



July 7, 2026

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Vice Mayor Michele Pryor
Councilmember Greg Boller
Councilmember Tony Daysog
Councilmember Tracy Jensen

RE: Special City Council Meeting Agenda Item 3-A CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS - City of Alameda and Neptune Beach Surf Club Development Partners, LLC

Dear Members of the City Council:

Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda (CASA) is a community-wide coalition dedicated to raising awareness, mobilizing community action, and facilitating the implementation of the City's Climate Action and Resiliency Plan and more generally to increase community sustainability and well-being.

We are writing to express our concerns about the surf club proposed for Enterprise Park.

- The project would allocate public lands for a private purpose without a master plan identifying the community need and without a competitive bid process.
- The location of the project is within an area of the shoreline that is vulnerable to sea level rise and may be more appropriate for a nature-based solution.
- Projects of this type require a significant amount of electricity, natural gas, water, chemicals, hardscape, traffic control and other environmental impacts which require significant mitigations.
- There are commercially zoned properties within the vicinity of Enterprise Park that may be more appropriate for this commercial enterprise.

Sincerely,

Ruth Abbe, Steering Committee
Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda

From: [Rick Lewis](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Surf Park agenda
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 11:46:05 AM

Dear City Council members,

I strongly object to this proposal for several reasons;
it does not fit an environmental approach.
it is contrary to the shoreline adaptation plan.
it is not compatible with restoration & preservation of existing habitat.
if it fails as a commercial project no other use/business/expansion could assume the site without extraordinary deconstruction of a 'single-use' facility.
It caters to a very small & targeted portion of the population.
it does not embrace an all inclusive outreach to the general population.

Therefore, please say no to this project.

Thank you, Rick Lewis

Rick Lewis
342 Beach Rd
Alameda, CA
510-295-3073

From: [Tricia W](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose proposed Alameda Surf Park
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 9:09:55 AM

Dear City Council Members,

We were somewhat perplexed and even distressed to see in the Alameda parade the assumption that the surf park is going forward. We are very opposed to this project.

We should not be building on any Alameda shoreline open space.

The City should be focusing on designing a living shoreline levee with expanded tidal habitat along this shoreline. This surf park proposal is at odds with progressive resiliency efforts currently underway around the Bay. The maximum shoreline adaptation plan with a living shoreline levee with trail on top and acres of new tidal habitat will not be possible if this project is built at the location the surf park is proposing. For the living shoreline concept to work, the whole parking area and the spaces for boating groups would have to be reconfigured behind the levee, which would have a roadway over the top for access to the boat ramp. We would also point out that this levee, whether it's a living levee or a levee right up where the trail is currently located, will be continued around the south end of Stargell Field someday. That's what that raggedy strip between Stargell Field and the water is being left for. You can walk there right now.

The City has also not conducted a normal, from-scratch park master planning process in which the community gets to decide what features are going to be in the park. we are two of the many people who wish that area to be a passive serene nature park without commercialization.

We are asking my City Council representatives to decline the surf park proposal.

Sincerely,
Patricia and Ernest Williamson
Alameda resident for 60 years

Sent from my iPad

From: [Deborah Crooks](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Closed Session 3-A Surf Park
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 7:05:12 AM

Dear Council,

I'm writing to express my concern about your consideration of the surf park proposal from Neptune Beach Surf Club, a proposal that is at odds with resiliency efforts currently underway around the Bay such as the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan. The maximum shoreline adaptation plan, including a living shoreline levee with a trail on top and acres of new tidal habitat, will not be possible if this a surf park is built at the location the surf park wants.

On top of this, the City has not conducted a park master planning process according to normal procedure in which the local Alameda community is given an opportunity to choose the features to be included in a park. I, for one, would like to see more priority given to minimizing further commercialization and prioritizing parks that leave room for natural, open space and wildlife habitat.

I'm already concerned to see Alameda's open spaces facing increasing pressure and degradation from development interests; likewise, climate change and sea level rise threaten all who live here. To see the City deciding on something that affects public interests without considering community input or addressing the RSAP (*and* accepting a no-bid contract), is problematic on many levels. Please put this surf park plan on hold and instead conduct a community-at-large master planning process for this shoreline park while continuing to prioritize shoreline resilience.

Sincerely,

Deborah Crooks
1105 Lincoln Ave
Alameda, CA

--

Deborah Crooks words & music
<https://deborahcrooks.com/> | [instagram](#) | [bandcamp](#)

From: [Heather Polley](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Neptune Beach Surf Club closed session is a problem
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 11:58:30 AM

Dear Alameda Council Members,

I have been following the story about the proposed Neptune Beach Surf Club lease on what is now public park and beach lands. I assumed that we as Alameda constituents would eventually have a chance to give our feedback regarding this lease once it was discussed in a public city council meeting. Imagine my disappointment when it came to my attention that this issue would be discussed in closed session, again, like it was last time it came to the council. I do not understand why, with such an important lease, the public wouldn't be allowed to speak and give feedback while the council makes their decision. A lease to Neptune Beach Surf Club would potentially take critical park lands and a beach that currently has public access and put it into the hands of a developer who intends to privatize this land and put it behind a paywall.

West End residents have fewer amenities than other island residents: fewer trees on the streets and fewer parks. The park lands and beach on this site are vital nature corridors not only for Alameda human residents, but also for migratory birds, seals, and other wildlife. This land should not be part of a commercial enterprise. It should be kept open to all and kept as park land.

I oppose the potential lease to Neptune Beach Surf Club, or to any other developer who would privatize these lands. Please give Alamedans a chance to voice our opinions on this lease. Please take our feedback to heart.

Sincerely,
Heather Polley
Alameda resident

Agenda Item 3-A, Closed Session, July 7, 2026

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I write with deep concern. The consent of the governed comes with a presumption of regularity in the conduct of public affairs by those elected. The current process for determining the future of Enterprise Park has been highly irregular.

The surf pool proposal came out of nowhere last year *before* a park specific master planning process was conducted, which is contrary to the City's normal practice. A surf pool facility at this location privatizes a large portion of this public parkland and would preclude the implementation of the city's maximum shoreline adaptation and resiliency plan. A proposal to commercialize part of this park, or any other park at Alameda Point, is at odds with the consensus reached in all of the City's community visioning exercises for parks since the base closed.

Park Master Plan – It has been customary in planning specific parks in Alameda to engage a consultant to facilitate community workshops and synthesize community input into potential design alternatives, which in turn are further refined until a preferred alternative is arrived at. Such a process for Enterprise Park has never been initiated. It was considered by the Recreation and Parks Commission in 2019 when prioritizing park projects, but Enterprise Park came in second to De-Pave Park, planning for which is still ongoing.

Rather than a community-driven design process for Enterprise Park, the current process has been driven by City staff. The announcement on the City's website for the May 17, 2025 pop-up event at Alameda Point to introduce the surf park concept made a presumptuous assertion: "This innovative concept would be a key feature of the future Enterprise Park." With no master planning process underway, it is premature for staff to be promoting one single feature, especially one of this scale and

impact. There are many features that could be key defining features of this park, not the least of which could be a living levee spanning the length of the park.

Starting in 1996, community input on the types of features desired in future Alameda Point parks always favored passive recreation, trails, and habitat conservation. A city staff report on a [previous planning effort](#) for Alameda Point in 2010 and 2011 did not mention any community interest in having commercial businesses in parks. The report determined that, “The parks and open space network originally established in the [Reuse Plan](#), adopted in the [General Plan](#), and then further refined in the [2006 Preliminary Development Concept \(PDC\)](#) open space framework plan is **widely agreed upon**. If trade-offs and compromises are necessary to achieve financial feasibility, there appears to be a general consensus that **passive recreational facilities (e.g., trails, paths, promenades) and habitat conservation areas are a higher priority than active recreational facilities**, new marinas and new ferry terminals.” (Bold added.)

The same themes were reiterated the following year during preparation of a citywide parks assessment with extensive community input. It was called [Urban Greening Plan – Parks Improvement Assessment](#). One of the recommendations was to provide additional passive open space, habitat areas, trails and shoreline access. “**Access to natural open space and trails ranked as the highest priority for most Alameda residents,**” states the assessment. “Partnerships with East Bay Regional Parks District, expansion of Alameda’s trail system and shoreline access, and open space planning for Alameda Point are among the recommended strategies.” (Bold added.)

You can read my report in full by going to my blog <https://alamedapointenviro.com/2025/10/31/city-council-sidesteps-community-planning-process-for-enterprise-park/>

Climate Resiliency Plan – The current proposal to put a surf pool facility in Enterprise Park is antithetical to the city's climate resiliency planning. At last September's Sea Level Rise Planning Fair at the REAP Center, City conceptual drawings for adaptation of the shoreline at Enterprise Park included an alternative of an inland ecotone levee with a tidal terrace extending into the water with a host of marine habitat benefits. The Bay Trail would be on top of the levee. This would be the maximum nature-based solution for shoreline resiliency at that location. Encumbering the eastern end of this park with a surf pool facility would frustrate any attempt at adopting that option.

I urge you to pull the plug on this ill-conceived climate-ignorant plan and return to normalcy. If there is a market for a surf pool in Alameda, there is plenty of commercial land at Alameda Point still on the City's books awaiting transfer into the private sector.

Sincerely,
Richard Bangert
AlamedaPointEnviro.com

From: [Joyce Mercado](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Closed Session 3-A Surf Park
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2026 2:13:20 PM

Hello City Council Members, I'm writing to oppose the surf park as currently designed, as it doesn't fit with nature based sea level rise mitigation options as I understand it. I'd much prefer a nature based berm with a public access trail on top in preparation for sea level rise. Thank you for looking further into the environmental impact of this proposed project.

Sincerely,
Joyce Mercado

NBSC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, LLC

July 2, 2026

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
City of Alameda
Via CITYCOUNCIL-List

Re: July 7 Closed Session Item 3-A, Enterprise Park Surf Pool Negotiations

Dear Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I write on behalf of NBSC Development Partners, LLC (hereinafter, “Neptune Beach”) in response to the July 1, 2026 letter from Thomas Lochtefeld of SurfLoch LLC, which we understand has been entered into the public record in connection with Item 3-A on your July 7 closed session agenda. We ask that this letter likewise be entered into the record.

We do not write to dispute SurfLoch's right to communicate its interest to the Council. We write because the letter leaves the impression that the City's decision to negotiate exclusively with our team was arbitrary or made without the benefit of a comparative process. That impression is incorrect, and we think the Council should have the fuller picture before it acts on Item 3-A.

A competitive evaluation already took place, at the technology level. Before we approached the City, our team conducted its own diligence across the surf pool technology providers active in the market, including SurfLoch. That evaluation did not stay static. SurfLoch's own flagship commercial installation, the Palm Springs Surf Club, has since its opening developed a documented record of mechanical reliability problems and extended closures, including a wave pool closure that lasted from January through September 2024 (the first nine months of operation), requiring a major equipment overhaul before public surf sessions could resume ¹. The Palm Springs Planning Commission convened a formal operational review of the facility on July 22, 2025, following 66 noise complaints from neighboring residents and six code enforcement citations, four of which resulted in fines ². We do not raise this to disparage a competitor, on the contrary, we support and celebrate every new wave pool opening and the people who make them happen; we raise it because it is precisely the kind of information a responsible developer is obligated to weigh, and it directly informed our decision.

Based on that diligence, we selected Endless Surf, the wave technology developed by Whitewater West, as the platform for the Enterprise Park project. In our evaluation and that of our technical advisors, Endless Surf is the stronger technology for our use case on the metrics that matter most for a public-facing, high-utilization community facility: operational reliability, wave consistency, and total cost of ownership over the life of the asset. Put simply, we did not arrive at our vendor by default. We arrived at it by comparing SurfLoch against the alternatives and choosing an alternative. We would note that this selection, while informed by careful diligence, remains preliminary at this stage of development; no binding technology commitment has been made. **The exclusive negotiating process reflects that diligence, not a shortcut around it.**

¹ www.nbcpalmsprings.com/2024/01/12/palm-springs-surf-clubs-wave-pool-closes-days-after-opening
www.theinertia.com/surf/palm-springs-surf-club-wave-pool-once-again-non-operation
www.theinertia.com/opinion/palm-springs-surf-club-closure/

² www.theinertia.com/surf/palm-springs-surf-club-under-city-review-after-66-noise-complaints-from-neighbors/
www.thepalmspringspost.com/palm-springs-surf-club-faces-review-amid-noise-complaints-operational-setbacks/

Community Engagement Process to date. Neptune Beach has been engaged in an active and ongoing community engagement process including a public “Pop-Up” event in May of 2025, a public online survey, co-authored by Neptune Beach and City staff in May of 2025, an informational hearing with the Recreation and Parks Commission on July 10, 2025, and numerous direct engagements with neighboring businesses, non-profits, community organizations and more. The outcome of this process, quantified in the survey results on file with the City, is overwhelming support for the surf park concept in Alameda generally and Enterprise Park specifically. Neptune Beach has also explored other opportunity sites in Alameda Point, at the request of City staff, and determined that Enterprise Park is the superior location for this use. All of this engagement has been performed, at Neptune Beach’s sole expense, because of direct negotiations with City. An RFP process, whether specific to a surf pool or not, would circumvent this meaningful engagement. The engagement process to date has shaped the overall proposed project to ensure it is mutually beneficial to neighboring businesses, the community, and the City.

Our team has spent substantial time and resources since first engaging with City staff developing a project-specific plan for the Enterprise Park site, underwritten to the realities of that location. Reopening a formal solicitation at this stage, on the theory that the City has not yet tested the market, would overlook the comparative work our team already performed on the City's behalf before ever signing an exclusive negotiating agreement. It would also introduce delay and cost that falls most heavily on the City's own timeline for Alameda Point, without a corresponding likelihood of a better outcome, since an alternative technology proponent has already been evaluated and considered in our selection process.

SurfLoch’s letter does not represent a competing proposal for the Enterprise Park site. This is confirmed by Mr. Lochtefeld’s own prior communications with City staff, which entered the public record through a California Public Records Act request and were reported by the Alameda Post in February 2026³. According to that reporting, Mr. Lochtefeld wrote to City staff in July 2025 that “My group would prefer a location that is already targeted for commercial use and capable of land purchase... We would also consider the addition of a hotel resort.” According to the same reporting, in a November 2025 follow-up to City staff, Mr. Lochtefeld wrote: “I recall you mentioned that other properties (e.g., the air hangars) could be soon available. In this light, is there other opportunity? Especially if the property is capable of land purchase.” As recently as January 28, 2026, SurfLoch told the Alameda Post that it “still has interest to purchase land in Alameda Point for a surf pool and potentially a hotel.”

SurfLoch’s consistent and stated preference has been for a different type of transaction (a commercial land purchase) on a different type of parcel than Enterprise Park. The July 1 letter does not alter that position. It asks the Council to open a competitive solicitation, but the letter itself contains no proposal, no site plan, no financial structure, and no purchase offer for the Enterprise Park parcel or any other specific Alameda Point site. We are not aware of any formal submission by SurfLoch to the City for any Alameda Point parcel. A request to reopen a process, submitted without a competing proposal and six days before the City finalizes terms with a developer SurfLoch has publicly described as unlikely to succeed, reads less as a competing bid than as an effort to reset a process whose outcome SurfLoch has already publicly prejudged.

The City’s negotiation with Neptune Beach is consistent with how Alameda Point development has historically proceeded. The City’s own RFP for commercial real estate brokerage services, cited by Mr. Lochtefeld, applies to the disposition of commercial real estate assets, not to the negotiation of long-term park leases arising from a community-initiated planning process. The Enterprise Park surf pool concept originated through direct community engagement, was publicly presented, was reviewed by the Recreation and Park Commission, and was authorized by the City Council in closed session on October 21, 2025, following staff review. That is not an ad hoc process; it is the standard pathway for this type of public-private park partnership in Alameda.

We note, respectfully, that Mr. Lochtefeld’s letter arrives six days before the scheduled closed session, after more than thirteen months of intermittent staff contact and, to our knowledge, no formal submission of any kind. We do not question SurfLoch’s interest in the Alameda market; the company is free to approach the City about commercial parcels at any time, as City staff have indicated. We do ask the Council to consider the timing and substance of this request in context, and to recognize that opening a new competitive process at this stage would impose significant

³ www.alamedapost.com/news/analysis/records-show-other-developers-sought-different-surf-pool-deal

costs and delays on a community project that has broad Alameda support and has been advancing in good faith for well over a year.

We respect the Council's discretion over how to proceed on Item 3-A and do not ask you to disregard SurfLoch's letter. We ask only that the Council weigh it alongside the fact that a comparative evaluation of surf pool technology, including SurfLoch's own, has already occurred, and that our selection was the product of that evaluation rather than an absence of one. We would also note that, to the extent the Council has further questions about our technology selection or the terms of our vendor relationship, we welcome the opportunity to address those directly. SurfLoch's decision to seek process intervention rather than engage with Neptune Beach or the City as a potential technology partner speaks for itself. We would welcome the opportunity to answer any questions the Council or staff may have.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William P. Duncanson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

William P. Duncanson

Founder

NBSC Development Partners, LLC

From: [Thomas J Lochtefeld](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Cc: [Ranney Lochtefeld](#); id94501@gmail.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Request for a Competitive Process — July 7 Closed Session Item 3-A (Enterprise Park Surf Pool Negotiations)
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 8:59:23 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I write on behalf of SurfLoch LLC, a San Diego-based designer, manufacturer, and operator of surf pool systems, regarding the closed session item on your July 7 agenda, Item 3-A, Conference with Real Property Negotiators concerning a portion of the Alameda Point Enterprise Park and the negotiating parties identified as the City of Alameda and Neptune Beach Surf Club Development Partners, LLC. I respectfully ask that this letter be entered into the public record.

Continuing interest in a commercial-property alternative. SurfLoch first expressed interest to City staff in 2025 and, as recently as January 2026, confirmed to the press that we remain interested in purchasing or leasing land at Alameda Point for a surf pool and potentially an accompanying hotel resort. Our preference has consistently been for property already targeted for commercial use and capable of outright purchase, rather than the leasing of public parkland. A purchase structure places the development risk on the buyer, generates sale proceeds the City could apply toward its substantial Alameda Point infrastructure obligations, and returns the parcel to the property tax rolls. We understand at least one additional developer also expressed interest during the same period.

Question regarding the absence of a competitive process. Our purpose here is not to oppose a surf facility in Alameda; given that developing surfing facilities are our primary business, we would welcome the opportunity to compete to build one. We respectfully question why a project of this scale and public significance appears to be advancing through negotiations with a single, predetermined developer rather than through an open, competitive solicitation? We note that the City's own October 2025 Request for Proposals for commercial brokerage services states that, for the disposition of real estate assets at Alameda Point, the City Council encourages a competitive public process in marketing, negotiating with, and selecting tenants. A negotiation conducted exclusively with one party appears difficult to reconcile with that stated preference, and a competitive process would allow the Council to test the terms now under negotiation against genuine market alternatives.

Request. Before the City commits to price and terms with any single party, we ask that

the Council consider directing staff to open a competitive solicitation for a surf pool or comparable visitor-serving use at Alameda Point, whether on the Enterprise Park site or on commercial property suitable for sale. Such a process would invite qualified developers, including SurfLoch, to submit competing proposals on transparent and equal terms, and would give the Council the benefit of comparison before any binding commitment is made.

We recognize that the matter is presently in closed session and that the details of the negotiation are not public. We do not seek disclosure of confidential terms; we seek only a fair and open opportunity to participate. I would welcome the chance to discuss our interest with the City at the Council's convenience.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,



THOMAS LOCHTEFELD

CEO

Tel: +1 858 228 9333

Mob: +1 619 252 1777

loch@surfloch.com

www.surfloch.com

THIS COMMUNICATION IS PRIVILEGED AND SHOULD BE TREATED IN A CONFIDENTIAL MANNER.