Proposed delisting of 620 Central Avenue (originally the U.S. Maritime Officers Training School) from the Historic Building Study List (HBSL) - - (Item 7-A on Historical Advisory Board's March 4, 2021 Agenda)**

Dear Boardmembers:

The staff report is recommending approval of this delisting based primarily on a 2003 determination by the State Office Of Historic Preservation that the subject property is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places because it has lost its historic integrity and sense of association. The 2003 determination was primarily based on demolition of many of the important buildings that once constituted the complex during its period of significance associated with World War II and beginning with its 1942 construction when it served as the Maritime Officers Training School.

However, eligibility for the Historic Building Study List (HBSL) is not dependent upon National Register eligibility. HBSL properties can also be listed based on local significance. In addition, the materials included with the staff report do not provide information that is necessary to determine whether the property meets the HBSL criteria, including the significance of the surviving buildings with regard to the Maritime Officers Training School and the level of significance of the buildings proposed to be demolished.

Related to this, there appears to be extensive additional documentation of the significance of the complex, including a 1996 report from historic preservation consultants Page and Turnbull apparently supporting determination of eligibility for the National Register as well as a 1996 historic building preservation plan prepared by Page and Turnbull. The Alameda Point Collaborative has also recently located original plans and other documents that, among other things, show the complex's original layout and lists of the original buildings and their functions.

The Page and Turnbull reports were attached to the 2003 letter from Arthur Layne to the State Historic Preservation Officer included in the HAB packet, but for some reason the Page and Turnbull reports were not included in the packet.

In addition, the 2018 research by First Carbon Solutions and incorporated into the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Alameda Point Collaborative McKay Wellness Center project is flawed because it only evaluated the property according to the National Register criteria rather than the HBSL criteria.

Also, since the 1996 Page and Turnbull reports are 25 years old, even if they can be procured their analysis will need to be updated to reflect significant demolition of Maritime Officers Training School buildings since 1996 and the increased scarcity of World War II era complexes of this type since 1996.

**The Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) therefore recommends that the HAB defer its consideration of the proposed delisting until adequate documentation is made available to allow the HAB to make its decision on the proposed delisting.**

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

Sincerely,

Christopher Buckley, Chair  
Preservation Action Committee  
Alameda Architectural Preservation Society

By electronic transmission:

cc: Allen Tai and Andrew Thomas - - Planning, Building and Transportation Department  
Mayor and Councilmembers  
AAPS Board and Preservation Action Committee



---

**From:** Kris Motola [mailto:krismotola@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:42 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] De-Listing of 620 Central

Members:

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Alameda that objects to the proposal before you that property at 620 Central be de-listed from the Historical Board Study for several reasons.

My understanding is that the proper process has not been followed and that the move to de-list the property must first go before the Historical Advisory Board before going to Design Review. That was not done in this case. While it might seem a technicality, the rules are there for a reason and must be adhered to.

Another cause for rejection is that the applicant is not even the owner of a property as required by the Alameda Municipal Code. That alone should end the discussion.

If that weren't enough, the California Register of Historical Resources requires any survey over five years old to be updated. The applicant submitted a survey letter almost 20 years old without any update (and from the GSA not the State of California).

As to the property, I believe that it satisfied all criteria for Historical Designation Status - it is a reminder of the role Alameda played in our country's victory in WWII. With so much of our naval history being erased we need to maintain as many relevant monuments to contributions Alameda made to the state and the country.

Additionally, this project was rushed through in a pandemic when peoples' attention were justifiable on other pressing matters.

I am writing to respectfully request that you reject the application to de-list the property at 620 Central from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

Thank you,  
Kris Motola

---

**From:** Stephen Yslas [mailto:s17.premier@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:59 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Historical Advisory Board re: Wellness Center plan

Good afternoon,

In regards to the meeting tonight, I'd like to send in my thoughts as I may not be able to attend:

I object to the proposal for the Federal Property at 620 Central Ave. to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

- APC is not eligible to apply for delisting the property at 620 McKay Ave as a lessor under the following;

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b). Procedure for designation of historical monuments.** *Consider the property of an owner who feels his/her property should be designed or undesignated a Historical Monument and who requests that the Board study his/her property and who submits supporting documentation with the request.*

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.3 (c). Duties of the Historical Advisory Board** *Review the historical building study list pursuant to criteria and procedures which shall be developed and adopted by the Board, and subject to the prior notification of the property owner. Any such revisions shall also be filed with the City Clerk.*

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.5 (b) (8). Procedure for preservation of historical and cultural monuments.** *Notice of hearing before the historical advisory Board shall be given by postal card or letter mailed to owners, as shown on the latest assessment role, of all properties within 300 feet of the subject property.*

- APC's historical evaluation is non-compliant. The evaluation is required to be initiated by a State historian submitted within 5 years. The submitted letter is from 2003, and it was initiated by the GSA, not the State;

**California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter 11.5; Section 4853 (3)).** "If the results of the survey are five or more years old at the time of nomination, the documentation for a resource, or resources, must be updated prior to nomination to ensure the accuracy of the information. The statute creating the California Register requires surveys over five (5) years old to be updated.

- The Criteria for Historical Designation Status is VALID under the following;

**"Historical Significance: a property that comes from an association with the lives of persons or important events which have made a significant contribution to the community, state, political, economic, or industrial history; or the urban development of Alameda."** There has been no change to invalidate this designation.

--The property is a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army and officer training center in the 1940's. Our Alameda military history is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

--Similar buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco reflect this important era in our history and have been preserved for future generations as a visual reminder of the design, functionality and services they once provided.

•The mention in the Staff Report of the CEQA exemption is null and void under the following and supported by Case Laws;

<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/52/896.html>

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption **shall not be used** for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.(emphasis added)

**Case Laws Noted:** Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; References: Sections 21084 and 21084.1, Public Resources Code; *Wildlife Alive v. Chickering* (1977) 18 Cal.3d 190; *League for Protection of Oakland's Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896; *Citizens for Responsible Development in West Hollywood v. City of West Hollywood* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 925; *City of Pasadena v. State of California* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 810; *Association for the Protection etc. Values v. City of Ukiah* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 720; and *Baird v. County of Contra Costa* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1464

•The Applicant proceeded to Design Review before going first to the Historical Advisory Board for approval, which is in non-compliance with the procedure; **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b).**

--The property is currently under litigation for not adhering to the CEQA mandate. Clearly, the request to be removed from the Historical Advisory Board Study List is an attempt to work around this pending litigation and avoid due diligence and State Law: CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b); Proposals for legislation to be enacted by the State Legislature.

**--Please reject the petition to delist the property at 620 McKay Ave from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.**

Respectfully,

Steve

--

---

**From:** Carme001 [mailto:carmereid@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 2:14 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Ritta, Theresa (OS/ASA/PSC/RLO) <Theresa.Ritta@psc.hhs.gov>; Rhonda.Rance@gsa.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Historical Advisory Board Meeting 3/4/21 RE: HUD #54201630019

Dear Ms Ritta, Ms Rance and City Clerk,

Re:  
Alameda Federal Center Northern Parcel at  
620 Central Ave. Alameda, CA 94501  
GSA Control No 9-G-CA-1604-AD  
HUD #54201630019

This serves to notice the GSA and HHS of the pending Alameda Historical Advisory Board Meeting Agenda Item 7A related to 620 McKay Ave.

Please add the following to the correspondence for tonight's Historical Advisory Board meeting.  
Thank you.  
Carmen Reid

**Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,**

**I urge you to reject the application for 620 McKay Ave to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List under the following problematic findings:**

**Historical Delisting Procedures:**

1. APC/Biggs is not entitled to apply for delisting. According to the following Alameda Municipal Codes only the property owner is identified as the noticed party .
  - a. **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.3 (c). Duties of the Historical Advisory Board** Review the historical building study list pursuant to criteria and procedures which shall be developed and adopted by the Board, and subject to the prior notification of the ***property owner***. Any such revisions shall also be filed with the City Clerk. (emphasis added)

- b. **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b). Procedure for designation of historical monuments.** Consider the property of an **owner** who feels his/her property should be designed or undesignated a Historical Monument and who requests that the Board study his/her property and who submits supporting documentation with the request. (emphasis added)
- c. **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.5 (b) (8). Procedure for preservation of historical and cultural monuments.** Notice of hearing before the historical advisory Board shall be given by postal card or letter mailed to **owners**, as shown on the latest assessment role, of all properties within 300 feet of the subject property. (emphasis added)

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the California Register criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts to historical resources (PRC Section 21084.1, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(3)).

**Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 §15064.5**

**(a)** For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

**(1)** A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

**(2)** A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the California Register and are presumed to be significant resources for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (PRC § 5024.1, 14 CCR § 4850).

Categorical exemptions are identified by the State Resources Agency and are defined in the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15300-15331). Unlike statutory exemptions, categorical exemptions are not allowed to be used for projects that

may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource (14 CCR Section 15300.2(f)).

**Procedure for Listing and Delisting follows a similar process under California Register of Historical Resources:**

2. APC/Biggs historical evaluation is non-compliant; it requires an evaluation within 5 years (the submitted letter is from 2003, ie: 18 years old).

a. **California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter 11.5; Section 4853 (3)).** “If the results of the survey are five or more years old at the time of nomination, the documentation for a resource, or resources, must be updated prior to nomination to ensure the accuracy of the information. The statute creating the California Register requires surveys over five (5) years old to be updated.

b. The letter from the GSA is from a Federal agency, which is also not compliant with the process that requires the initiation of the process from a State evaluator (not vice versa). The designation for approval is mandated under this State Law.

c. **California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter 11.5; Section 4856;** Criteria and Procedures for Removal of an Historical Resource from the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources are formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the California Register on the basis of an evaluation of the historical data by qualified professionals. The Commission may, at its discretion, consider a request for formal de-listing after a public hearing has taken place.

**Note:**

(a) The Commission may remove an historical resource from the California Register if one of the following criteria is satisfied:

- (1) The historical resource, through demolition, alteration, or loss of integrity has lost its historic qualities or potential to yield information; or
- (2) New information or analysis shows that the historical resource was not eligible ***at the time of its listing (emphasis added)***. This does not meet eligibility for 620 McKay Ave. to be delisted as at the time of its Listing, the property was duly recognized by the establishment of the Historical Advisory Board and 100 volunteers who created the initial list in 1978. In order to evaluate the integrity of historic qualities or potential yield, the evaluation must be initiated by a State historian within the last (5) five years.

(c) The Office shall notify the resource owners, the local government in which the historical resource is located, the general public, and the individual, organization, or government authority which made the original nomination at least sixty (60) calendar days prior to the date scheduled for the public hearing. **Note:** This process was not satisfied.

**Criteria for Historical Designation Status on Historical Advisory Board Study List is Valid:**

1. The property at 620 McKay Ave was placed on the Historical Advisory Board Study List in 1978 and falls under the Alameda Historical Advisory Board Criteria stated as:  
**“Historical Significance: a property that comes from an association with the lives of persons or important events which have made a significant contribution to the community, state, political, economic, or industrial history; or the urban development of Alameda.”** There has been no change to invalidate this designation.
2. The property is a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army and officer training center in the 1940's. Our Alameda military history is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership and we should seek to preserve this heritage.
3. Similar buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco reflect this important era in our history and have been preserved for future generations as a visual reminder of the design, functionality and services they once provided.
4. The following Case Laws support this evidence that using the CEQA exemption is thereby null and void;  
<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/52/896.html>

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption **shall not be used** for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.(emphasis added)

**Note:** Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; References: Sections 21084 and 21084.1, Public Resources Code; *Wildlife Alive v. Chickering* (1977) 18 Cal.3d 190; *League for Protection of Oakland's Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896; *Citizens for Responsible Development in West Hollywood v. City of West Hollywood* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 925; *City of Pasadena v. State of California* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 810; *Association for the Protection etc. Values v. City of Ukiah* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 720; and *Baird v. County of Contra Costa* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1464

5. The Historical Advisory Board should consider adopting the recommendations in the Case Law, *League for Protection of Oakland's Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896, by proposing mitigation measures similar to; (1) preparation of an "historic resources documentation report" to provide historic material for City archives; (2) a historical building survey to "further document this historic structure"; (3) design of the proposed center to "reflect elements of the building's original architecture"; (4) display on the site of a plaque or marker commemorating the **[52 Cal. App. 4th 902]** buildings; and (5) consultation with a qualified archeologist to monitor excavation for discovery of any possible cultural resources.

**The Applicant has other problematic property-related non-compliance issues:**

1. The Property is currently Zoned Administrative-Professional which does not allow for APC's proposed services as Permanent Supportive Housing.
2. While **Convalescent Home** is allowed under the purview of medical facility; this presumes that residents would require licensed/skilled nursing care to adequately address their needs.

**Note:** According to the California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform: "In addition to being licensed, nursing homes that choose to participate in the Medicare and Medi-Cal programs must be certified by the federal government in order to qualify for payments from these programs. Federally certified facilities must meet federal standards as well as the California requirements."

3. Furthermore, if the intent of the proposal by APC is to house the most "medically complex and psychiatric patients" as stated in their official application to the GSA and HHS, this assumes the residents would need licensed/skilled nursing care to adequately address their needs under the licensure mandates of the California Department of Public Health.
4. If the Applicant is stating to serve a medically vulnerable population, then this licensure under the California Department of Public Health designation should be indicated at all levels of compliance to ensure that the public has been duly advised that the Applicant does not seek to demolish the existing historic buildings and proceed with an alternate plan to not only increase the size and scope of the proposed facility, but provide a lesser level of service than advertised in their campaign efforts and election materials.
5. The Applicant proceeded to Design Review before going first to the Historical Advisory Board for approval, which is in non-compliance with the procedure; **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b)**.
  - a. The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149 facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. Per **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b)** proposed modifications to a "S" designated building needs to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, The City of Alameda Planning Department and/or staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council cannot endorse the Planning Department decision to approve APC Design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered in 2018.
  - b. As a result, the Historical Advisory Board process includes an evaluation component under CEQA mandates for properties listed on the Historical Advisory Board Study List. (See previous section and reference to Staff report that using CEQA exemption is null and void).
  - c. The property is currently under litigation for not adhering to the CEQA mandate. Clearly, the request to be removed from the Historical Advisory Board Study List is an attempt to work around this pending litigation and avoid due diligence and State Law. **Note:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b); Proposals for legislation to be enacted by the State Legislature.



In summary, the listing/delisting procedure is the same process, requiring a current evaluation within five (5) years by a State historian (PhD) specialized in reviewing the historical significance of said properties. A CEQA determination is not relevant in the process for determining whether or not a property qualifies to be listed/delisted. Furthermore, the Staff report should be dismissed as State Law applies to us locally, and the evaluation for a determination of a property to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board is to be made by qualified professionals on the Historical Advisory Board, not City staff, and only after a public hearing has taken place. The Applicant has also not met the requirements set forth in the municipal and State code sections. Consequently, the petition should be null and void.

Based on the totality of this evidence, I respectfully request advisory board members to reject the Applicant's request to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

Respectfully,  
Carmen Reid  
Alameda resident

---

**From:** David Diaz [mailto:davidjavierdiaz@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 2:18 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Historical Advisory Board re: Wellness Center plans

Dear City Officials,

As a resident of Alameda who has recently followed all of the rules and protocol to apply for permits appropriately, I find it unacceptable that this applicant proceeded to Design Review before going first to the Historical Advisory Board for approval, which is in non-compliance with the procedure;

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b).**

I object to the proposal for the Federal Property at 620 Central Ave. to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List for the reasons listed below:

The property is a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army and officer training center in the 1940's. Our Alameda military history is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

Similar buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco reflect this important era in our history and have been preserved for future generations as a visual reminder of the design, functionality and services they once provided.

Please reject the petition to delist the property at 620 McKay Ave from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

Thank you,

David Diaz  
516 Central Ave.  
Alameda, CA 94501

(917)453-9836

---

**From:** Helen Simpson [mailto:HSimpson@MPBF.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:23 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Historical Advisory Board Meeting - March 4, 2021 - 7:00 p.m.

I object to the proposal for the Federal Property at 620 Central Ave. to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

•APC is not eligible to apply for delisting the property at 620 McKay Ave as a lessor under the following;  
**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b). Procedure for designation of historical monuments.** *Consider the property of an owner who feels his/her property should be designed or undesignated a Historical Monument and who requests that the Board study his/her property and who submits supporting documentation with the request.*

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.3 (c). Duties of the Historical Advisory Board** *Review the historical building study list pursuant to criteria and procedures which shall be developed and adopted by the Board, and subject to the prior notification of the property owner. Any such revisions shall also be filed with the City Clerk.*

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.5 (b) (8). Procedure for preservation of historical and cultural monuments.** *Notice of hearing before the historical advisory Board shall be given by postal card or letter mailed to owners, as shown on the latest assessment role, of all properties within 300 feet of the subject property.*

•APC's historical evaluation is non-compliant. The evaluation is required to be initiated by a State historian submitted within 5 years. The submitted letter is from 2003, and it was initiated by the GSA, not the State;  
**California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter 11.5; Section 4853 (3)).** "If the results of the survey are five or more years old at the time of nomination, the documentation for a resource, or resources, must be updated prior to nomination to ensure the accuracy of the information. The statute creating the California Register requires surveys over five (5) years old to be updated.

•The Criteria for Historical Designation Status is VALID under the following;  
**"Historical Significance: a property that comes from an association with the lives of persons or important events which have made a significant contribution to the community, state, political, economic, or industrial history; or the urban development of Alameda."** There has been no change to invalidate this designation.

--The property is a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army and officer training center in the 1940's. Our Alameda military history is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

--Similar buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco reflect this important era in our history and have been preserved for future generations as a visual reminder of the design, functionality and services they once provided.

- The mention in the Staff Report of the CEQA exemption is null and void under the following and supported by Case Laws;

<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/52/896.html>

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption **shall not be used** for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.(emphasis added)

**Case Laws Noted:** Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; References: Sections 21084 and 21084.1, Public Resources Code; *Wildlife Alive v. Chickering* (1977) 18 Cal.3d 190; *League for Protection of Oakland's Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896; *Citizens for Responsible Development in West Hollywood v. City of West Hollywood* (1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 925; *City of Pasadena v. State of California* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 810; *Association for the Protection etc. Values v. City of Ukiah* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 720; and *Baird v. County of Contra Costa* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1464

- The Applicant proceeded to Design Review before going first to the Historical Advisory Board for approval, which is in non-compliance with the procedure; **Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b).**

--The property is currently under litigation for not adhering to the CEQA mandate. Clearly, the request to be removed from the Historical Advisory Board Study List is an attempt to work around this pending litigation and avoid due diligence and State Law: CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b); Proposals for legislation to be enacted by the State Legislature.

--Please reject the petition to delist the property at 620 McKay Ave from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Helen Simpson  
Resident of Alameda

---

**From:** Carme001 [mailto:carmereid@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 4:09 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Historical Advisory Board Meeting 3/4/21

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,  
Addendum: Item 7A

The staff report references an environmental assessment performed in 2018 by First Carbon Solutions which has significant flaws. The assessment states, "...it would not induce population growth, as the project **would not draw new residents from outside Alameda.**" As a result, the report states "low traffic trip generation characteristics," which is an invalid analysis based on the Applicant's submitted proposal and subsequent public presentations, that ALL patients visiting the respite center (50 beds) and the medical clinic (10 exam rooms) would be brought by ambulance or other transportation transferred or referred by hospitals within the County.

The report should not be included as any evidence upon making a decision regarding delisting the property at 620 McKay Ave from the Historical Advisory Board Study List .I respectfully ask that the property maintain its status on the "S" list.

Best,  
Carmen Reid  
Alameda Resident

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Alexandra Petrich <apetrich@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 3:55 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai; City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 7-A, / PLN 20-0431, Historical Advisory Board meeting 3/4/01

To the members of the Historical Advisory Board --

I am an Alameda resident, homeowner, and taxpayer. I am writing about the proposal by Alameda Point Collaborative ("APC") and Doug Biggs to delist the Federal Property located at 620 McKay Avenue (site of planned Wellness Center) from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This proposal is unlawful and ill-advised.

First, APC is not eligible to seek delisting of the property at McKay Avenue. The property is listed as a HUD property. APC is the lessor; it is not the owner. Thus, APC does not have standing to seek delisting of the property.

Second, the the property is currently in litigation regarding the issue of whether the proponents of the project failed to adhere to State mandates (under CEQA) for environmental review. This request by APC is an attempt to evade this pending litigation.

Third, removing the property from the study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope of the project. The property should remain on the HAB study list, as it has historical significance. It was a Maritime Officers School from 1942-1947, and then served as a Maritime Training Station from 1947-1957. Our military history in Alameda serves as a reminder of those who faithfully served our country, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

I urge the Historical Advisory Board to uphold the current status of the property, and keep it on the Study List at this time.

Very truly yours, Alexandra Petrich

## SAVE ALAMEDA

875A Island Drive, Suite 135, Alameda, CA 94502

04 March 2021

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,

We respectfully request that you reject this request to de-list the Alameda Federal Center at 620 Central Avenue from the Historical Building Study List for multiple reasons.

Through Alameda Point Collaborative (APC), the City of Alameda is attempting to use this procedure of de-listing the property from the Historical Building Study List in an attempt to circumvent its liability and culpability in ongoing litigation in the Alameda County Superior Court. One of the multiple issues before the court is whether APC and the City of Alameda Planning Department, through the Planning Departments Director, why they failed to go before the Historical Advisory Board when planning significant changes to the structures at 620 Central Avenue while at the same time, that facility is listed on the Historical Building Study List with an "S" designation. In the litigation.

Our objections were made during the Design Review, and these objections have brought us to litigation, including the issue of equal protection. We certainly don't object to what Alameda Citizens voted for at this location; what we object to is how the City of Alameda with APC in this project is not held to the same standard of law like everyone else. We have found no statute, no law, or any wording of any kind that exempts the City of Alameda through APC and 620 Central Avenue from being held to the same standard of law as everyone else in Alameda. We cannot locate any special privileges for the City of Alameda, APC, or the City of Alameda Planning Director that have been granted regarding 620 Central Avenue, especially for not applying the law equally.

I would respectfully ask the Historical Advisory Board to look at the design review package submitted to the City of Alameda by APC for 620 Central Avenue. It includes removing all the siding on the building, removing, replacing all the windows, and enclosing the staircases in the building in direct violation of AMC 13-21.5 for the Procedure for Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments. The definition in the AMC of alteration is listed below from AMC 13-21.2

"Alteration shall mean any addition, or exterior modification, improvement, repair, or replacement of character defining elements, which alter or change the original materials or appearance of a historical resource, including but not limited to, massing, roof forms, porches, finish materials, windows, and decorative details. The addition and alteration of awnings and signs, excluding historically designated signs, or interior modifications, improvements and repairs are not included in this definition."

The Historical Advisory Board should look at The Design Review of 620 Central Avenue that APC submitted, showing the construction of 99 housing units at 620 Central, which is counter to Alameda City law & Alameda City zoning ordinances and violates the Historical Building codes in the City of Alameda.



The application for de-listing the structure violates California State Law

California Code of Regulations  
California Register of Historical Resources  
(Title 14, Chapter 11.5)

4856. Criteria and Procedures for Removal of an Historical Resource from the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources are formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the California Register on the basis of an evaluation of the historical data by qualified professionals. The Commission may, at its discretion, consider a request for formal de-listing after a public hearing has taken place.

(a) The Commission may remove an historical resource from the California Register if one of the following criteria is satisfied:

- (1) The historical resource, through demolition, alteration, or loss of integrity has lost its historic qualities or potential to yield information; or
- (2) New information or analysis shows that the historical resource was not eligible at the time of its listing.

Under statute 4856, there has been no new information or new analysis that shows that the historical resource was not eligible at the time of its listing. Nor that significant construction or deconstruction since its placement on the historical building study list would remove its historical value. Under California law, 620 Central Ave. is considered a Historical Resource as the site is listed on the Alameda Historical Building Study List. Thus, the Historical Advisory Board must follow the California Register of Historical Resources Code of Regulations. In this particular case, the City of Alameda has not followed statute 4856 listed above for properly de-listing a Historical Resource from the Alameda Historical Building Study List.

The letter presented by APC from the State of California Office of Historic Preservation(OPH) is not valid for several reasons.

- (1) The letter is over 18 years old and not within the five-year parameter outlined in the California Historical Resources Code of Regulations, and the letter was from the wrong agency.
- (2) The property in question is Federal. Under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Section 106, Federal Agencies must take into account the effects of the undertakings on historic properties and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) with a reasonable opportunity to comment. Even though the Federal Agencies must consult with the State Historic Preservation Office, the state preservation office does not have the final say.



The de-listing can only be done based on evaluating the historical data by qualified professionals as outlined in 4856. That means that the City Planner, City Attorney, or other staff members of the City of Alameda cannot make this decision to de-list 620 Central Avenue as they have shown in this matter. Please remember only qualified professionals who were members of the City of Alameda Historical Advisory Board were able to place 620 Central Avenue on the Historical Building Study List. The Historical Advisory Board was the one who put 620 Central Avenue on the Historical Building Study List, making it a Historical Resources in the City of Alameda as set out in California Law. OPH did not make this decision, and they were not the proper agency for GAS to turn to first; it was the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Alameda placed it on the list, not anyone from OPH or ACHP.

#### **CEQA**

As to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), The exemption cited by the Draft Resolution prepared by the City Attorney is not supported by law and is defective. Section 15061(b)(3) exemption is a categorical exemption and cannot be used in this instance. Categorical exemptions are not allowed to be used for projects that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (14 CCR Section 15300.2(f).

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the California Register and are presumed to be significant resources for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (PRC § 5024.1, 14 CCR § 4850).

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the California Register criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts to historical resources (PRC Section 21084.1, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(3). We have not seen this for 620 Central Avenue.

Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15064.5

**(a)** For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

**(1)** A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

**(2)** A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.



(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or maybe likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

(b) A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

(1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

(2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when project:

(A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or



(B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

The City of Alameda, through APC, has not met the requirements as outlined in the statutes. The CEQA exemption does not apply, and the de-listing process has not been followed as set forth by state law.

I again respectfully ask the Historical Advisory Board to reject this de-listing application from the Historical Building Study List as they were caught breaking the law. They are trying to find a way out of the litigation by using the Historical Advisory Board.

You have to ask why they did not want to go before the Board, just like everyone else? APC and the City of Alameda somehow don't feel that the law applies to them as it applies to the rest of us in the City of Alameda.

If the Board grants this application for de-listing, you are setting a bad precedent going forward, especially for all owners of property who tenants who don't want to follow the law.

Based on the law and the information above, we ask that you not de-list 620 Central Avenue from the Historical Building Study List.

On behalf of the loosely associated group of citizens of Alameda, know as Save Alameda, we humbly ask that you follow the law and only allow you, the qualified professionals of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board, to make these types of decisions, not city staffers with political agendas that are inconsistent with the needs and desires of the entire population of the City of Alameda.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Healy, JD", with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

John Healy, JD

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Dan Tuazon <d2wazon@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 6:39 PM  
**To:** Allen Tai  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 620 McKay Ave.

Dear,  
Alvin Lau, Thomas Saxby, Lynn Jones, Norman Sanchez, Jenn Witt

I understand that APC/Wellness Center is attempting to de-list 620 McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board Study list. However, this property truly played a history role for Alameda and our country. The demolition of these historical and classic buildings would seem to be in contradiction to the goals and objectives of the Historical Advisory Board to preserve physical reminders of Alameda's history and heritage.

Since APC/Wellness Center is a tenant of the property, they must follow and comply with the rules and obligations towards preserving our history. There are many examples in our National, State and Regional areas where historical places were preserved and a value to our citizens.

Alameda has a strong Military history and I for one came from a Military family. So please retain 620 McKay Avenue on the Study List. And see what we can do to comply with CEQA and the Historical Review Board, and take the steps to finish the study of this valuable Alameda property.

Best Regards and Respectfully,

Dan Tuazon  
60 year resident of Alameda.

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Ryan LaLonde <rlalonde3@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 5, 2021 6:58 AM  
**To:** Allen Tai  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Letter for Tonight's Meeting - Thank you for forwarding to the board

Good morning HAB,

I know that last night you all continued the decision to d-list the property site on McKay and Central Ave in order to tour the site and get more documentation. I watched last night the majority of your meeting. I understand the concern for more information. I did want to make a few observations and ask a few questions that may aid in your decision-making process.

1. What part of a site qualifies for your oversight when it is listed? In the 1978 listing of the site – it was not in reference to one building – it was the whole site. Do you oversee the preservation of the land too?
2. The listing of the property as the city staff showed in its presentation is an “S”. I understood that designation was in reference to the potential that the State would designate the preservation of the site. As presented – the State has stated there is no significance for them. But last night – the board kept referring the “H” local historic value of the site. This would be creating a new designation for the property and that was not the task on hand. The HAB needed to see if met the “S” qualifications to be on the list. I am concerned that you all might have moved it to a new category of preservation in your decision-making process and thus pushed the threshold standards in a new designation area.
3. According to city staff – many of the properties on the 1978 study listing have been demolished – and need to be removed from the list. The HAB definition of demolished is removal of 30% of the structures or building? Wouldn't the Central Ave property have been among those that were considered demolished – since the government removed more than 30% of the structures already from when listed in the 1970's?
4. Or if the 30% in reference to current site and not the status in the 1970's – would the demolishing of the building 2 NOT qualify as a demolish based on the fact that the buildings make up less than 30% of the full site?
5. And most importantly - given that anyone can request the delisting of a property – could I request that the HAB formally remove from the 1978 list any property that have been demolished (30% of structure(s) removed). Or does each property need to be a separate vote?

I look forward to hearing the answers to these questions

Ryan LaLonde  
2945 Marina Drive

On Thursday, March 4, 2021, 8:13:33 AM CST, Ryan LaLonde <rlalonde3@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Historical Advisory Board,

Thank you for the time you dedicate to the mission of working for what is best for the welfare of the city by protecting and preserving landmarks and structures that are reminders of the positive history of Alameda. We have evolved into the one of the most wonderful towns I have ever lived in. I grew up on a farm in rural Michigan and what I love about Alameda is that it has that same small-town feel – but with diversity and a celebration of what makes us unique. The other piece of Alameda that makes my multi-racial, same sex-headed family feel the most welcome is the work that many do to help those who are the most vulnerable and in need.

I have been seeing an ugly faction of folks online in Alameda that seem to want to continue to fight against helping our most at-risk populations. Two years ago, members of the community rallied against a facility that would help our areas unhoused seniors with major health concerns. In my time volunteering at Food Shift at the Alameda Point Collaborative, I would see the long lines of mostly senior citizens waiting across the street for the Food Bank to open. I would see many of the same people getting the pre-made meals we prepared at centers in Oakland. It is hard to believe that people would fight against helping them.

But that is exactly what a contingent of people are trying to do in writing you and speaking out in opposition of delisting 620 Central – which was an old USDA office. Normally, the function and use of the building is not the main focus of your preservation concerns – but that is their exact motivation.

During your March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting it has been recommended that you delist the property. Other buildings like in have been delisted. And I saw that the State Office of Historic Preservation determined that the site is not eligible for inclusion. I would listen to their sound advice.

Much of the opposition you will hear on March 4<sup>th</sup> are the same people who have previously called for the property to be demolished and used as parks – don't be fooled by their attempt to be concerned now. Given that this is my first time weighing in on your work – this may sound like I too am attempting to sway you from your mission – but this property offers no alignment with your mission – in fact – what is to come of the property does – to promote the educational, cultural, and economic welfare of the City. Please accept staff recommendations, and delist these properties.

Ryan LaLonde  
2945 Marina Drive, Alameda

---

**Subject:**

[EXTERNAL] March 4 Meeting, Agenda Item 7-A

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

I am writing to oppose the petition to delist the property at 620 McKay Ave from the Historical Advisory Board (HAB) Study List. The property has historical significance to many of us here in Alameda and serves as an important reminder of the role this city played throughout WWII era. Alameda Point Collaborative (APC) promised to restore and recondition the existing barracks to house veterans and seniors, to essentially refurbish the buildings for a related cause, housing.

I believe that delisting the property right now is an attempt by APC to circumvent the reviews mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (litigation is pending) and, more importantly, to pave the way for the eventual demolition of these buildings.

Please don't let that happen. Watching so much of Alameda's military and maritime past be demolished rather than repurposed saddens me. Weaving the past into the present is what creates this city's unique identity and gives it its charm. It's a driver for island tourism, an important part of the economy here! Alameda becomes one more BigBox/Applebees stop along highway 880 otherwise. The restoration of Alameda High School has been a joy to see and I hope to see the same sort of thing done with the Federal structures at 620 McKay. Please hold Mr Biggs accountable to his promises so that the project is a Win-Win for everyone.

Sincerely,

Therese Hall

---

**Subject:**

[EXTERNAL] Homeless Facility

Alvin Lau  
Thomas Saxby  
Lynn Jones  
Norman Sanchez  
Jenn Witt

**Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431**

Dear Historical Advisory Board Members,

It was recently brought to my attention that Alameda Point Collaborative has submitted an application to delist the Federal property at McKay Avenue from the Historical Advisory Board. The property is currently being litigated for not adhering to State CEQA environmental mandates. This attempt to remove the property from the historical study list is motivated by the pending lawsuit.

The applicant is not the property owner, nor has standing to request a modification to be delisted from the Historical Advisory Board Study List.

The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are significantly outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board.

I respectfully object to the property being delisted.

Thank you.

Kathleen Egan  
812 Paru Street  
Alameda, CA 94501



---

**Subject:**

[EXTERNAL] Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

Dear Historical Advisory Board,

Re: Item 7-A/ PLN 20-0431

I am writing to oppose the proposal to delist the Federal property at 620 McKay Ave. from the Historical Advisory Board Study List. This is intended as a work-around to modify his proposed "Wellness Center" project. The voters in Alameda have already expressed concern over his project. APC does not have standing for the property. The property is deeded to the Federal Government. Pending litigation over State CEQA environmental mandates are currently under appeal.

Also, The letters submitted by APC from the GSA are outdated. Both individuals cited in the correspondence are either no longer alive or not currently employed at the stated agency.

Removing it from the HAB study list would allow for demolition and a likely significant increase in overall size and scope. The property should stay on the HAB study list as it represents a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army training barracks in the 1940s one of the very few buildings in existence of this type in the Bay Area. Our military history in Alameda is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership, and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

The entire McKay Avenue parcel for the proposed 149-bed facility for Alameda County's homeless population is on Alameda's Historic Study list with an "S" (Study) designation. According to the Alameda Municipal Code, proposed modifications to a building with an "S" designation need to be first presented to the Historical Review Board. This was never done. Without first having this necessary historic review, the City of Alameda Planning Department and/or its staff had no jurisdiction to approve the design. Therefore, the City Council can not endorse the Planning Department decision to approve the design since the Planning Department did not have jurisdiction when its decision was rendered.

Please keep the Federal property on the Historical Advisory Study List.

Thank you.

John Turner  
Bayport Alameda Resident

---

**Subject:**

[EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 7-A Historical Advisory Board Meeting; Thursday, March 4, 2021, 7pm

Hello,

I am writing to oppose the delisting of the Alameda Federal Buildings addressed at 620 Central Ave.

Preserving historical architecture is part of Alameda's DNA and it has resulted in creating the very unique character of the place we love and the place where we live. As all of you know, historical buildings are valuable unique assets that keep us connected with artisans of the past and to our growth as a community. Their design and materials uplift us and keep us grounded at the same time. I have seen several projects completed by present members off the board that have transformed and rescued building others called blight. We need advocates such as the Historical Advisory Board to protect these assets and deliver these building to future generations for a multitude of future uses.

Take at look at what happens when historical architecture is ignored. The incredibly unique brick Del Monte building is being preserved while the City permitted a completely unconnected Senior Housing building next door. This is what happens when architecture is ignored. Bureaucracies left alone deliver developer profits not design.







The goal is to preserve the architectural asset and recognize it's history as a springboard to develop and restore the space so it has a useful future. Here are some inspirational pictures from this Alameda Federal Buildings that once housed a US Navy Officers Maritime School. One graduate's heroic rescue from a sinking freighter was the cover of a 1943 Collier's magazine.

# Collier's

TEN CENTS

DECEMBER 11, 1943

© THE NEW YORK COLLIERS PUBLISHING COMPANY—PUBLISHED BY THE NEW YORK COLLIERS PUBLISHING COMPANY—PUBLISHED BY THE NEW YORK COLLIERS PUBLISHING COMPANY

MERCHANT MARINE  
DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL







ADMINISTRATION BUILDING—U. S. MARITIME SERVICE OFFICERS'

Also please note these additional reasons to disallow the delisting of the Alameda Federal Buildings.

- Alameda Point Collaborative (APC) is not eligible to apply for delisting the property at 620 McKay Ave as a lessor under the following;

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21-4 (b). Procedure for designation of historical monuments.** Consider the property of an owner who feels his/her property should be designed or undesignated a Historical Monument and who requests that the Board study his/her property and who submits supporting documentation with the request.

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.3 (c). Duties of the Historical Advisory Board** Review the historical building study list pursuant to criteria and procedures which shall be developed and adopted by the Board, and subject to the prior notification of the property owner. Any such revisions shall also be filed with the City Clerk.

**Alameda Municipal Code 13-21.5 (b) (8). Procedure for preservation of historical and cultural monuments.** Notice of hearing before the historical advisory Board shall be given by postal card or letter mailed to owners, as shown on the latest assessment role, of all properties within 300 feet of the subject property.

•APC's historical evaluation is non-compliant. The evaluation is required to be initiated by a State historian submitted within 5 years. The submitted letter is from 2003, and it was initiated by the GSA, not the State; **California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter 11.5; Section 4853 (3).** “If the results of the survey are five or more years old at the time of nomination, the documentation for a resource, or resources, must be updated prior to nomination to ensure the accuracy of the information. The statute creating the California Register requires surveys over five (5) years old to be updated.

•The Criteria for Historical Designation Status is VALID under the following;  
**“Historical Significance: a property that comes from an association with the lives of persons or important events which have made a significant contribution to the community, state, political, economic, or industrial history; or the urban development of Alameda.”** There has been no change to invalidate this designation.

--The property is a visual reminder of the history and heritage of the City of Alameda, consistent with the stated efforts of the Alameda Historical Advisory Board. The property served as army and officer training center in the 1940's. Our Alameda military history is a reminder of those who faithfully served our country through their leadership and we should seek to preserve this heritage.

--Similar buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco reflect this important era in our history and have been preserved for future generations as a visual reminder of the design, functionality and services they once provided.

The goal is to preserve our history through these building and allow whatever future uses they may have. Protection, preservation and renovation of these structures has no connection to any particular cause and should not be seen as an adversary to those goals rather a foundation to all causes that will inhabit them in the next 80 years. Thank you for the important work you're doing as you serve on the Historical Advisory Board.

Mike Van Dine  
Power & Light  
[www.powerlight.net](http://www.powerlight.net)  
510-205-4101