Alameda County Mayors' Conference

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

September 9, 2026
6:30 p.m.
Concannon Winery
[4590 Tesla Road, Livermore, CA]

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of July 8, 2026, Meeting Minutes*
3. Agenda Amendments
4. Public Comments and Other Announcements
5. Member Reports on Regional Boards and Activities
   a) Alameda County Mayors' Working Group on Homelessness – Mayor Ishii
6. Appointments to Regional Boards and Call for Applications

Board Name/ Appointment	District	Incumbent	Applicant(s)	Start	End
No appointments scheduled					

*Applications submitted for appointment are included with the Nominating Committee agenda packet, which also includes a listing of current regional board vacancies.

7. League of California Cities' Report, Legislative Updates, and Actions
   a) Samantha Brightman, East Bay Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities
8. Other Business Matters
   a) Consideration to adopt Resolution 2026-01, A Resolution of the Alameda County Mayors' Conference opposing Proposition 43 (ACA22), the two-thirds vote requirement for local special taxes.
9. Request for Future Agenda Items and Presenters
   - September 9, 2026 - SPUR, Connect Bay Area
   - October 14, 2926 – Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) System Update
   - November 11, 2026 – Meeting Canceled
   - December 9, 2026 – Alameda County Area Agency on Aging
10. Adjournment

*Denotes report included below or attached material. Regional board applications are included with the Nominating Committee agenda packet

Note: The Mayors' Conference or the Alameda County City Selection Committee may act on any subject posted on this agenda, including nominations from the floor for regional boards.

After Meeting Dinner Events

a) Host City Mayors' Report

Mayor John Marchand, City of Livermore

b) Guest Speaker Meeting Presentation

Presenter: Lisa Tucker, President of the Tucker Group

Presentation Topic: Review of the regional transit measure, including the funding challenges facing Bay Area transit agencies.

Attachments

July 8, 2026, Meeting Minutes

Draft Resolution 2026-01

Executive Director's Report

Item 8 - Consideration to adopt Resolution 2026-01, A Resolution of the Alameda County Mayors' Conference opposing Proposition 43 (ACA22), the two-thirds vote requirement for local special taxes.

RECOMMENDATION – Consider the recommendation of the Alameda County Mayors' Conference Executive Committee regarding the Alameda County Mayors' Conference Resolution 2026-01 and take action to approve, amend, or reject the resolution.

CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meeting Date	Host City
September 9, 2026	Livermore
October 14, 2026	Alameda
November 11, 2026	Meeting Canceled
December 9, 2026	Albany
January 13, 2027	San Leandro

Meeting information is available at www.alamedacountymayorsconference.org

ALAMEDA COUNTY MAYORS' CONFERENCE MINUTES

Meeting of July 8, 2026

The meeting was called to order by President González on July 8, 2026, at Workday, 6120 Stoneridge Mall Road, Pleasanton, California.

1. **Roll Call**

The following mayors, or their elected alternates, were present during the proceedings:

City	Member Attendee
Alameda	Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Albany	Mayor Peggy McQuaid
Berkeley	Mayor Adena Ishii
Dublin	Mayor Sherry Hu
Emeryville	Mayor Sukhdeep Kaur
Fremont	Mayor Raj Salwan
Hayward	Mayor Mark Salinas
Livermore	Mayor John Marchand
Newark	Mayor Michael Hannon
Oakland	Mayor Barbara Lee
Piedmont	Mayor Betsy Smegel Andersen
Pleasanton	Mayor Jack Balch
San Leandro	Mayor Juan González
Union City	Mayor Gary Singh

2. **Approval of the June 10, 2026, Meeting Minutes**

It was moved by Mayor Marchand and seconded by Mayor Hannon to approve the June 10, 2026, meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Agenda Amendments**

There were no agenda amendments.

4. **Public Comments and Other Announcements**

Bradley Dunn, Government & Community Relations Representative with BART, indicated that BART won the Triple Crown Award from the Government Finance Officers Association, adopted a balanced budget, and that its ridership continues to be strong.

5. **Member Reports on Regional Activities and Committees**

Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft provided an update on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, indicating that it is supporting the Connect Bay Area Act (SB63), and she discussed the importance of maintaining a strong public transit system.

President González provided an update on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, indicating it is still exploring changes to natural gas-powered appliances.

Mayor Ishii provided an update on the Alameda County Mayor's Conference Working Group on Homelessness, focused on working with Alameda County regarding the implementation of Measure W funds.

6. **Appointments to Regional Boards and Call for Applications**
President González announced that the Nominating Committee had made its recommendations on the applications included in its July 8, 2026, meeting agenda and opened the floor for comments/nominations. Seeing no additional nominations, it was moved by Mayor and seconded by Mayor that the Alameda County Mayors' Conference make the following appointment:

- Appoint City of Newark resident Sabzar Kaur, 6140 Rockrose Drive, Newark, CA, to the Alameda County Advisory Commission on Aging for a four-year term beginning in July 2026 and ending in July 2030.

The motion was approved unanimously by a roll-call vote and was so ordered.

7. **League of California Cities Reports, Legislative Updates, and Actions**
Major Salwan provided a report due to Samantha Brightmen's absence. He indicated that the proposed California Two-Thirds Vote Requirement for Special Taxes and Charter City Real Estate Transfer Tax Prohibition Initiative will not be on the November 3, 2026, ballot. In its place will be ACA-22, a state Assembly Constitutional Amendment that, in part, establishes a 2/3 threshold for communities to pass tax increases.

8. **Other Business Matters**
President González indicated his intention to convene the Executive/Legislative Committee to review ACA-22, an Assembly Constitutional Amendment. The Committee will do so at its September meeting.

9. **Request for Future Agenda Items and Presenters**
No recommendations were presented for future agenda items or presenters.

10. **Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Bocian
Executive Director

<u>POST MEETING NOTES</u>

Mayor's Report

Mayor Jack Balch introduced Pleasanton elected officials and staff, welcomed guests, and thanked staff for their work, including special thanks to Lisa Tarnow, Executive Assistant, for leading the event.

Guest Speaker

Caitlin Safradin, Workday Foundation Director, provided an overview of the Pleasanton Connects program and the Building Initiative Model.

Caitlin Safradin addressed questions from Mayors Marchand, Lee, Berkeley, Salinas, and Ezzy-Ashcraft,

Mayor Balch further discussed the City’s Longest Table event and plans to improve it in the future.

This page is intentionally blank.

Alameda County Mayors' Conference

RESOLUTION No. 2026-01 (DRAFT)

A RESOLUTION OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY MAYORS' CONFERENCE OPPOSING PROPOSITION 43(ACA22), THE TWO-THIRDS VOTE REQUIREMENT FOR LOCAL SPECIAL TAXES

WHEREAS, Proposition 43, placed on the November 3, 2026 statewide ballot through Assembly Constitutional Amendment 22 (ACA 22), would amend the California Constitution to require local special taxes proposed through the initiative process to receive approval from two-thirds of voters; and

WHEREAS, local governments rely upon voter-approved revenues to provide essential public services and address community priorities, including public safety, transportation and infrastructure, parks and open space, housing and homelessness programs, and other locally determined needs; and

WHEREAS, requiring a two-thirds supermajority for voter-initiated special taxes would make it substantially more difficult for local communities to approve revenues dedicated to specific local purposes, even when such measures receive support from a clear majority of voters; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 43 would restrict the ability of local voters to determine how best to fund services and programs within their own communities and would reduce the fiscal flexibility of cities, counties, and other local agencies; and

WHEREAS, the measure would also impose a higher approval threshold on citizens exercising their local initiative power and could prevent measures supported by a substantial majority of local voters from taking effect.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Alameda County Mayors' Conference hereby expresses its opposition to **Proposition 43 (ACA 22)** on the November 3, 2026 statewide ballot; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Conference supports preserving the ability of local voters and communities to make decisions concerning locally generated revenues and the services and priorities those revenues support.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Alameda County Mayors' Conference at its meeting held on September 9, 2026, by the following member city vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTION:

I, Steven Bocian, Executive Director of the Alameda County Mayors' Conference, certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Alameda County Mayors' Conference at its meeting held on the X day of XX.

Steven Bocian
Executive Director, Alameda County Mayors' Conference

PROPOSITION

43 LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The text of this measure can be found on page 153 and the Secretary of State's website at *voterguide.sos.ca.gov.*

- Currently, local governments must obtain two-thirds voter approval to impose, extend, or increase special taxes (taxes dedicated to a specific purpose) that they place on the ballot. However, this two-thirds vote requirement does not currently apply to special taxes put on ballot by voter signature gathering.
- This measure would limit voters' ability to pass voter-proposed local special taxes by raising the percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measures from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds.
- Applies to voter-proposed ballot measures approved after January 1, 2027.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S ESTIMATE OF NET STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL IMPACT:

- Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes.

FINAL VOTES CAST BY THE LEGISLATURE ON ACA 22 (PROPOSITION 43)
(CHAPTER 132, STATUTES OF 2026)

Senate:	Ayes 35	Noes 1
Assembly:	Ayes 68	Noes 2

43

BACKGROUND

Local Governments in California. California has many local governments. These include cities, counties, special districts, and school districts.

Vote Thresholds for Local Taxes. The State Constitution allows local governments to increase taxes with local voter approval. Tax increases can be put on a ballot by voters or a local governing board (such as a city council or board of supervisors). Increases in some types of local taxes require a two-thirds vote to approve them, while other types of taxes require a majority (more than half) vote to approve them. Some local tax increases are approved permanently, while others are approved for a limited period of time. Before those taxes expire, voters can be asked whether to extend them.

PROPOSAL

Requires Certain Local Taxes Receive Two-Thirds Approval by Voters. Under current law, local taxes that are used for a specific purpose require a two-thirds vote to be approved. These are called special taxes. However, recent court decisions have allowed special taxes that are *proposed by voters* to be approved with a majority vote. Under Proposition 43, beginning on January 1, 2027, any new, increased, or extended local special taxes proposed by voters would require a two-thirds vote.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Possibility for Lower Local Government Tax Revenues in the Future. Proposition 43 makes it harder for local governments to pass certain taxes. As a result, local governments' tax revenues could be lower in the future than they otherwise would be. The actual revenue impact is unknown and would depend on future decisions by local governments and voters.

Visit *sos.ca.gov/campaign-lobbying/cal-access-resources/measure-contributions/2026-ballot-measure-contribution-totals* for a list of committees primarily formed to support or oppose this measure.

Visit *fppc.ca.gov/transparency/top-contributors.html* to access the committee's top 10 contributors.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 43 ★

VOTE YES ON PROP. 43: THE LOCAL TAXPAYER PROTECTION ACT

California families are struggling with the highest income, sales, and gas taxes in the nation. Yet politicians and special interests keep pushing higher taxes that make our cost of living even more expensive.

We can't afford to pay ANY MORE in new or higher taxes.

PROP. 43 RESTORES PROPOSITION 13 TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS

Proposition 13 was designed to make it harder to raise taxes, but court decisions created loopholes that allow special interests to impose massive new tax increases by circumventing the taxpayer protections voters approved. Californians are paying billions in new or higher taxes they would not have to pay if it weren't for these loopholes. Prop. 43 closes these loopholes and restores the two-thirds vote requirement to pass local special taxes.

PROP. 43 MAKES IT HARDER TO RAISE YOUR TAXES

Local governments have imposed over 2,000 new or higher taxes in the past decade, including higher sales, property and utility taxes—using the loopholes courts created in Prop. 13 to impose some of the most costly and damaging tax increases Californians face today.

These new and higher taxes make everything we buy or use more expensive, from food and gas to utilities and housing.

Prop. 43 guarantees voters the right to vote on all local taxes and restores the two-thirds vote for special local taxes.

PROP. 43 PROTECTS HOMEOWNERS FROM COSTLY NEW REAL ESTATE TAXES

California already has some of the highest housing costs in America, yet special interests are using court-created loopholes to add new taxes on the sale of homes, apartments and other real estate.

Some cities now charge real estate transfer taxes as high as 6%. For California's median-priced home of $900,000, that would cost a homeowner $54,000 simply for selling their house. Those costs steal homeowners' equity, raise apartment rents, and make building new housing more expensive.

Prop. 43 makes it much harder for special interests to impose these costly taxes on homeowners, renters, and small businesses.

PROP. 43 STOPS THE BAIT-AND-SWITCH TAX TRICKS

Politicians and special interests promise new taxes will fund schools, roads, and public safety—only to divert the money elsewhere and frustrate the will of voters.

Prop. 43 requires governments to spend tax revenue for the specific purpose voters approved and restores the broad voter support required before politicians and special interests impose earmarked tax measures.

If taxpayers are asked to pay more, they deserve the right to vote and the confidence their money will be spent as promised.

PROP. 43 PUTS VOTERS BACK IN CHARGE

Every election, politicians say they need just one more tax increase. Prop. 43 simply ensures TAXPAYERS are fully protected by the right to vote on taxes.

Vote YES on Prop. 43:

• Affirms the voters' right to vote on all new or higher local taxes. • Restores the two-thirds vote requirement for local special taxes. • Protects Proposition 13 and closes court-created loopholes. • Makes it harder for special interests to raise taxes. • Protects homeowners, renters, and small businesses from new real estate taxes. • Strengthens accountability for how taxpayer dollars are spent.

Robert Gutierrez, President
California Taxpayers Association

Robert Rivinius, President
Family Business Association of California

Julian Canete, President
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 43 ★

We all want relief from California's high cost of living. But Proposition 43 doesn't cut your taxes a penny. It attacks something far more valuable: the power of your vote.

43

PROP. 43 WEAKENS YOUR VOTE.

Today, when local voters decide how to fund their communities, the majority rules. Prop. 43 throws that out, letting just 33.4% of voters veto what nearly 67% want. Under Prop. 43, a NO vote counts twice as much as a YES. That isn't fair, and it isn't democracy.

PROP. 43 DEEPENS THE HOUSING CRISIS.

Across California, communities vote to build affordable homes for working families, seniors, and veterans. They are helping renters stay housed and move people off the streets. Prop. 43 hands a small minority the power to block those solutions, even when a clear majority of your neighbors support them.

PROP. 43 TIES YOUR COMMUNITY'S HANDS.

Prop. 43 makes it harder for you to fund the critical local services your community counts on: staffing fire stations and 911 response, preparing neighborhoods for wildfire, repairing crumbling roads, keeping schools, parks, and libraries open, and protecting local hospitals and clinics as Washington cuts healthcare funding. When funding is blocked, help arrives slower, classrooms grow more crowded, and communities are left less safe.

KEEP THE POWER WHERE IT BELONGS—WITH YOU AND YOUR NEIGHBORS.

That's why teachers, nurses, firefighters, and housing advocates all oppose Prop. 43.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 43.

www.NoProp43CA.com

Nick Lapis, Director of Advocacy
Californians Against Waste

Bill Barnes, Director of Campaigns & Community
Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

Steve Frisch, President
Sierra Business Council

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 43 ★

PROPOSITION 43 LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO FUND ESSENTIAL LOCAL SERVICES.

Prop. 43 makes it harder for you to fund critical services like police and fire departments, fix and repair local roads, staff our local schools or backfill federal healthcare cuts. Prop. 43 undermines the voice of voters and the majority vote by letting just one-third of voters (33.4%) block local voter decisions—and it makes it easier for corporate special interests to avoid paying their fair share.

PROP. 43 MAKES IT HARDER TO FUND FIRE AND POLICE SERVICES.

Local police and firefighters can't rely on Sacramento or Washington politicians. These services are funded at the local level. Prop. 43 wants to make it harder for local voters to direct new funding to services like police and fire. Without adequate funding, 911 response times are slower, fire stations sit understaffed, and families wait longer for help when every second counts. When a house fire breaks out—or a wildfire threatens our neighborhoods—that local funding is what protects us. Prop. 43 would let a small minority of voters block it. Even if 66% of voters say yes, Prop. 43 would prevent us from funding desperately needed local services.

PROP. 43 MAKES IT HARDER TO FIX ROADS, FUND SCHOOLS, AND PROTECT HEALTHCARE.

Across California, local voters have come together to repair crumbling roads and improve transportation, to fund their neighborhood schools, and to protect local hospitals and healthcare—especially as Washington cuts federal health funding. These are decisions communities make for themselves, by majority vote. Instead, Prop. 43 hands a small group of voters the power to veto those solutions, even when the majority supports them.

PROP. 43 EMPOWERS 33.4% OF VOTERS OVER THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY.

In America, we believe in one person, one vote—and the majority wins. Prop. 43 throws that out. It empowers just over one-third of voters to block what nearly 67% want. It puts the out-voted minority in charge—even if they are extremists. It makes their NO vote count twice as much as a YES vote.

CORPORATE DONORS BENEFIT. NOT TAXPAYERS.

Under Prop. 43, corporate donors who spend big in elections will benefit most. Right now, voters can hold these corporations and developers accountable at the ballot box, and make them pay their fair share for local needs. Prop. 43 is designed to take that power away—to protect the powerful few, at everyone else's expense.

That's why these organizations are asking you to vote NO on Prop. 43:

• California Professional Firefighters • Californians Against Waste • California Federation of Teachers • California School Employees Association • Communities for a Better Environment • AAPI Force • Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California • Nurses Alliance of SEIU California • Sierra Business Council

Vote NO to protect your vote and majority rule. Keep the power where it belongs—with you and your neighbors.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 43.

www.NoProp43CA.com

Darrell Roberts, President
California Professional Firefighters

Chris Harkins, Executive Director
Nurse Alliance of SEIU California

Adam Weinberger, President
California School Employees Association

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 43 ★

VOTE YES ON PROP. 43 TO RESTORE TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS

Californians already pay high taxes. But instead of prioritizing funding for critical services like police and fire, local politicians waste your money on their pet projects—then demand tax increases, claiming the need to fund the most important priorities.

The state Constitution requires a two-thirds vote for taxes earmarked for a specific purpose, but recent court decisions created a loophole that allowed special taxes to pass with fewer votes. Now Californians are paying billions in taxes they should not have had to pay.

Prop. 43 RESTORES the longstanding two-thirds vote requirement for local special taxes, protecting homeowners, renters, and small businesses from costly new sales and parcel taxes, taxes on electricity and gas, and real estate taxes.

Prop. 43 GUARANTEES taxpayers the right to vote on new or higher local taxes and requires governments to spend taxpayer dollars for the specific purposes voters approved—preventing bait-and-switch schemes that make our sky-high cost of living even worse.

Over the last decade, local governments have imposed 2,000 new or higher taxes. Prop. 43 CLOSES LOOPHOLES used to pass some of the most damaging tax increases, restores the protections voters originally approved under Proposition 13, and makes it harder for special interests to raise taxes without broad voter support.

The Legislature's nearly unanimous vote to place Prop. 43 on the ballot sends a clear message: activist courts exceeded voters' intent by creating loopholes that weakened Proposition 13's protections.

Restore your right to vote on ALL local taxes.

VOTE YES ON PROP. 43

Jon Coupal, President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Michael Hedges, President
California Small Business Association

Greg Van Dyke, Chairman
California Consumer Advocates for Affordability and Safety