

July 6, 2026

Re: July 7, 2026 City Council Meeting, Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C and 7-D

Greetings Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers Daysog, Boller, Jensen, and Pryor,

Your dedication to serving our community and carefully considering the goals and desires of your constituents is commendable. I am appealing to this deep commitment to public service as I request that you pause and invest more thought into the highly consequential decisions on the July 7, 2026 City Council meeting agenda related to proposed Charter amendments.

Every Alameda resident will be affected by these measures, as each will have direct and permanent bearing on how Alameda is governed. I request that you **VOTE NO on Agenda Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, and 7-D**. These items all require additional public review, and therefore any decision on them should be postponed.

Agenda Item 7-A — Proposed \$300M Infrastructure Bond

While it is critical that we invest in Alameda's infrastructure, the current language of the proposed bond measure is perilously vague about how our funds would be allocated or prioritized. It is irresponsible to ask taxpayers to take on the enormity of a \$300 million bond without presenting an itemized, in-depth, and transparent project list that identifies which projects will be funded first, the estimated costs of each project, and the criteria that will be used to allocate the funds.

We as a community face an urgent need to adjust for sea level rise across the city, and to take robust action toward strengthening the deteriorating sidewalks, potholes, and other fundamental components of our neighborhoods' existing infrastructure. These are fundamental municipal responsibilities. Such routine maintenance expenses should be cared for within the Alameda's General Fund and ongoing capital planning, rather than relying primarily on broad borrowing authority without clearly defined spending commitments.

Item 7-A will affect the budgets of Alamedans in a very tangible way. The Bay Area is facing a housing affordability crisis, and the proposed bond measure would put further financial constraints on families and individuals, including renters who would also likely see an increase in their rents as a result. Voters deserve more information and greater certainty before being asked to approve a bond of this magnitude.

Agenda Item 7-B — Charter "Cleanup" Measure

Item 7-B should be removed from consideration at this time; it is a hodgepodge of different issues that must be re-worked to address each one coherently.

The proposal combines two repeals and nineteen separate Charter amendments into a single ballot measure. Many of the proposed changes address entirely different subjects. Packaging so many unrelated amendments together makes it difficult for both the Council and the public to thoughtfully evaluate each proposal on its own merits. Additionally, public trust is weakened because this conglomeration approach gives an uneasy sense that bad ideas are being swept in along with the good.

Particularly concerning is the proposed modification to qualification requirements for members of important advisory boards and commissions. Alameda should not join the flight from expertise that has become sadly prevalent in our national government. Our city benefits from having qualified professionals—including engineers, architects, contractors, and subject matter experts who help guide decisions affecting our infrastructure, utilities, and historic resources. We must not weaken those qualifications.

Charter amendments are serious agreements that we make with our neighbors about how we wish Alameda to be governed. Each one merits its own thorough analysis and independent public debate rather than being lumped into a single catch-all measure. Please separate these issues to promote transparency, encourage informed public participation, and strengthen confidence in the process.

Agenda Item 7-C — Changes to Public Land Approval Requirements

I strongly encourage the Council to vote No on this proposal.

Public lands are not a trivial asset to be bought and sold on a whim. These lands are public and therefore belong to all Alameda residents. Decisions involving the sale or long-term lease of public property must continue to require broad consensus.

Currently, the requirement of a supermajority vote and multiple public meetings provides an important safeguard that encourages research, transparency, deliberation, and community participation before irreversible decisions are made. Lowering the voting threshold while reducing opportunities for public review endangers those protections.

The existing requirements should be maintained (or even strengthened!) to help ensure that significant decisions involving public assets receive broad public support and reasoned consideration.

Agenda Item 7-D — Elimination of the Elected Auditor and Treasurer

Item 7-D should be removed from consideration.

The elected Auditor and Treasurer positions play critical roles in providing independent financial oversight, which is a cornerstone of good governance. These experts provide accountability directly to Alameda voters and serve as important checks within the City's financial management structure. Eliminating independently elected financial oversight raises legitimate concerns about transparency and accountability.

Alameda depends on the Auditor and Treasurer for independent review to help reduce the risk of financial errors, conflicts of interest, and potential fraud while strengthening public confidence in the stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Our community deserves a comprehensive public discussion evaluating the long-term implications and possible alternatives to these positions, before such a significant change is considered. While administrative efficiencies may be worth discussing, outright elimination of the roles is ill-advised.

In summary, these proposed Charter amendments would permanently alter important aspects of Alameda's government, and so deserve much greater public engagement and analysis before they are considered for a vote.

As longtime homeowners in Alameda, we urge the Council to vote NO on all of these agenda items, so that each proposal can be re-evaluated through in-depth public review and independent evaluation. The City Charter should be treated with greater care and consensus.

Thank you for serving Alameda faithfully and listening to the citizens whom you represent.

Respectfully,

Mary Levy and
Steven Levy
Alameda Residents

From: [Linda Bytof](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on Agenda Item 7-A
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 11:31:15 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

We have been Alameda residents since 1999 and have been active in many different civic activities over the years. While we appreciate the need to address the City's infrastructure needs, we cannot support the \$300 million bond proposal as it is currently written. It is overbroad and lacks measures to ensure accountability. Thus, we are asking you to rethink and revise the proposed infrastructure bond measure before putting it on the ballot. ([agenda item 7-A](#))

As we are sure you are aware, the City has passed about 5 prior infrastructure bonds since the 1970s that covered essentially the same projects you now are proposing to be covered by this bond measure. In fact, the language you use to support this bond measure is almost identical to the language you used for the prior bond measures. So what happened to the money you raised in the prior bond measures? In fact, as I understand it, the 2019 bond measure specifically addressed the City's sewer needs. Where is the accountability? If you want to sell this measure to Alameda residents, particularly in these difficult economic times, you will need to account for your expenditures in the past and adopt measures to ensure that the funds are used for the most critical needs.

We all know that \$300 million will not be enough to address all of the infrastructure needs. So someone will be making decisions about what will be funded from among all the possible projects you list in the bond measure. While we understand the need for flexibility, we think that the priorities should be stated in the measure. Is this really a bond that you intend primarily to focus on infrastructure needs of fire and police? If so, the bond measure should say that - once those needs are met there will be little left for other essential infrastructure needs - to address climate change and sea level

rise as well as earthquake protection. One suggestion would be to separate out police and fire needs into a separate bond measure.

And what's up with street improvements and potholes? As students of government, we have always believed that fixing streets and potholes and other routine maintenance is the essential work of a municipality (thank you Don Perata) - this doesn't belong in an infrastructure bill. And, frankly, we doubt that any of these funds would be used for this purpose. So, putting that language in the bond measure appears disingenuous.

Money is tight for everyone today. To maximize the chances of voter approval, we believe that it is essential to be transparent about priorities, provide explanations for why this work was not done in the past, even though we supported bond measures for the same projects, and incorporate accountability measures into the measure itself.

Linda Bytof and Mark Renner

RE: Item 7A July 7, 2026

Dear Madam Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the issuing of bonds to finance the questionably accurate list of projects being offered as examples of what the city will eventually be responsible for.

For example: 1. it is highly doubtful that the city would even be permitted to construct levees along the edge of the Bay which would be subject to approval by BCDC, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, in addition to other regional agencies. Levees, if they are to be constructed, will undoubtedly be the responsibility of the state and/or federal government, not the city.

2. Most, though certainly not all, of the costs related to sewage control are the responsibility of EBMUD.

3. Prevention of flooding in the tubes which are part of the state highway system as proposed in Staff's marketing flyer is the responsibility of Caltrans, not the city.

As Staff have acknowledged, the details, costs, urgency, priority, importance, and wisdom of the specific projects being suggested are far from being settled.

In my opinion floating a \$300,000,000 bond would be an unacceptably premature and cavalier approach to addressing the future funding of Alameda's potential infrastructure improvement projects.

I encourage the Council to reject the resolution proposed in Item 7A.

Respectfully,

Jay Garfinkle

From: [Mitch B](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written Copy of Comment for 7A of 7/7/26 City Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:26:05 AM

Hello,

I will be making a public comment on item 7A for the 7/7/26 City Council Meeting and wanted to share a written copy with linked citations.

In past city council meetings on this topic, it was proposed that the city consider an infrastructure bond measure paid for by a floorplan area parcel tax. I came and spoke on this topic and suggested that the city instead consider a lot area parcel tax for 3 reasons: it would form a better tax-benefit linkage so that properties who cost the city more pay more tax, it would tax more progressively putting a lighter burden on the least wealthy, and lastly it would encourage housing development rather than discourage it. Since then, city staff has now come back with a new proposal for a prop 13-style property tax, which is unfortunately a major step back in all 3 of these categories.

Prop 13-style property taxes have little tax benefit linkage and put a disproportionately large burden on newer residents for costs not incurred by new residents. Newer development has less motor vehicle parking and puts less, not more strain on roadways, fire stations 1, 2, and 4 don't need to be built, they need to be maintained, and most obviously, sea level rise is not caused by new homes. I'm also very disappointed that the polling conducted by FM3 skewed their results by falsely suggesting new development is responsible for these costs immediately before asking respondents to consider a floorplan area parcel tax. Polling with leading questions isn't an accurate representation of potential future voting.

Prop 13-style property taxes are also uniquely regressive. Sales taxes are often considered the most regressive tax, but that's only because a tax as uniquely regressive as California's property tax has no comparison (<https://www.taxfairnessproject.org/reform>). Sales taxes at least have exemptions on items necessary for basic human survival, namely food. Instead property taxes specifically tax a necessity for human survival, shelter. Typically this is offset by property taxes allowing for assessed values to grow at an accurate rate so that they're a form of wealth tax that counteracts wealth inequality, but California's lowest in the nation assessment growth cap (<https://www.appealdesk.com/blog/how-much-can-property-taxes-increase-california>) completely removes this benefit leaving behind a tax that simply discourages survival.

Lastly, prop 13-style property tax is far worse when it comes to its impact on financial feasibility of new housing. While floorplan area taxes discourage floorplan area, at least that burden is distributed evenly across the entire property base. Prop 13-style property taxes focus all of that burden on new developments making them far more harmful to production of new housing which is pretty shocking considering that housing scarcity is the greatest moral and economic issue this city faces.

Ultimately, while I was previously prepared to support a floorplan area parcel tax because our infrastructure deserves funding, I cannot say the same for a prop 13-style property tax. Not

necessarily for the reasons just stated, but specifically because of who it targets. Anyone here who read Grapes of Wrath in high school knows that California has a dark history of xenophobia so discriminatory that it was not only directed against immigrants from foreign countries but also newcomers born within the same country. This xenophobia continued until 1978, where it manifested in prop 13, the decision that immigrants and newcomers would be burdened with costs incurred by some of the most wealthy people on the planet (<https://edsource.org/2022/californias-prop-13s-unjust-legacy-detailed-in-critical-study/674412>), and it continues today now that you are being asked to expand upon prop 13 in your capacity as representatives of this municipality. The city needs this funding, but the cities motto is also “everyone belongs here” and this proposed tax stands in direct hypocrisy of that belief. I am an immigrant, so as a matter of principle, I cannot in good conscience support a tax designed to keep me and people like me out, and I hope you share this same principle.

Thank you,
-Mitch Ball

July 7, 2026

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council:

Re: Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D – Proposed Charter Amendments and Ballot Measures

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

Alameda Citizens Task Force respectfully urges the Council to postpone consideration of Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D, and defer placing these measures before the voters until the City has provided a more deliberate, transparent, and legally defensible public process.

The Alameda City Charter is not an ordinary policy document. It functions as the City's constitution. Amendments should therefore be considered only after the public has received clear notice of the specific changes under consideration and a meaningful opportunity to evaluate their legal and practical consequences.

Although the Council possesses the authority to propose Charter amendments, that authority carries a corresponding obligation to ensure that the legislative process satisfies the fundamental principles of transparency, informed public participation, and procedural fairness. When government proposes permanent structural changes to its governing framework, the public process should *exceed* the minimum legal requirements rather than merely satisfy them.

Several of the proposed Charter amendments appear to have developed through an accelerated internal staff process that has not afforded residents sufficient time to review the legal ramifications of each proposal. The agenda materials describe these measures as routine updates or administrative improvements, yet several provisions would substantially alter the allocation of governmental authority, public oversight, and voter protections. Characterizing significant structural revisions as "housekeeping" risks obscuring their true legal effect.

Moreover, presenting numerous Charter revisions simultaneously places an unreasonable burden on the electorate. Even if each proposal is individually lawful, the cumulative effect is to require voters to evaluate multiple fundamental governmental changes within a compressed timeframe. Sound public administration favors incremental reform supported by extensive public engagement rather than wholesale revision under ordinary legislative scheduling.

ACT is also concerned that the Council has not adequately demonstrated *why* these amendments require immediate placement on the November ballot. Charter amendments are intended to endure for decades. A delay of several months to permit additional study, public workshops, and independent legal review would not prejudice the City's interests but would materially improve public confidence in the outcome.

From a legal perspective, California courts have long recognized that open government depends not only upon technical compliance with statutory notice requirements but also upon ensuring that citizens receive meaningful notice sufficient to understand the matters upon which their elected representatives intend to act. When **significant governmental restructuring** is proposed, transparency requires more than publication of agenda packets shortly before a meeting. It requires a process that genuinely facilitates informed civic participation.

Accordingly, Alameda Citizens Task Force respectfully requests that the Council:

1. Withdraw Agenda Items 7-A through 7-D from consideration at this time;
2. Direct the City Attorney to prepare a comprehensive **legal analysis explaining the practical effect of each proposed Charter amendment**;
3. Conduct a series of **publicly noticed community workshops devoted exclusively to Charter reform**;
4. Allow sufficient time for written public comment before any future vote to place Charter amendments on the ballot; and

5. Consider each substantive Charter amendment independently rather than as part of broader omnibus measures whenever practicable.

The legitimacy of our City's governing Charter depends as much upon the fairness of the amendment process as upon the substance of the amendments themselves. Alameda residents deserve an open, deliberate, and transparent process before being asked to approve permanent changes to the City's foundational governing document.

Respectfully submitted,
Alameda Citizens Task Force



July 7, 2026

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

RE: City Council Meeting Agenda Item 7-A SAFER Alameda Act - Preparing Alameda for Sea-Level Rise, Accidents, Flooding, Earthquakes, Resilience

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 strong support for placing the SAFER Alameda Act on the ballot for the November 3, 2026 election.

- Alameda is uniquely vulnerable to the impacts of sea level rise.
- The City has adopted an award-winning Climate Action and Resiliency Plan that identified the potential vulnerabilities and mitigations to reduce the impacts of sea level rise.
- The City has received state and federal funding to plan for future adaption infrastructure to address these vulnerabilities.
- The City will need to provide "skin in the game" to attract state and federal investment in our adaptation infrastructure.

Should the City Council elect to place the SAFER Alameda Act on the ballot for the November 3, 2026 election, CASA will commit our full efforts to ensure its passage.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth Abbe".

Ruth Abbe, Steering Committee
Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda

From: [Karen Uno](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] \$300 Million Bond Measure
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 5:00:30 PM

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I support the City's effort to address the City's infrastructure needs in light of a deteriorating and obsolete infrastructure and imminent climate change threats. I am a long time Alameda resident and often say that I am very lucky to live in this beautiful and wonderful community and want to protect it.

The \$300 million bond measure is too vague and broad to be acceptable. To gain community wide support the bond measure should specify the work that will be accomplished to address the imminent dangers posed by rising sea levels and flooding. As it stands now, the money may go to normal wear and tear maintenance issues like potholes and possible improvements to fire and police facilities – not a compelling ask. If the measure is to pass, it should be more specific and focus on the community wide concern about the impact of more intense rain periods and flooding. The money should be directed at those issues. Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Uno

From: [Cathy Leong](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Alameda City Council Meeting July 7 2026
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 12:31:48 PM

Dear Alameda City Council,

As a 39-year resident of Alameda, I feel it is important to stay involved in our community and to speak up when issues arise. This is one of those times. On July 7, you will hold a meeting that includes several proposed Charter amendments which could permanently change how our city is governed. These are not small housekeeping changes—they affect how public money is spent, who provides oversight, and how decisions about public property are made.

7A: \$300 Million Infrastructure Bond

You are considering a \$300 million infrastructure bond—twice the size of the \$150 million bond that voters rejected in 2024. That measure failed in part because its purpose wasn't specified clearly enough, and because residents wanted the money allocated to specific projects rather than a general fund. The current proposal references projects like seawalls, fire stations, and roads, but it still doesn't clearly specify what gets funded first or provide binding guarantees on how the money will be prioritized. Before asking voters to approve an amount this large, residents deserve more detail about exactly where the money will go. As the saying goes, doing the same thing again and expecting a different result rarely works out.

7B: Bundling 18 Charter Amendments Into One Measure

This proposal combines 18 separate Charter amendments into a single ballot measure. Among the changes are the removal of current professional qualification requirements for serving on boards such as the Public Utilities Board and the Historical Advisory Board—including eliminating requirements that those boards include engineers, architects, and contractors.

Each amendment should be considered on its own merits. Bundling so many unrelated changes together makes it difficult for residents to evaluate—and vote on—each proposal individually.

7C: Changing the Rules for Public Land Deals

This proposal would lower the number of Council votes needed to approve land sales and long-term leases from four to three. It would also eliminate the current requirement for two public meetings, allowing these decisions to move forward after just one meeting and take effect immediately.

Public land belongs to all of us. Decisions involving city property deserve broad consensus and real opportunities for public input before they become final.

Alameda has always been a community that cares about good government and thoughtful decision-making. That's why it's so important to speak up now, on decisions that will shape our city's future.

Sincerely, Cathy Leong 48 Kara Road Alameda CA 94502

7-D: Eliminating Elected Financial Oversight (this I have already emailed you and Lara confirmed it was to be part of the record)

Cathy Leong <gocathyl@gmail.com>

to:

Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov>,

Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>,

Tony Daysog <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>,

Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>,

Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>

cc:

LARA WEISIGER <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>

date: Jun 28, 2026, 8:43 AM

subject: Response in concern over Proposed Charter Amendment on 7/7 City Council Agenda

From: [Cam Bochman](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter of Support 7-A & 7-C
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 9:22:59 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I'm writing in support of moving agenda items 7-A and 7-C to the November ballot.

As a new resident of the city with a very young family, I hope to call this place my home for a very long time, and hope my kids could say the same too. In order for us to stay here long-term, I think it is critical that we address our most urgent needs.

Alameda has major infrastructure needs that are not going away: flooding, sea level rise, aging public safety facilities, street conditions, and basic emergency preparedness. The proposed infrastructure measure gives voters the chance to decide whether to create a dedicated capital funding source for those needs.

I also support the Charter reform for city-owned property leases and sales. Alameda Point in particular needs a process that is still public and accountable, but less cumbersome for routine or long-term real estate decisions. Making that process more predictable would help the City activate vacant spaces, support economic development, and generate revenue for needed infrastructure.

Neither item decides the final question for voters. These actions simply allow Alameda residents to consider the measures directly in November. Given the scale of the City's infrastructure needs, I think voters should have that opportunity.

Please vote to advance both agenda item 7-A and agenda item 7-C.

Thank you,

Cam Bochman
781-626-1562

From: [Catherine Egelhoff](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] July 7 Agenda 7A
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 6:40:17 AM

Dear City Council members,

On July 7 please vote for both the infrastructure bond to get on the November ballot. Please also vote for the Alameda Point leasing arrangement which would allow leases to be approved when three out of five City Council members vote in favor of a lease instead of four. We need to move on these leases with more speed than we have been.

Both of these measures are vital to the City Of Alameda and to all of us residents. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Catherine Egelhoff

From: [Drew Dara-Abrams](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] strong support for agenda items 7-A and 7-C
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 11:43:14 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I'm writing to you in strong support of advancing to the November ballot both the City's proposed infrastructure funding measure (agenda item 7-A) and the proposed City Charter reform measure regarding city-owned facility leasing (agenda item 7-C).

While these measures may appear different on the surface, the overarching goal is substantially similar: to address our most pressing civic infrastructure needs.

- **The proposed City Charter reform will make it more predictable for businesses to lease the massive spaces at Alameda Point**, thereby funding operations of Alameda Point services and paying into the City's funds for full rebuilds of underground utilities and surrounding streets across Alameda Point.
- **The proposed infrastructure funding measure will ask us as voters and as taxpayers to do our own part**, contributing toward carefully managed funds for street repaving, flooding preparations, emergency response times, and seismic improvements to outdated buildings for the established neighborhoods and business districts of Alameda Island and Bay Farm.

While city staff and consultants have estimated Alameda's entire extent may need upwards of \$800 million in public funds to address known physical problems, the combination of these two ballot measures targets the most critical of those needs *and* sets in place a sustainable path toward addressing the entirety.

The proposed infrastructure funding measure is designed to pair with external funding sources, to leverage regional/state/federal grants. Most of these grant opportunities require a "local match" (sometimes upwards of 30%):

- Alameda has a very successful track record of winning these competitive funding opportunities when we work together: **the Alameda Free Library was built with funds from Alameda's voters/taxpayers and funds from a State of California grant**. I've appreciated insights Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft has shared with me and other newcomers to Alameda of the many people and groups who worked together to pass the successful bond measure for the city's share of the funds. I also appreciate seeing Councilmember Daysog's name on the plaques in the lobby, highlighting the continuity of community leaders who care about Alameda's public facilities and services. And credit is also due to Councilmember Jensen for leadership on the Alameda School Board, the Alameda Health Care District Board, and the Alameda Health System Board for capital projects using both voter-authorized and partner-provided funds.
- **The critical FEMA BRIC program** is now back and a window has opened again to accept applications (thanks to court order and lobbying by Congressional members such as the Bay Area's Rep. Sam Liccardo). Alameda was previously on track to potentially receive tens of millions of federal dollars to reduce the city's exposure to flooding from San Leandro Bay. The reinstated program now favors shovel-ready projects with sufficient local match — precisely the kind of plans Alameda and partners have kept

refining through the federal lull.

- **In recent years, Alameda city staff have brought to our city tens of millions of external dollars** from MTC, from Alameda County's transportation-dedicated sales taxes, and from federal sources including the EPA, HUD, and USDOT. This successful track record, which is quite impressive for a city of ~80,000, depends upon strategic preparations and prompt work. The exact form of a federal "Notice of Funding Opportunity" or a state or regional grant opportunity may not be known in advance. When Alameda competes successfully, it's because the city already has the potential ingredients in hand: broad assessments prepared by expert consultants, sufficiently flexible funding sources ready to serve as local matches, and leaders on City Council ready to promptly execute agreements.
- **Voters and taxpayers can trust that the proposed infrastructure funding measure will dedicate its proceeds solely to capital expenses in well-defined classifications –** *not* to operational costs or pension liabilities. (While also important, "soft" costs will continue to be managed through the City's fiscal-year budgeting process.) And simultaneously, these new locally-controlled capital funds will be strategically deployed by the City to pair and supercharge with external funding as both planned and unexpected grant opportunities appear.

The time to act is now:

- Voters effectively decided that it is the City of Alameda that serves as the "master developer" for Alameda Point. Since then, the city and its real-estate managers have successfully worked with private businesses and developers to create eateries, residences, R&D facilities, and the beginnings of a new mixed-use district. But progress is slow. And at times progress for even standard leases has become overly politicized. **To continue to work toward the potential of Alameda Point requires that the City more efficiently lease and sell vacant buildings.** This approach continues to firewall the rest of Alameda capital funds, which are needed for existing neighborhoods, business districts, and streets. Alameda Point can and will pay for its own infrastructure needs, as long as the City acts with the professionalism and efficiency required to be an effective counter-party to sophisticated businesses and experienced developers.
- You all know of many iterations the City of Alameda has tried to raise local funds for infrastructure repairs and improvements. In the meantime, **construction costs have increased.** On the Transportation Commission, where I currently serve, we were presented with detailed budgets in advance of the most recent two-year fiscal year cycle indicating that this is the first time that the City of Alameda is needing to utilize the General Fund to supplement gas taxes and traditional sources for the annual paving management program. Without an additional source of local funding in coming fiscal years, Alameda will no longer even be able to keep up with the previous rate of repair, which was already insufficient to get ahead on potholes and paint, let alone traffic safety concerns. While City Council members may each fiscal year continue to vigorously debate funding priorities such as staff headcount for various departments, I hope you can all agree that the city's repaving program is a necessary annual requirement that will ideally not have to draw from and compete with the many needs for the General Fund.

These two proposals you are considering on July 7 represent both **a continuation of what already works in Alameda** – what residents and businesses trust and see in civic facilities like Alameda Free Library, the city's annual paving program, and lively pockets of new activity at Alameda Point – and **forward-looking means of building a more secure, sustainable, and shared city.**

Please vote to bring the proposed infrastructure funding measure and the proposed Charter reform measure regarding leasing city-owned facilities to our ballots in November.

Thank you for your time,
Drew Dara-Abrams

July 5, 2026

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers Pryor, Boller, Daysog and Jensen,

Re: July 7, 2026 City Council Meeting, Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C and 7-D

I appreciate the many hours of work that the City Council, staff, and commissions dedicate to serving our community. The decisions before you regarding the proposed Charter amendments are among the **most significant that Alameda residents will consider in many years**. Because these measures could permanently change how our city is governed, I respectfully ask that you **vote No on Agenda Items 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, and 7-D**, and postpone these items that require additional public review.

Agenda Item 7-A — Proposed \$300M Infrastructure Bond

I support investing in Alameda's infrastructure, but I do not believe the proposed bond measure provides voters with sufficient clarity regarding how the proceeds would be allocated or prioritized.

A \$300 million bond represents a substantial long-term financial commitment for Alameda taxpayers. Before asking residents to approve borrowing of this magnitude, the City should present a clear, detailed, and transparent project list that identifies which projects will be funded first, the estimated costs of each project, and the criteria that will be used to allocate the funds.

If Alameda's most pressing infrastructure needs are to be addressed, I believe the highest priorities should include preparing for sea level rise and maintaining the city's existing infrastructure, particularly repairing deteriorating sidewalks and potholes throughout our neighborhoods. These are fundamental municipal responsibilities that residents experience every day. Routine maintenance should remain a priority within the City's General Fund and ongoing capital planning rather than relying primarily on broad borrowing authority without clearly defined spending commitments. Considering the Bay Area is facing a housing affordability crisis, the proposed bond measure would also put further financial constraints on families and individuals, including renters who would also likely see an increase in their rents as a result.

Voters deserve greater certainty before being asked to approve a bond of this size.

Agenda Item 7-B — Charter "Cleanup" Measure

I respectfully request that Item 7-B be removed from consideration at this time.

This proposal combines two repeals and nineteen separate Charter amendments into a single ballot measure despite the fact that many of the proposed changes address entirely different subjects. Bundling numerous unrelated amendments together makes it difficult for both the Council and the public to thoughtfully evaluate each proposal on its own merits.

Some of these changes, including modifications to qualification requirements for members of important advisory boards and commissions, deserve independent public discussion. Alameda benefits from having qualified professionals—including engineers, architects, contractors, and subject matter experts who help guide decisions affecting our infrastructure, utilities, and historic resources.

Each proposed Charter amendment should receive its own careful analysis and public debate rather than being grouped into one comprehensive measure. Separating these issues would promote transparency, encourage informed public participation, and strengthen confidence in the process.

Agenda Item 7-C — Changes to Public Land Approval Requirements

I respectfully urge the Council to vote No on this proposal.

Public lands belong to all Alameda residents. Decisions involving the sale or long-term lease of public property should continue to require broad consensus.

The existing requirement of a supermajority vote and multiple public meetings provides an important safeguard that encourages transparency, deliberation, and community participation before irreversible decisions are made. Lowering the voting threshold while reducing opportunities for public review diminishes those protections.

Maintaining the current requirements helps ensure that significant decisions involving public assets receive broad public support and careful consideration.

Agenda Item 7-D — Elimination of the Elected Auditor and Treasurer

I respectfully request that this item also be removed from consideration.

Independent financial oversight is a cornerstone of good government. The elected Auditor and Treasurer provide accountability directly to Alameda voters and serve as important checks within the City's financial management structure.

While administrative efficiencies may be worth discussing, eliminating independently elected financial oversight raises legitimate concerns about transparency and accountability. Independent review helps reduce the risk of financial errors, conflicts of interest, and potential fraud while strengthening public confidence in the stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Before considering such a significant governance change, I believe the community deserves a comprehensive public discussion evaluating the long-term implications and possible alternatives.

These proposed Charter amendments would permanently alter important aspects of Alameda's government. Changes of this magnitude should proceed only after robust public engagement, careful analysis, and broad community consensus.

I respectfully ask the Council to **vote No on all of these agenda items** until each proposal has received the level of public review and independent evaluation that changes to our City Charter deserve.

Thank you for your service to Alameda and for considering the views of residents who value transparency, accountability, and thoughtful governance.

Respectfully,

Carmen Reid

Alameda Resident

From: [Steve Slauson](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Regular Agenda Items 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 4:20:35 PM

Honorable Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and Council Members Michele Pryor, Greg Boller, Tony Daysog, Tracy Jensen

I object to the Regular Agenda Items 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D as follows:

Item 7A is a \$300 million bond with no information on the projects or needs for the projects explained.

Item 7B bundles numerous City Charter amendments into a single ballot measure preventing thoughtful individual consideration
of individual changes.

Item 7C appears in violation of Alameda's Measure D

Item 7D proposes eliminating the elected positions of City auditor and City Treasurer, thereby removing independent financial
oversite.

I respectfully request these items be removed from the July 7, 2026 Regular Agenda and be placed on a future Regular Agenda with at least 90 Days allowed for full public review and participation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Slauson
2426 Otis Drive
Alameda

From: [margie](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objections to items on the July 7 agenda
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 2:55:00 PM

First of all, I object to consideration of major changes when many Alamedans are on vacation.

Specific objections:
I OBJECT to:

Item 7A (\$300 million bond) The bond is for "infrastructure," however, no specific projects are budgeted. The funds could be used for anything. Further, many homeowners in Alameda are seniors on fixed incomes. Additional property tax may be unaffordable.

Item 7B bundles numerous City Charter amendments into a single ballot measure. This approach forces voters into an all-or-nothing decision, preventing thoughtful consideration of individual changes.

Item 7C would make it easier for the City Council to approve the sale or lease of city property by allowing approval via simple majority resolution rather than a super majority ordinance. This change may weaken existing protections, including those established under Measure D.

Item 7D proposes eliminating the elected positions of City Auditor and Treasurer. This proposal, combined with the very vague proposal for a \$300 million bond, is very problematic. I am in favor of independent oversight, not dependent on the approval of the Council.

From: [marilyn alwan](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda 7A. Adoption of Municipal Bond Measure
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 1:14:42 PM

Please distribute and add to the comments for the 7 July City Council agenda.

Thank you.

Marilyn Alwan

Hello Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and City Council Members:

I recognize the importance of the needs described in the proposed bond measure. However, I wish to propose a way to ameliorate financial unfairness while funding the bond.

As is wellknown, Prop 13 protects long time homeowners and newcomers pay higher real estate taxes for comparable properties. This results in an unfair and unequal burden for the many newcomers to Alameda.

I suggest the bond financing be structured in a way that both newcomers and long time homeowners would share the cost equally and fairly. I ask that you determine the appraised value of all residential properties and then assess the same percentage of the value of each to fund the dollars needed for the bond.

Thank you.

Marilyn Alwan
Alameda Resident

From: [Dorothy Freeman](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2026 4:37:21 PM

Alameda City Council Agenda July 7, 2026 Item 7A

July 3, 2026

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Pryor and Council Members Daysog, Boller, and Jensen;

Regarding the proposed \$300 million infrastructure bond for the November 2026 election, I have lived in Alameda for 27 years. During that entire time, I have heard that the city has millions of dollars in unmet infrastructure needs. The dollar amount has only continued to grow. What infrastructure improvements have actually been completed during those 27 years and why does the backlog continues to increase.

The staff report states that in 2024, the City Council directed staff to "complete additional work to refine the project needs and come back at a future date." Where is that refined project list? The agenda still presents only broad categories rather than a detailed list of projects, priorities, estimated costs, and implementation timelines.

As written, I do not see enough specificity to assure voters that bond proceeds will be spent on clearly identified projects. The language is so general that it leaves considerable discretion over how the money could ultimately be allocated.

I agree that repairing sewer systems, storm drains, and streets is necessary. However, I would like to see exactly which streets and infrastructure are proposed for repair and when. Some streets have been resurfaced more than once during the time I have lived here, while my street has become increasingly deteriorated and has never been resurfaced. Residents deserve to know how project priorities will be determined.

Sea level rise is a well-documented challenge. Given that reality, I also question why the city has approved substantial new development in areas that are particularly vulnerable to future flooding and groundwater rise, including proposed housing on landfill near South Shore. I would like to better understand how these decisions align with the City's long-term climate resilience planning.

In addition, the Posey and Webster Tubes are part of the state highway system, and the bridges are maintained by Caltrans or the Alameda County Public Works Agency. To what extent are those agencies expected to contribute funding for projects necessary to maintain reliable access to Alameda, rather than relying primarily on local taxpayers?

The Public Safety category is also extremely broad. Without project-specific allocations, I am concerned that a significant portion of the bond proceeds could be directed there, leaving fewer resources available for streets, drainage, sewer infrastructure, and shoreline protection. The proposal must be made stronger by identifying anticipated funding amounts for each major project or category.

I recognize that Alameda has significant infrastructure needs. However, I do not believe the current proposal provides sufficient detail for voters to make an informed decision on a \$300 million bond measure. Before asking voters to approve this level of funding, the city should provide the refined project list that was promised, identify specific projects and estimated costs, explain how projects will be prioritized, and clearly describe the accountability measures that will ensure bond proceeds are used as presented to the public. Saying the list will be provided in the future is not adequate. We need to see that information before council votes to place the measure on the ballot.

Providing that level of detail would give voters greater confidence that these funds will address the City's highest-priority infrastructure needs and reduce the likelihood of returning to voters in the near future with another request to address the same unresolved problems.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

cc: City Manager
City Clerk

From: patricia.lamborn@aol.com
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A City Council Agenda July 7, 2026
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:18:49 AM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and City Council Members Pryor, Boller, Jensen and Daysog,

I am a long-time Alameda resident, and I have been active in issues impacting shoreline parks and sea level rise for years. I appreciate the efforts of City Council and Staff to address the City's infrastructure needs and support the issuance of a general obligation bond to address those issues.

Unfortunately, the proposed \$300 million bond measure described in Agenda #7-A is too broad and should not be approved unless it is modified. Recent storms and the devastation along the Alameda Shoreline have shown our community that sea level rise and flooding are a certainty and pose an immediate threat to the shoreline parks, our homes and community. Action to address those problems is the most likely to receive widespread support even from residents who also support addressing other issues. To maximize the chances of voter approval, the bond measure should specify that proceeds will be used for this purpose, along with specified other projects the City Council identifies as truly essential that can be funded within the \$300 million bond limit.

If the council has any concerns that the measure will fail (it will need two-thirds) there is a good chance it will in its current packaging. I urge you to make the changes I've suggested. The current measure is too broad, please take action and support a measure focused on climate resiliency (shoreline adaptation and storm water system upgrades).

Sincerely,

Patricia Lamborn
Alameda Resident 34 years

From: nrubenstein@comcast.net
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed \$300 Million Infrastructure Bond Measure - Item 7A on July 7, 2026 City Council Agenda
File # 2026-6118. Public Comment
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2026 8:56:13 AM

Alameda City Council Members and Staff:

I am a long-time Alameda resident. I appreciate the efforts of City Council and Staff to address the City's infrastructure needs and support the issuance of a general obligation bond to address that issue. Unfortunately, the proposed \$300 million bond measure described in Agenda #7-A should not be approved unless it is modified to specify what the bond proceeds will be spent for.

As discussed in the Staff report, the City has conducted studies over the past several years, identifying specific infrastructure projects that the City needs and the cost of each such project, and concluding that the total cost is about \$800 million. Clearly, the bond proposal will not generate enough money to pay for everything.

The proposed bond measure in Exhibit A lists five broad "categories of capital improvement projects" and examples of projects that are "authorized," but does not specify any that the City actually agrees to fund with the bond proceeds. It also says that the projects funded may not even be on the list.

This is not an acceptable procedure. The decision about which projects have priority and will be funded is a policy issue that the City Council should address, specify, and justify in its submission to the voters. The City Council has the information required to do that. In the absence of such a plan, decisions will be made in the future on an ad hoc basis, with the money flowing to the loudest voices in the room.

As a practical matter, since sea level rise and flooding are a certainty and pose an existential threat to the City, action to address those problems is the most likely to receive widespread support even from residents who also support addressing other issues. To maximize the chances of voter approval, the bond measure should specify that proceeds will be used for this purpose, along with specified other projects the City Council deems essential that can be funded within the \$300 million bond limit.

The City Council has an opportunity to do something valuable for the residents of Alameda. I hope it does so.

Neil Rubenstein
nrubenstein@comcast.net