

RE: Item 7C July 7, 2026

Dear Madam Mayor and Councilmembers

If I am understanding the resolution which is being considered in Item 7C correctly, it would not only make it too easy for the Council to approve the sale and leasing of virtually any property recommended by Staff no matter how controversial the transaction might be, but the proposed resolution also appears to override measure D which was passed several years ago by an overwhelming vote to prohibit the Council from selling our parks.

Please tread very carefully here.

Respectfully,

Jay Garfinkle

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

From: [Reyla Graber](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Do not approve Charter Changes Tuesday- please
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 6:07:17 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I disagree with your attempt to seek approval Tuesday of several ballot measures which would change our City Charter without adequate discussion or input from residents. Yes, it will be on the November ballot and still without adequate analysis or feedback from residents.

I don't believe this is good government practice, I'm shocked and I hope and trust it will not be approved tomorrow evening.

Reyla Graber
Alameda Resident

Meeting Date: July 7, 2026

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Re: Agenda item 7-C, City Charter Reform

The proposed City Charter reform measure regarding leasing city-owned/controlled property will weaken our local system of governance. Management of this land should be represented through our elected council members by a broad majority of Alamedans, not a voting bloc of three.

There are no compelling arguments presented for either the change in voting threshold or the change from ordinance to resolution.

The Tidelands exception is problematic

The proposed ballot language says, “No real property of the City, *except Tidelands*, shall be leased for a period in excess of ten years or sold, except upon the affirmative vote of four members of the Council.” By inserting an exception for Tidelands means it will require only a simple majority to approve long-term leases on state tidelands.

Can you imagine the ramifications? It would take only three votes to approve commercializing our public park land, most of which is located along the shoreline on state tidelands, with a built-in surf pool or amusement park or hotel, forever changing the landscape.

10-year lease exception is misleading

The proposed reform would change the charter from requiring four to only three votes for approving leases less than 10 years. This would cover almost *every* lease at Alameda Point. Most leases there are for three, four, or five years. A tenant in good standing could expect to be leasing for more than 10 years, because leases typically allow for extending one or two more terms. And even if an extension clause were not in the original lease, a business could come back 9.9 years later and ask for a new lease, making every lease potentially a forever lease.

The disturbing net effect would be, for example, that it would take *only* three votes to approve having a data center cycling millions of gallons water out of the Bay for its cooling system and emitting noise into our environment. Decisions like this should require a supermajority threshold.

Faulty Rationale for Expediency May Emerge

Some may claim a supermajority threshold requirement for leasing is stymying economic development. Truth be told, the reason the reuse and redevelopment of Alameda Point has been moving at a snail's pace for three decades has little to do with the voting threshold for leases or the time it takes for a lease to take effect. It instead has everything to do with the policy choices made by successive city councils, the state of the economy, and extensive environmental cleanup. Furthermore, it is leasing itself, rather than selling property, that is stymying the much needed infrastructure upgrades for economic development. Leasing revenue does not produce new infrastructure, only land and building sales produce new infrastructure.

Please do not place this proposed charter amendment on the ballot.

Sincerely,
Richard Bangert
AlamedaPointEnviro.com

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: [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: [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 6:23:15 PM

Alameda City Council Agenda July 7, 2026 Item 7c

July 4, 2026

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

City-owned property belongs to the people of Alameda. Because these properties are public assets, residents must be given every reasonable opportunity to have a meaningful voice in decisions regarding their sale or lease. These are not routine transactions; they are decisions that deserve the highest level of transparency, public participation, and respect.

Requiring a super majority vote of the City Council helps ensure that these decisions reflect broad community consensus. Alameda voters elected all four council members to represent them, and every representative should have the opportunity to vote on matters involving publicly owned property. Maintaining the current four-vote requirement protects the public's interest by requiring wider agreement before valuable public assets can be sold or leased.

Changing the approval process from a resolution to an ordinance, thereby eliminating the 30-day waiting period, creates the appearance that the Council is seeking to reduce opportunities for public input. Why should the sale or lease of publicly owned property be streamlined? If anything, the process should be structured to maximize public participation and allow sufficient time for community review and engagement. Preserving the four-vote super majority requirement is essential both to ensure meaningful public representation and to maintain public confidence in the fairness of the process.

In 2012, Alameda voters approved Measure D, a Charter amendment requiring voter approval before any public park land can be sold, transferred, or otherwise alienated. That vote demonstrated the community's strong commitment to protecting public lands and ensuring that decisions involving these assets remain in the hands of the people. How does this proposed measure interact with Measure D? Could any part of this proposal weaken or circumvent the protections that Alameda voters approved?

Finally, the proposal references the City's tidelands. However, the City of Alameda does not own its tidelands outright. These are Public Trust Lands, which the city administers as trustee on behalf of the people of California. Under the Public Trust Doctrine, these lands generally cannot be sold and must be used for trust purposes, such as maritime activities, resource protection, recreation, or visitor-serving uses. If the City lacks the authority to sell these lands, why are the tidelands included or referenced in this item? Clarification on this point is needed.

Respectfully

Dorothy Freeman

Cc: City Manager

City Clerk

From: [Joe VanWinkle](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Agenda
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 3:30:18 PM

Letter to the Mayor and City Council of Alameda

Concerning the Supermajority Requirement for Leasing or Selling City Lands

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to you regarding the items on the City Council agenda tonight, specifically the proposal to alter the City Charter's supermajority requirement for leasing or selling city-owned lands.

As a concerned resident, I urge you to retain the supermajority threshold for such significant decisions. The requirement ensures that any move to lease or sell city lands receives broad consensus among council members, reflecting the gravity and lasting impact of these actions. City lands are a public treasure, and decisions about their fate often affect the community for generations—long after current council members have left the dais.

Reducing or eliminating the supermajority requirement risks making it easier for future councils to dispose of city assets without sufficient deliberation or input from a wide range of voices. Such a change would weaken important safeguards designed to protect Alameda's public resources from being hastily or unwisely relinquished.

I strongly encourage the council to maintain the supermajority requirement in the City Charter. Please continue to prioritize the long-term interests of Alameda residents and safeguard our city's lands for present and future generations.

Thank you for your attention and your commitment to the well-being of our community.

Sincerely,

Joe Van Winkle

Alameda, CA

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)