

From: [City Clerk](#)
To: [Ashley Zieba](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 4:03:39 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

From: Christine Firstenberg <christine@cfirstenberg.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 4:01 PM
To: Bill Chapin <bchapin@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda

H Bill:

First of all, I want the City Council to know how well you took care of me at our meeting last week. Your kindness was so very much appreciated, even while delivering bad news.

Regarding your email below about a recap thru the CIP process....it is a non-starter for us. We noticed, just the water alone has increased substantially over the last year. Water in 2023 averaged \$410 for the 2 months. It wasn't much more in 2025 at \$415 for the 2 months, but the average for 2026 has risen to \$546 for the 2 months which is a 31% increase within 1 year. Some of this increase is due to the tenant's increase of usage, and some of it is the water agency. But a few of these type of increases, over a short time would make our retirement investment into a negative. We don't know when these type of increases will happen and have absolutely no control over them. So unless the City were to give the landlords an ongoing process by which to be made whole on the utilities, we would not do it. As over a short period, we could be under water.

The way I understand the ordinance installing a sub-meter allows the tenant to manage their own water usage as it shows them exactly what their usage is. This would be the only option for us and most landlords who want and need to manage their finances.

All in all, this ordinance, added to the rent control ordinance, is extremely difficult for small landlords to handle financially. And we ask that the City not approve it.

Thank you.

Christine Firstenberg

Lic # 00973135

Metrovation Retail Resources, President

Lic #02108374

925-381-8666

christine@cfirstenberg.com

<http://metrovationretailresources.com>

From: Bill Chapin <bchapin@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 3:05 PM

To: Christine Firstenberg <christine@cfirstenberg.com>

Cc: Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>;
City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda

Hello Christine,

Thank you for your feedback on the agenda item 7-C for the 6/16 council meeting. I see that you followed through on doing some research on the cost of submetering, as you mentioned when we met last week.

I did want to respond to provide some additional context about the proposed ordinance:

Staff is aware that separating utilities and installing separate meters can be very costly, especially for the older properties that make up much of Alameda's rental market. Please note that no landlord will be required to install separate meters. The proposal just allows landlords who want to make the investment to recover those costs through the existing CIP process.

Landlords who are unable to do this, or choose not to, would still receive the one-time rent adjustment equal to the average RUBS charges over a one-year period (as long as they submit documentation on time). Afterwards, if a landlord finds that rising utility costs are decreasing their rental income, they can apply for an additional upward rent adjustment through the existing Fair Return Petition process. These adjustments provide a way for the landlord to maintain the same net operating income they had beforehand, as is their constitutional right under the concept of Fair Return.

Regards,

Bill Chapin

Rent Program Director

City of Alameda Rent Program

www.alamedarentprogram.org

ph: (510) 747-7520 | rentprogram@alamedaca.gov



The Alameda Rent Program administers the City of Alameda's Rent Ordinance, which regulates rent increases and "no fault" terminations of tenancy and requires landlords to register all rental units.

Mailing Address: 950 W. Mall Square, Room 172, Alameda, CA 94501

24-Hour Drop Box: Oak Street between City Hall and Alameda Police Dept.

Hours of Operation: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday-Friday

From: Christine Firstenberg <christine@cfirstenberg.com>

Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 12:26 PM

To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk Team <CityClerk@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Andy Cell <andrewfirstenberg@gmail.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

We have read the proposed Ordinance to be discussed tonight under **Item #7-C, 2026-6053**, and as a small property owner in Alameda, we are opposed to this ordinance.

My husband and I own only this one rental property. This property investment, (bought in 2017 before the official rent control ordinance was passed, was where we placed our retirement monies. It is basically all we have other than the home we live in.

Last week I received by email a notice that the City Council was considering Item 7-C 2026-6053. This proposed ordinance disallows all landlords from estimating, via a ratio utility billing system, the utilities that landlords are legally allowed to charge back tenants for their utility usage.

As it so happens, the only utility our tenants are required to pay, that are not separately metered, is the water/sewer. After we get the bill from EBMUD every 2 months we invoice the 2 tenants for their usage, dividing the bill equally, which I am told is a form of RUBS.

After reading the proposed ordinance, I called both EBMUD and a local plumbing company to get estimates of the costs for either EBMUD meters or sub-meters. The costs are **huge**, and frankly extremely difficult for a small landlord to handle even with repayment back from the tenants (repayment over an elongated time period).

The EBMUD meters alone are \$20,000 each according to EBMUD. But this amount DOES NOT include what it takes to separate the utilities.

According to the plumbing company, for our duplex, it will take:

- Approx. \$15,000 in plumbing fees to run a new main line thru the building. Then the plumber must run sub lines to EVERY sink/toilet or water outlet (washers) in each of the units (each unit is 3 bedrooms and 2 baths with washer /dryers in units).
- Because the plumbers would have to tear up nearly every wall, the ceiling (in 1` unit) and the entire floor in the other unit, the construction repair costs are estimated to be \$15,000 to \$20,000 as all new sheetrock, and flooring must be installed.
- These numbers DO NOT INCLUDE the cost to bring both units totally up to the new codes since no interior construction has been done on the units since 1995.

Because the sub-meter itself is only about \$600 I think many landlords don't understand the extent of their liability.

The cost for this ordinance is truly untenable for small landlords. Please, please consider opposing this ordinance and allowing local landlords who do our best to follow the law, an ability to hold onto our retirement monies.

Andy and Christine Firstenberg

Property owners

1540 Buena Vista

Alameda, CA

From: [City Clerk](#)
To: [Ashley Zieba](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 3:44:15 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-0rqgfguo.png](#)

From: Bill Chapin <bchapin@alamedaca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 3:05 PM
To: christine@cfirstenberg.com
Cc: Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Re: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda

Hello Christine,

Thank you for your feedback on the agenda item 7-C for the 6/16 council meeting. I see that you followed through on doing some research on the cost of submetering, as you mentioned when we met last week.

I did want to respond to provide some additional context about the proposed ordinance:

Staff is aware that separating utilities and installing separate meters can be very costly, especially for the older properties that make up much of Alameda's rental market. Please note that no landlord will be required to install separate meters. The proposal just allows landlords who want to make the investment to recover those costs through the existing CIP process.

Landlords who are unable to do this, or choose not to, would still receive the one-time rent adjustment equal to the average RUBS charges over a one-year period (as long as they submit documentation on time). Afterwards, if a landlord finds that rising utility costs are decreasing their rental income, they can apply for an additional upward rent adjustment through the existing Fair Return Petition process. These adjustments provide a way for the landlord to maintain the same net operating income they had beforehand, as is their constitutional right under the concept of Fair Return.

Regards,

Bill Chapin

Rent Program Director

City of Alameda Rent Program

www.alamedarentprogram.org

ph: (510) 747-7520 | rentprogram@alamedaca.gov



The Alameda Rent Program administers the City of Alameda's Rent Ordinance, which regulates rent increases and "no fault" terminations of tenancy and requires landlords to register all rental units.

Mailing Address: 950 W. Mall Square, Room 172, Alameda, CA 94501

24-Hour Drop Box: Oak Street between City Hall and Alameda Police Dept.

Hours of Operation: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday-Friday

From: Christine Firstenberg <christine@cfirstenberg.com>

Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 12:26 PM

To: Marilyn Ezy Ashcraft <MEzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk Team <CityClerk@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Andy Cell <andrewfirstenberg@gmail.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

We have read the proposed Ordinance to be discussed tonight under **Item #7-C, 2026-6053**, and as a small property owner in Alameda, we are opposed to this ordinance.

My husband and I own only this one rental property. This property investment, (bought in 2017

before the official rent control ordinance was passed, was where we placed our retirement monies. It is basically all we have other than the home we live in.

Last week I received by email a notice that the City Council was considering Item 7-C 2026-6053. This proposed ordinance disallows all landlords from estimating, via a ratio utility billing system, the utilities that landlords are legally allowed to charge back tenants for their utility usage.

As it so happens, the only utility our tenants are required to pay, that are not separately metered, is the water/sewer. After we get the bill from EBMUD every 2 months we invoice the 2 tenants for their usage, dividing the bill equally, which I am told is a form of RUBS.

After reading the proposed ordinance, I called both EBMUD and a local plumbing company to get estimates of the costs for either EBMUD meters or sub-meters. The costs are **huge**, and frankly extremely difficult for a small landlord to handle even with repayment back from the tenants (repayment over an elongated time period).

The EBMUD meters alone are \$20,000 each according to EBMUD. But this amount DOES NOT include what it takes to separate the utilities.

According to the plumbing company, for our duplex, it will take:

- Approx. \$15,000 in plumbing fees to run a new main line thru the building. Then the plumber must run sub lines to EVERY sink/toilet or water outlet (washers) in each of the units (each unit is 3 bedrooms and 2 baths with washer /dryers in units).
- Because the plumbers would have to tear up nearly every wall, the ceiling (in 1` unit) and the entire floor in the other unit, the construction repair costs are estimated to be \$15,000 to \$20,000 as all new sheetrock, and flooring must be installed.
- These numbers DO NOT INCLUDE the cost to bring both units totally up to the new codes since no interior construction has been done on the units since 1995.

Because the sub-meter itself is only about \$600 I think many landlords don't understand the extent of their liability.

The cost for this ordinance is truly untenable for small landlords. Please, please consider opposing this ordinance and allowing local landlords who do our best to follow the law, an ability to hold onto our retirement monies.

Andy and Christine Firstenberg

Property owners

1540 Buena Vista

Alameda, CA

From: [Christine Firstenberg](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [City Clerk Team](#)
Cc: [Andy Cell](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Ordinance 2026-6053- Agenda Item 7-C- on tonight's agenda
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 12:26:13 PM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

We have read the proposed Ordinance to be discussed tonight under **Item #7-C, 2026-6053**, and as a small property owner in Alameda, we are opposed to this ordinance.

My husband and I own only this one rental property. This property investment, (bought in 2017 before the official rent control ordinance was passed, was where we placed our retirement monies. It is basically all we have other than the home we live in.

Last week I received by email a notice that the City Council was considering Item 7-C 2026-6053. This proposed ordinance disallows all landlords from estimating, via a ratio utility billing system, the utilities that landlords are legally allowed to charge back tenants for their utility usage.

As it so happens, the only utility our tenants are required to pay, that are not separately metered, is the water/sewer. After we get the bill from EBMUD every 2 months we invoice the 2 tenants for their usage, dividing the bill equally, which I am told is a form of RUBS.

After reading the proposed ordinance, I called both EBMUD and a local plumbing company to get estimates of the costs for either EBMUD meters or sub-meters. The costs are **huge**, and frankly extremely difficult for a small landlord to handle even with repayment back from the tenants (repayment over an elongated time period).

The EBMUD meters alone are \$20,000 each according to EBMUD. But this amount DOES NOT include what it takes to separate the utilities.

According to the plumbing company, for our duplex, it will take:

- Approx. \$15,000 in plumbing fees to run a new main line thru the building. Then the plumber must run sub lines to EVERY sink/toilet or water outlet (washers) in each of the units (each unit is 3 bedrooms and 2 baths with washer /dryers in units).
- Because the plumbers would have to tear up nearly every wall, the ceiling (in 1` unit) and the entire floor in the other unit, the construction repair costs are estimated to be \$15,000 to \$20,000 as all new sheetrock, and flooring must be installed.
- These numbers DO NOT INCLUDE the cost to bring both units totally up to the new codes since no interior construction has been done on the units since 1995.

Because the sub-meter itself is only about \$600 I think many landlords don't understand the extent of their liability.

The cost for this ordinance is truly untenable for small landlords. Please, please consider opposing this ordinance and allowing local landlords who do our best to follow the law, an ability to hold onto our retirement monies.

Andy and Christine Firstenberg
Property owners
1540 Buena Vista
Alameda, CA

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Thuy Nguyen](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:12 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,

Thuy Nguyen
2060 Central Avenue, Alameda

Sincerely,

Thuy Nguyen
2060 Central Ave
Alameda, CA 94501
thuytee@yahoo.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Mary Wang Oskamp](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:12 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

T0 raise the rental housing operation expenses will lead to harm housing providers and decrease the rental units in the City of Oakland

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Mary Wang Oskamp
199 California Dr
Millbrae, CA 94030
marywangoskamp@aol.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Anne Lowry](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:11 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

As a landlord who has periodically paid for tenant utilities, I can say without equivocation that tenants who do see what they are using or have to pay for what they use, do NOT conserve on their usage. When they see their abuses and have to pay for them, they become more responsible users. Keep the RUBS system in place, please.

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Anne Lowry
295 27th St
Oakland, CA 94612
acelowry@aol.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Sean Cahill](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:11 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Sean Cahill
1815 Broadway
Alameda, CA 94501
kelleycahill@yahoo.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Chris Hu](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:11 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Chris Hu
524 Alcalde Way
Fremont, CA 94539
mhxprs@yahoo.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Lindia Lachaux](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:11 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Lindia Lachaux
685 65th St
Oakland, CA 94609
redboneq45@aol.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Cecilia Pang](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:09 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Siu
Alameda Ca 94501

Sincerely,

Cecilia Pang
PO Box 2290
Alameda, CA 94501
cppang99@yahoo.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Mehmed Ahmetpahic](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:27:09 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Mehmed Ahmetpahic
2124 Alameda Ave Apt A
Alameda, CA 94501
djana5@aol.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Jon Chinn](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 7:18:09 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

Re: Council File No. 2026-6053 — Opposition to Proposed Ban on RUBS for New Tenancies

To the Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I strongly oppose any proposal to ban Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in Alameda. It would do real harm without delivering meaningful public benefit.

RUBS is not just a billing method. It is a conservation tool. When people see the link between use and cost, they are more likely to conserve. In a time of water scarcity and rising energy demand, Alameda should support practical conservation measures—not ban them.

RUBS also promotes fairness and transparency. When tenants know up front how utility costs are shared, they can make informed choices and avoid confusion later. Banning RUBS would not create fairness. It would only hide costs and shift them elsewhere.

Housing providers are already facing steep increases in insurance, utilities, maintenance, labor, compliance, and taxes. Removing RUBS would not erase those costs. It would push them into higher rents, delayed repairs, and less investment in housing quality.

In my own three Alameda units, RUBS has been fair, transparent, and workable. Tenants are told before signing the lease that they will pay their share of water costs, and the EBMUD bill is apportioned among the units. They have accepted that arrangement without issue. Most importantly, when residents know their own use affects what they pay, they have more incentive to conserve.

Alameda should support policies that conserve water, preserve transparency, and protect housing stability—not measures that only shift costs and make housing harder to maintain.

I urge the Council to reject any amendment to Council File No. 2026-6053 that would ban RUBS for new tenancies.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued service to the Alameda community.

Respectfully submitted,
Jon Chinn
Housing Provider
Alameda, California

Sincerely,

Jon Chinn
508 Kains Ave
Albany, CA 94706
dougchinn@earthlink.net

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Vincent Milani](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 10:40:13 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

I oppose the ban on RUBS

My duplex has only one water meter. I use RUBS to encourage water conservation. It is a fair system and is designed so that tenants never overpay for water usage by using a good will deduction and a common area deduction.

The tenants only share 85% of the total water bill. Don't ruin it by banning RUBS.

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Vincent Milani
1806 Weir Dr
Fairview, CA 94541
vcmilani@prodigy.net

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Sandra Youssefpour](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 8:14:12 AM

Dear City Council City Council,

I support rubs due to wasteful use if water by tenants. I have witness showers let running and sinks let running when not in use. The lack if unreported leaks to managers fir repair.

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Sandra Youssefpour
4645 Meritage Ct
Gilroy, CA 95020
syoussefpour@aol.com

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Gene Mahr](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:10:15 PM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
Gene Mahr

Sincerely,

Gene Mahr
570 Amber Isle
Alameda, CA 94501
genemahr@comcast.net

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of [Myrtis Cockrel](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C — Proposed Ban on RUBS
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:00:16 PM

Dear City Council City Council,

Council File #: 2026-6053 – Opposition to Agenda Item #7-C Proposed Ban on RUBS

Dear Council President and Honorable Council Members:

I am writing to respectfully oppose any proposal that would prohibit the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies in the City of Alameda.

RUBS is one of the most effective and proven conservation tools available to housing providers. Studies have shown that connecting residents to their actual utility costs leads to up to 30% reductions in consumption - a meaningful outcome for water, gas, and electricity usage. At a time when California continues to face significant challenges related to water availability, energy demand, and environmental sustainability, the City should be encouraging these results, not eliminating the policies that produce them.

Beyond conservation, RUBS delivers an important layer of transparency and accountability to the landlord-tenant relationship. When residents receive a clear accounting of how utility costs are calculated and allocated, it builds trust, encourages responsible usage, and removes the opacity that can lead to disputes. Prohibiting RUBS removes this accountability framework and shifts costs invisibly back onto property owners, with no corresponding benefit to residents or the environment.

Housing providers are already struggling with rapidly increasing operating expenses, including insurance premiums, utility costs, maintenance expenses, labor costs, regulatory compliance, and property taxes. Eliminating RUBS would remove an important management tool and further increase the financial burden on rental housing providers - ultimately making it harder and more expensive to maintain quality rental housing in Alameda.

The City of Alameda should pursue policies that encourage conservation, promote transparency, and support the continued operation of quality rental housing. Additional restrictions on housing providers will only make it more difficult to provide and sustain rental housing in an already challenging environment.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies and to reject any amendments to Council File 2026-6053 that would prohibit its use.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the residents of Alameda.

Sincerely,
[Property Owner / Housing Provider] [Address or Neighborhood, if desired]

Sincerely,

Myrtis Cockrel
3221 Blandon Rd
Oakland, CA 94605
cockrelmyrtis@comcast.net