LARA WEISIGER

From:	Alan Teague <alan@alameda.morphdog.com></alan@alameda.morphdog.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, October 01, 2019 3:49 PM
То:	LARA WEISIGER
Subject:	Re: Proposed 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Initiative

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any guestions. ***

Lara,

Yes, please use my typed name as my signature for the protest.

Thank you, Alan

On Oct 1, 2019, at 3:47 PM, LARA WEISIGER <<u>LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov</u>> wrote:

Hi Alan,

Please confirm you would like your typed name to serve as your signature and I will include your protest in the meeting record. Thanks, Lara

From: Alan Teague [mailto:alan@alameda.morphdog.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2019 3:41 PM
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <<u>MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov</u>>; John Knox White
<JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <<u>TDaysog@alamedaca.gov</u>>; Malia Vella
<<u>MVella@alamedaca.gov</u>>; Jim Oddie <<u>JOddie@alamedaca.gov</u>>
Cc: City Clerk <<u>CLERK@alamedaca.gov</u>>
Subject: Proposed 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Initiative

*** CAUTION: This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice-Mayor Knox White, Council Members Daysog, Vella and Oddie,

California Proposition 218 requires that a property-related fee program expenses to be fairly distributed among property owners:

The local government bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity, and that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=CONS§ionNum=SECTION%201.&article=XI II%20C

In the proposed ordinance there is a definition for 'multi-family residential' which includes the Use Code 7200 Single Family Residence Converted to 5+ units parcels. From an imperviousness point-of-view, these parcels are still on par with single family homes.

According to Jerry Bradshaw of the SCI Consulting group:

- 110 parcels are Use Code 7200

- Number of residential units vary from 5-12 with only 5 parcels having 10-12 units

- Lot size varies from 0.07 to 0.48 acres with the largest one having an approximate 55% impervious rating

- Many apartment buildings are up around 100% impervious

I own one of these parcels and am next door to a 'real' apartment building.

- The vast majority of rain water on my property goes into the ground, not the storm water system

- The vast majority of the rain water on the neighboring edge-to-edge apartment building goes into the storm water system

- Both of these parcels will be paying approximately the same \$400+ per year fee.

Had the carriage house not been converted into two units using the City's Substantial Rehabilitation program, the parcel would pay \$85.06 per year under this proposal. The footprint of the buildings on the parcel are the same.

The fee proposed by this initiative does not bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the impact the 7200 Use Code parcels impose on the storm water system.

Please change the definition of 'multi-family residential' to clarify that the 7200 Use Code IS NOT synonymous with apartment and IS NOT categorized as non-residential.

I'm in favor of this work but I want to see the fee fairly distributed according to Prop 218. Currently 10% of the parcels are paying over 50% of the total fee.

Unless the requested change to the definition of 'multi-family' is made, consider this a protest of the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Initiative.

Best regards, Alan Teague Alameda Resident and Property Owner Subject: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee (OPPOSED) Date: Sept. 30, 2019 Re: Parcel #70-152-32 1307 Wayne Court, Alameda



At this time I must submit my opposition to the proposed fee increase as it is currently written.

I do believe that Storm Water Protection is extremely important to both our community and to the Bay Area; however, I feel that the information that has been provided is somewhat ambiguous and lacks specific details with regards to who should be funding this program and why this falls on the shoulders of the property owners as a fee and not a general tax to the community.

- Automobiles contribute the highest degree of pollution from leakage of oil, gasoline and other petroleum products as well as particulate emissions that settle onto the streets and thereby washed into the bay. Why are apartment renters not required to pay their fair share. If they own an automobile, they are contributing to the problem. Condominium owners are being required to pay a "fee" per unit so why not apartment renters. The apartment building owner will be required to pay a "fee" which can be distributed to the renters. I feel that is not fair. If you have an mailing address in Alameda, you should be contributing to the "fee".
- 2. With the continued growth of building in the City, are the developers paying their fair share to the City for necessary upgrades that will be required since their developments are overloading our current systems. More homes mean more automobiles, more impervious ground covering, ie; sidewalks, driveways, roadways, roofs etc. I do not see anything regarding their contribution as part of the "fee" structure.
- 3. When I attended the first meeting there was a brief discussion of sea level rise. Exactly how is that being handled. There was no information at the meeting I attended as to what are some of the ways of confronting,

preparing and resolving sea level rise. Again, is this all going to land on the shoulders of the property owners to protect South Shore, the Navy Base, and other large developments along the shorelines of Alameda.

- 4. The automatic "fee" increase each year seems to be an open check book. How will the public be informed of the need for the fee increase each year? And by how much?
- 5. The City currently budgets the Storm Water Quality and Flood Protection program, a) from the existing \$56 fee and b) from the City general budget and recent ¼% tax. Will the program continue to receive its current budget allowance from the city or will this fee eliminate those monies? We were informed they would remain, but have not seen anything in writing.

Thank You,

Randy Horton

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest, c/o City Clerk, 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380, Alameda, CA 94501

To the City Council:

I am a property owner at 3009 Windsor Drive and 1336 Broadway in Alameda. I am writing to protest the manner in which you have proceeded to impose a storm drain/sewer fee on property owners in this city.

First, I did not receive the initial letter dated August 14th. I saw a copy only when my neighbors showed me their letter. I should have received two copies.

Second, the July 16th report is incomprehensible to the average property owner. For example, we question why we would pay for lagoon drainage on private properties along the south shore of the island. We cannot use these for even a walk. The BFI lagoons are accessible to the public, but not the south shore lagoons.

Third, aren't the lagoons the object of fees collected from the various HOAs? Is this not double payment for the same service?

Fourth, why did the City of Alameda wait **15 years** before asking for a report (how much did that cost us??) and then suddenly impose these fees, under duress, otherwise the Island would sink? This shows poor administrative planning.

Fifth, it seems that all controversial measures and decisions are proposed over the summer months when families are away, or in the weeks before school starts, when families are busy getting ready for the new school and work year. Is it easier to push these measures through when no one is paying attention? By the way, I have seen this with the ARPD and AUSD, besides the City Council.

Sixth, one of my properties is a fourplex rental unit. The City Council voted to limit any increase in rents to 2.8% every 12 months. It is ironic that now the City will boost our storm drain/sewer fees by 238%. How can you justify such short notice? The decision to limit rent increases also came with very short notice. I am not a big landlord! And I am not alone in that respect.

I was not in town on August 28th and September 10th for the presentation of this project. However, I have read all literature and still have no clear picture where the money will go. Sorry to say, but with the malfeasance demonstrated by some current councilmembers, **I don't trust you**.

Today, I would vote NO. It is up to you to regain my trust.

Sincerely, Patricia Bowen, property owner in Alameda September 26, 2019

Patricia Bon



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest % City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave Room 380 Alameda Ca 94501



City Clerk,

We oppose the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee as currently proposed. The fee increase represents a 240% increase or a 6% annual increase over the past 15 years. In addition the tax will increase annually by 3%. While we agree infrastructure updates need to be made we do not support this tax as is currently projected. Notification of this increase came out via mail and allowed homeowners 6 weeks to react. The letter was also sent during the summer when many are on vacation and less attentive to mail. Many of my neighbors have said they never received this letter and one of them owns rental property in town so should have received more than one letter.

The lagoon in Alameda has no public access and we do not believe the Alameda taxpayers should pay for its maintenance. The lagoon maintenance should be paid for by a homeowners association fee assessed to maintain the amenity by those who benefit from its existence.

The street sweeper is an expensive service and question how much trash is collected. The sweeper typically collects green waste which is not a pollutant in the water. In our neighborhood the street sweeper drives down the center of the street. When curbs are clear he does not pull into those areas but rather drives straight down the block. This expense, should the city deem it necessary, should not be paid for through this tax as it does little to prevent trash from entering our waterways.

What are other cities doing to update their systems? Our water quality is dependent on our neighbors behavior as well and ensuring they are in with us is significant. I and many of my neighbors have contacted city leaders, state and federal agencies about the homeless throwing human waste and trash into the estuary. No one has taken any action and nothing has been done to rectify this situation.

We object to the proposed increase of the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee. Requiring the majority of properties to submit protests against this fee through regular mail is not a fair democratic process. You state, "A majority vote of the property owners of the properties subject to the fee is needed for approval, with each parcel counting for one vote" but you are not abiding by this process.

Nanette Smith

3005 Windsor Dr Alameda Ca 94501

Roderick L Smith /

3005 Windsor Dr Alameda Ca 94501

LARA WEISIGER

From:	Ginnon <ginnonc@comcast.net></ginnonc@comcast.net>
Sent:	Monday, September 30, 2019 2:21 PM
То:	LARA WEISIGER
Subject:	RE: 2019 Water Quality and Flood protection fee

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any guestions. ***

Confirmed - Ginnon A Cunningham is my official signature. Thank you

From: LARA WEISIGER [mailto:LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2019 1:59 PM
To: Ginnon
Subject: RE: 2019 Water Quality and Flood protection fee

Hi Ginnon, Thank you for your email. Please respond to this email to confirm you would like your typed name below to serve as your official signature. Thank you, Lara

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk City of Alameda

From: Ginnon [mailto:ginnonc@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2019 12:15 PM
To: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Sarah Henry <SHenry@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: 2019 Water Quality and Flood protection fee

*** **CAUTION**: This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

I am not in favor of yet another fee and thus oppose the city using Prop 218 to add another tax. Please record my opposition.

Ginnon A Cunningham 2521 Washington Way Alameda, CA 94501 GinnonC@comcast.net

LARA WEISIGER

From:	Reyla Graber <reylagraber@aol.com></reylagraber@aol.com>
Sent:	Monday, September 30, 2019 2:03 PM
То:	LARA WEISIGER
Subject:	Re: Water Quality Initiative

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Hi Laura, Yes,its ok to use George and mine typed names. Thank you,

-----Original Message-----From: LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov> To: Reyla Graber <reylagraber@aol.com> Sent: Mon, Sep 30, 2019 1:59 pm Subject: RE: Water Quality Initiative

Hi Reyla, Can you please let me know if you would like your email to be used as a protest using your typed name as you written signature? Thanks, Lara

From: Reyla Graber [mailto:reylagraber@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2019 12:43 PM
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White
<JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella
<MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: ellivitt@alamedaca.gov; LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Water Quality Initiative

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Below is a summary from George Humphries, engineer and long time Alameda resident. His summary(below) concerns various figures given to the public regarding the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection initiative. Per George's analysis, the figures show several substantial discrepancies between the August 14 public mailing, the Public Meeting Fact Sheet and the City of Alameda website re Clean Water Initiative.

1. Existing income is stated to be \$2.5 million a year

 2. Proposed increase in monthly and/or yearly charges for average sized residence: Current fee = \$56.00 per year (pg.3 of website etc) Additional fee= \$78.00 per year

\$134.00 per year divided by 12 months = \$11.17 per month (*ok --this figure checks out*)

2.Annual budget figures: Pg 7 of 8 of website figures: (www.alamedaca.gov/clean water)

Current budget Without increase must decrease by	\$4million year divided by _ \$1 million a year	
	= 3million/year = 1.33 or 133 % per cent increase	
The proposed fee of	\$ 134.00 /year divided by \$56.00/ year = 2.39 or 239 % per cent increase	

This is a difference of over 100%. So does the total fee include capital expenditures? What? It must include more than bare operating costs.

However, the original public mailing dated 8/	/14/ 2019 contained different figures:
Existing income	\$2.5 million/ yr
Current expenses	\$4.2 million/yr
Needed to prevent current degradation	\$5.4 million/yr
	+
	= \$9.6 million/yr

Please compare \$9.6 million with \$4million/yr cited above. This does not correlate.

So, \$9.6 million/yr. divided by \$2.5 million/yr(stated current income)= 3.84 or a 384% increase, Whereas the new proposed total is only \$239\% /yr.

Then in the original mailing it also says they additionally they need a \$30 million bond for capital improvement. Would this amount be covered by a future bond issue? Depending upon the terms of a capitol bond, they might need \$1.5 million to \$2 million per year to pay off the bonds--in addition. Therefore, with the 30 m dollar bond, they might need \$11 million to \$12 million /yr total. **Assuming 25,000 residents, this bond plus the Initiative would require about \$400.00 per year per residence.**

In conclusion, as you the City Council, are the public guardians for Alameda residents and their taxpaying pocket books-if you have not already done so-- we ask you to take an in depth look and further analysis of the Water Quality Initiative figures.

Thank you, George Humphreys Reyla Graber , a manager a construction of the second states and the

P. 0. BOX 2109 Alameda, CA 94501 September 30, 2019

Liam Garland Public Works Director Office of the Public Works Director 950 West Mall Square, #110 Alameda, CA 94501

FAX: 510-522-7538

It would be nice to comply with the upgrades suggested. I note with great interest that along with the increase a 3 per cent increase as an inflation factor is included.

There is little satisfaction in the bold statement "dedicated only to our storm drainage system and <u>cannot</u> be used for any other purposes." The reality is the committees who oversee the use of funds are usually made of cronies to the politicians promoting these fees, and the oversight is a farce. If this sounds cynical, in fact it is the truth in far too many cases.

Additionally, since I own rental cottages in Alameda, the rent increases are capped at 2.8%. FEMA required me to purchase flood insurance last year. The cost for this came to \$2,000 alone. And I also brought my fire/liability coverage up to current prices. Another \$1,000 in premium.

EBMUD increased its fees 5 or 6% this year with the promise of an additional increase of the same percentage for 2020. I would really like to know who teaches economics to politicans.

Does Alameda want to become a city of slums and homeless because properties cannot be maintained on 2.8% rent increases. Then all other entities need to be capped. There has to some fairness for all, not just some groups backed by overly burdensome governmental policy makers.

Sincerely, Barbara Jolliffe

LARA WEISIGER

From:	John Knox White
Sent:	Friday, September 27, 2019 1:47 PM
То:	Liam Garland; City Clerk
Cc:	Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen
Subject:	FW: the Storm Drain and Sewer fee

Forwarding for response (Team Liam I believe) and to lodge their vote if they didn't also send to the clerk's office. (Irma/Lara/etc)

Best,

John Knox White Vice Mayor, Alameda

From: Patricia Bowen <patsbowen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Jim
Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Sarah Henry <SHenry@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: the Storm Drain and Sewer fee

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest, c/o City Clerk, 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380, Alameda, CA

To the City Council:

I am a property owner at 3009 Windsor Drive and 1336 Broadway in Alameda. I am writing to protest the manner in which you have proceeded to impose a storm drain/sewer fee on property owners in this city.

First, I did not receive the initial letter dated August 14th. I saw a copy only when my neighbors showed me their letter. I should have received two copies.

Second, the July 16th report is incomprehensible to the average property owner. For example, we question why we would pay for lagoon drainage on private properties along the south shore of the island. We cannot use these for even a walk. The BFI lagoons are accessible to the public, but not the south shore lagoons.

Third, aren't the lagoons the object of fees collected from the various HOAs? Is this not double payment for the same service?

Fourth, why did the City of Alameda wait **15 years** before asking for a report (how much did that cost us??) and then suddenly impose these fees, under duress, otherwise the Island would sink? This shows poor administrative planning.

Fifth, it seems that all controversial measures and decisions are proposed over the summer months when families are away, or in the weeks before school starts, when families are busy getting ready for the new school and work year. Is it easier to push these measures through when no one is paying attention? By the way, I have seen this with the ARPD and AUSD, besides the City Council.

Sixth, one of my properties is a fourplex rental unit. The City Council voted to limit any increase in rents to 2.8% every 12 months. It is ironic that now the City will boost our storm drain/sewer fees by 238%. How can you justify such short notice? The decision to limit rent increases also came with very short notice. I am not a big landlord! And I am not alone in that respect.

I was not in town on August 28th and September 10th for the presentation of this project. However, I have read all literature and still have no clear picture where the money will go. Sorry to say, but with the malfeasance demonstrated by some current councilmembers, I don't trust you.

Today, I would vote NO. It is up to you to regain my trust.

Sincerely, Patricia Bowen, property owner in Alameda September 26, 2019

September 26, 2019

City Clerk City of Alameda: Lara Weisiger; City Council of Alameda, 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Alameda CA 94501



As a property owner in Alameda I have found that a new fee/tax may be coming to Alameda property owners in addition to the current sewer tax. I understand that the City Clerk needs to be given notice as to any protest by October 1st, 2019 or at the public hearing the City Council is going to hold on October 1st 2019. As a point of reference I did not receive any notification as a property owner by mail. I was able to receive a copy through Liam Garland and Jerry Bradshaw via email.

I have read about the proposed fee/tax and at this time I am having difficulty supporting such an additional fee/tax. The proposed fee/tax does not a have sunset feature, and the fee/tax compounds annually. Over a ten year period the percentage of growth would be substantial. I understand that the cities of Moraga and Los Altos have both decided against such a measure as a fee/tax.

I do Protest this new proposed fee/tax in its current form. The parcel number which I note for my Alameda property is 74-426-5.

Regards,

ryl Jucey

Beryl Lucey

Flood Protection Fee Protest

C/o City Clerk

2263 Oak St Room 380

Alameda CA 94501

CITY OF ALAMEDA CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

We do not object to this tax which we will gladly pay on our own residence but we will not vote for this fee unless we can proportionally pass it on to our tenants on our rental property given the new rent cap at 70% of CPI.

Regards,

Karen Miller

Kall (1) Keith Miller

720 Paru St

2264 San Jose

September 22, 2019



City Council 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave, Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501

RE: Objection to the City of Alameda 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

Attention: Alameda City Councilmembers:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the City of Alameda's 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee increase proposal. We reviewed the City of Alameda's 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee public notice letter ("Letter") dated August 14, 2019 detailing the proposed fee increase on property owners for the city's storm drainage system management. We as property owners at 9 Killybegs Road, Alameda oppose the City of Alameda's proposed fee increase as it puts an undue burden of cost on the property owner for the following reasons:

- The July 2019 City of Alameda Fee Report ("Report") does not indicate how the cost estimates for certain repair projects shown in Appendix A, Table 9 were derived and if such estimates are justified.
- Water Quality is in the Report's title and subsequent subsections, but it does not provide any quantitative storm water runoff monitoring data that supports the claim that the City of Alameda would be in jeopardy of not being in compliance with its NPDES permit ("Permit") or other federal or state water quality standards.
- The Letter states that if funding is not obtained that cut back in services such as street sweeping, drain and pipe cleaning, beach cleanups and pump station upgrades. The report does not explain whether these activities are required BMPs used to comply with the NPDES or if they are optional activities for which the City of Alameda if it chooses to cut back or eliminate.
- Table 3 of the Report calls out funding for enhanced operations and improvements as part of high priority CIP. It is unclear, as those items as marked warrant the same priority compared to projects that are vital and necessary such as general replacement of like for like.
- Though not verified, we believe the homeowner associations (at least on Harbor Bay Isle) pays for the maintenance and upkeep of the Bay Farm lagoons that are also shown in the Report.
- The Report discusses fees associated with flood control/prevention, the Report does not discuss
 the history of floods or it's real impact to homes and business. That is, the number of actual
 floods resulting from rain storms, how large the affected areas were and to what extent such
 homes or businesses actually incurred as a direct result of inadequate drainage. Based on
 Alameda's climatology (in terms of historical rainfall amounts) it would seem that the cost of
 flood avoidance compared to any temporary inconvenience caused by such floods (as a
 percentage of alameda's total number of homes/business) may not be justified in this case.

• The Report does not discuss other options in obtaining the necessary funding such as government grants, EPA or state initiatives, Mello-Roos, municipal bonds, and the General Fund etc. Rather it puts the burden solely on the property owners.

While we recognize the cost of services and equipment have increased over time, we believe the amount of fee increase is disproportionate to the base fee level we currently pay even taking into account general inflation rates (up to 3% per year) and is not justified along with the lack of evidence of water quality or actual flood data.

Thank you for your consideration to the items discussed.

Sincerely,

David and Treya Weintraub 9 Killybegs Road Alameda, CA 94502

Treya Wintrack



-

September 18, 2019

2019 Water Quality & Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Rm. 380 Alameda, CA 94502

RE: 12 Kara Road Alameda, CA 94502

This shall serve as a written protest to the proposed fee.

We object to this fee.

Sincerely,

james Kinney

Geanne Kinney

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

c/o City Clerk, 2263 Santa Clara Ave. Room 380,

Alameda, CA 94501

TO Whom It May Concern;

I am the homeowner at 3119 Bayview Drive, here in Alameda, CA. 94501. I am writing to oppose the tax being considered, labeled the "2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee".

There are many reasons I oppose this fee, so I am going to forego listing them. I will say that I believe the City council and particularly members of this City Council have hurt this city financially, and should not be on the council. Everyone knows the members in question.

I have had some correspondence with one such member who violated my trust and sent my e-mails received in confidence to my adversary. I do not trust these untrustworthy members of the City Council, and therefore I do not believe in giving money to persons of questionable character.

Please put me down as a NO. I protest this fee.

Best Regards, Homeowners of: 3119 Bayview Dr. Alameda, CA. 94501

laurice M

CITY OF ALAMEDA CITY CLERK'S OFFICE



Keith and Diane Frederick 1287 Caroline Street Alameda, CA 94501 Sept. 15, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave. Room 380 Alameda CA 94501

Dear City of Alameda Clerk,

I object to the proposed additional storm drainage fee called * 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee. There was no accountability to how the current fees where used. You offer no explanation on how much money was collected over the years for the current fee and how it was spent. In fact, it may have been put into the "General Fund" and spent on city officials "Golden Parachutes" who are fired and sue and get a severance package. Even if the current fee is monitored there is no guarantee that in times of tight budgets that the money would not be loaned to other departments to cover their shortfalls.

We all work off of household budgets with finite amounts of money. The city need to stop crying "wolf" and trying to circumvent their allotted tax budget by asking for more money all the time. I already pay for bloated school and hospital parcel taxes, Parks and Recreation utility taxes including internet and cell phone services, increased sale taxes to cover police and fire services.

As seniors on a fixed income I am appalled by your proposal! Where will it all end? I vote to disapprove your proposal.

The following listed properties are owned by us:

- 1. 1287 Caroline Street APN: 74-1290-36
- 2. 826 Pacific Avenue APN: 73-407-29
- 3. 830 Pacific Avenue APN: 73-407-30
- 4. 1714 Nason Street APN: 73-409-29

Thank you for your kind attention in this matter.

Sincerely Yours,

Keith R. Frederick Diane M. Frederick Diane M. Frederick

September 18, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 380Alameda, CA 94501



RE: 2846 Lincoln Avenue Alameda, CA 94501 Parcel 69-101-7 1 residential unit

Dear Sir,

We object to the proposed 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee increase.

Sincerely, (gerez

Rockne P. and Cathy J. Harmon 2846 Lincoln Avenue Alameda, CA 94501

September 18, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 380Alameda, CA 94501



RE: 1045 Regent Street Alameda, CA 94501 Parcel 70-182-25 5 residential units

Dear Sir,

We object to the proposed 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee increase.

Sincerely, - Coco H (topue)

Rockne P. and Cathy J. Harmon 2846 Lincoln Avenue Alameda, CA 94501

9.15.19

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I AM THE OWNER of PROPERty at 1016 UNION St. ALAMEDA, CA. MY NAME IN JAMES A.KLINE

I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED FEE REGARDing the 2019 WATER QUALITY AND FLOOD PROTECTION FEE.





John and Sandra Childs 1308 Wayne Ct Alameda, CA 94501



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave. Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501

City Clerk:

We are opposed to the proposed 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee and would like to file our objection with the City clerk.

Thank you.

John Childs

Childs

Sandra Childs

We own 2 Alameda Parcels:

1308 Wayne Ct Alameda,CA

2163-65 Lincoln Ave. Alameda,CA 94501 Paul & Joni Mahler 1100 Paru Street Alameda, CA 94501 (510) 205-9231



September 18, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest
c/o City Clerk
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 380
Alameda, CA 94501

RE: 1100 Paru Street, Alameda Objection to Increased Fee

To Whom it May Concern:

The undersigned, owners of the above real property in Alameda, California, write to object to the increased water quality and flood protection fee.

While our objection stands on its own, there are three issues related to the fee that I would like to comment on. First, this is a tax, not a fee. It should be treated like that, and calling it a fee is wrong.

Second, the voting process here, fee or tax, is unfair. This should be voted on by all homeowners in an active ballot. Using a "default" of approval unless more than 50% of homeowners write in to object is unreasonable. This is similar to "opt-out" options on many websites, a practice that is forbidden, or at least limited, by statute.

Third, where are the financials? You are more than doubling the fee, and say expenses exceed expenses, but you provide no support for that assertion. At a minimum, more detailed financial information should have been included in the mailer. As it stands, it looks like more money to the same folks (the City) that has a long history of not properly managing its income and expenses.

incerely, Jon, Mahlen

Paul and Joni Mahler

Sept 10, 2019

al object to the proposed 2019 Water Quetily and Flood Protection Fee-

Beber & Morgan Bol Shonn ST. 120 meda, Ca - 94130)



From : Elizabeth Adelstein 914 Taylor Ave Alameda, Ca 94501



Sept 16, 2019

_P

To the City Clerk,

re : the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

I object to the fee on the basis that, any new developer would not have to equally pay the share per acre or sq. ft.

I do agree that upgrades to the storm drain system are needed.

When the city can assure me that every new developer, or home owner within a new development in our city of Alameda will equally pay the parcel fee (as determined by lot size), that is here being applied, than I will gladly vote for this fee and pay my part.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Adelstein

- -

Mynha adula

Donald and Karen McGregor 1 Applegate Way Alameda, CA 94502



September 12, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee c/o City Clerk * 2263 Santa Clara Avenue Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501

SUBJECT : 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Proposition 218

As the owner of three (3) parcels of land in the City of Alameda, 1 Applegate Way, 52 Maitland Drive and 3205 Fir Avenue, we vote NO on Proposition 218.

After attending the meeting on September 10th, 2019 we determined that portions of the Proposition would not be beneficial to Alameda property owners, based on the following:

- 1. The annual increase of no greater than 3% each year tied to the Consumer Price Index.
- 2. The increase is too high, a 141% increase. The explanation regarding why we would have two buckets of funds was insufficient.
- 3. The fee has no end date and would continue into perpetuity, therefore, we forsee that a minimal review of expenses would be performed each year.

Yours truly,

Donald McGregor

en Meltrez.

Karen McGregor

august 17, 2019 NECELVET 2019 Water Quality / Hood Fee Protest City of alameda SEP 17 2019 CITY OF ALAMEDA Y CLERK'S OFFICE Dear Mrs. Aarah Henry, I recently received your letter saying you want an additional \$11.17, from me for the Clean Water Program. I our a duples, live one half, rent the other. My sole income is a small social security Disability check and rent from one rental. Because of your Rent Control Program, I am only able to raise my tenants rent \$ 53.20 per month. So for the City to ask for #11. 17 a month is significant. On one hand you are telling me how to run my rental business and the other hand you are asking for more money. My house needs repairs, but I can't afford your permit fees and then I fear my taxes being raised. clam the "Mom and Pop" landlord, but actually just the "Mom." your letter says street sweeping might be curtailed. The front of my property rarely gets cleaned by the City - too many parked cars! I am out at least every other day sweeping my gutter. Thank you for hearing my perspective. Respectfully, Mary Cerusma (510) 915-1011 Mary Perusina 1021 Fincoln ave. alameda, CA 94501

I appose the \$13 fee to cover water quality & flood protection. This affects all protection . utizens of alanded & all should pay fee in someway hurease sales tax etc.

Deanne Richmond 16 Avondale Landing Alameda, C1 94502



August 17, 2019



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

% City Clerk

2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 360

Alameda, Ca 94501

This is a protest of the fee.

Parcel Number 74-428-5

635 Santa Clara Avenue

Alameda Ca 94501

Stanly B. Smith

Stanley B. Smith, co owner

1611 Wood Street

Alameda. CA 045-1

Bergin L. Rubiolo Georgia L. Rubiolo, co owner



3541 Norman Lane Alameda, CA 94502

September 9, 2019

Alameda City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave, Room 380 Alameda, CA 94502

Re: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter is to document my objection to the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection proposed fee.

I am a homeowner in Alameda. My address 3541 Norman Lane, Alameda, CA 94502.

Thank you,

Deborah Kleinfeld

9/8/5

TO THECITY COUNCIL OF ALAMEDA:

DR. LESLIE HILGER and MARY ELENA GOODAN reside at and are the legal owners of: 1250 Saint Charles Street ALAMEDA. We refuse to pay \$78.00 in fees for water, water infra-structure or sewer. We will continue to pay our taxes as usual.

yours truly,



Mary Elena Lookan Hohen MM LESLIE & FULGOR

2940 Fernside Blvd. Alameda, CA 94501 September 11, 2019

City Clerk's Office City Hall, Alameda, CA 94501



LETTER REGARDING OWNER ARGUMENT OVER INCREASE PROPOSAL

To Whom it may concern,

Upon learning that the city wants owners of rented condos, houses, apartments, to willingly give an extra \$58.00 (for should be city expense) after already taxing a previous previous amount this year I am appalled that our city is so money-oriented.

We owners have a rental (since 1986) 33 years at 950 Shorepoint Court, South Shore Beach and Tennis club condos. This October we will increase the rent 2% to \$1400 for a one bedroom, one bath unit. Being part of this association we pay a monthly fee of \$369.00. Therefore, we will receive about \$1000 a month.

We do not feel that it is fair for the city to ask more money for any owner. Some owners have multiple properties, which means more expense. Cannot vouch for these owners, but we absolutely refuse to pay a voluntary additional expense. The city can find a better way to fund an increase revenue.

Sincere home owners and condominium renters,

wen Pirack

Larry and Gwen Pirack

cc: Mayor Marilyn Ashcroft

September 6, 2019

Mary J. Clerk 1629 Alameda Avenue Alameda, CA 94501

City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Avenue Room 380 Alameda, California 94501

RE: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

To Whom It May Concern:

Why should property owners alone shoulder the cost of performing necessary work that benefits all Alameda residents? In order to be fair, these costs *MUST INCLUDE RENTERS*, not property owners exclusively.

As owner of a parcel of real property located at 1629 Alameda Avenue, Alameda, California 94501, I hereby submit my written protest objecting to the proposed fee for the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection.

Property owners bear enough burden.
"Enough is enough"!

Mary J.//Clerk 1629 Alameda Avenue Alameda, California 94501



NORTHWESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY

5-2103

REDWOOD EMPIRE ROUTE

September 5, 2019 Enough, as someone of a fixed income I am seek of government imposing more cost increases and fees. EBMUD just raised fees. I have never had children is public schools yet I pay for other peoples' children's schooling. No more fees, Bruce Sherman 438 Taylor Ave Alameda, CA 94501

Buce Sherman


David Louis 153 Anderson Road Alameda, CA 94502

September 6, 2019

City of Alameda, Office of City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave, #380 Alameda, CA 94501

- Re: Opposition to Proposed \$78 Fee for Property Owners for 'Water Quality and Flood Protection'
- To Whom It May Concern:

I am in opposition to the proposed \$78 fee charged only to Alameda property owners.

Alameda already has restricted rental increases but our expenses keep going up.

The property owners are left paying for EVERYTHING, including the registration fee

for rental units etc., that we can't recoup from our tenants. It is time for the tenants

to bear some of these fees!

Jaced haven !

Alameda Property Owner of 153 Anderson Road 266 Beach Road 1501 Encinal Avenue



City Clepk 2263 Santa Claca alameda. Con 945'01

This letter is in apposition to keep fee of \$78.00 per Romeownee - Chun feer

Owner-Margaret Lomba 1100 Bay St. Quameda. Calif 94501

Sept 5, 2019



9/10/19

City of Alameda Atta City Clerk

WILLIAM J. DOAN Sheila A DOAN

3018 Grabous DR Alameda

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection fee.

We appose this see as home owners.

Will- / Dea-510 865-5615-



Sept. 5, 2019



Liam Garland, Public Works Director 950 West Mall Square, Suite 110 Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr. Liam Garland

As 33 year homeowners in Alameda we are opposed to yet another additional fee of \$78 a year plus annual fee hikes for flood protection.

The quality of life goes rapidly downhill as developers make huge profits by greatly increasing the population without paying the inherent increase in pollution they are and will be causing. Therefore they should be paying for the proposed fee hikes concerning water quality and flood issues.

Sincerely,

-

C+D

Property Owners 1360 Burbank St. Alameda, CA 94501



From:	Todd Wehmann <ptwehmann@gmail.com></ptwehmann@gmail.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, September 10, 2019 5:51 PM
То:	LARA WEISIGER
Subject:	Re: Against Proposed Water Quality/Flood Fee Increase

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

No need to mail. Typed signature is fine. Thanks

On Tue, Sep 10, 2019 at 4:22 PM LARA WEISIGER <<u>LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov</u>> wrote:

The other option is to mail a signed letter to the Clerk's office.

From: Todd Wehmann [mailto:ptwehmann@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 4:11 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER <<u>LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov</u>>
Subject: Re: Against Proposed Water Quality/Flood Fee Increase

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

I guess. Is there another option?

On Tue, Sep 10, 2019 at 9:06 AM LARA WEISIGER <<u>LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov</u>> wrote:

Hi Todd,

Can you please confirm that you would like your typed name below to serve as your signature for this protest?

Thanks,

Lara

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk

From: Todd Wehmann [mailto:ptwehmann@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 8:34 AM
To: City Clerk <<u>CLERK@alamedaca.gov</u>>
Subject: Against Proposed Water Quality/Flood Fee Increase

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposed flood fee increase for two core reasons:

1. While this fee has not been increased in 15 years, the proposed fee now represents a compounded annual growth rate of 6%. Over that same period CPI for Oakland/Hayward has been 2.6%. So the proposal effectively doubles the rate of CPI, which we have all been forced to accept as gospel to govern all rent increases.

2. Unless this fee can be fully passed through to renters I will not support any increase in this fee. Renters are benefiting from it, so should also have to pay for it.

As a result I do not support this proposal.

Todd Wehmann

September 4, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest 2263 Santa Clara Avenue Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501



Dear City Clerk,

This note voices opposition to this proposed parcel tax that would raise property taxes for Alameda homeowners.

The reasons for opposing this are as follows:

The Prop 218 method of raising funds is a disingenuous way for the City Government to raise funds by focusing the monetary impact to only property owners. Renters are excluded and therefore expected to accept rent increases when their landlords raise the rent to pay for this.

Alameda voters already approved a 0.50% sales tax last November which was designed to pay for city projects such as this. It appears that these additional monies should be allocated from these new funds to pay for these types of program.

And once again there is no sunset date for the expiration of this parcel tax.

Admittedly, clean storm water management is important to the community but funding this project by prudent, transparent and all-inclusive budget management are the most responsible way to pay for this.

The City must start cutting costs and begin living within it's means. Thank you.

(MAI

Thomas J Krysiak 308 Sweet Road Alameda, CA 94502-7787

Citi of allaweda, California.

Water Quality and flood protection fee, Protest

Weare protesting, proposed 2019 Water

Quality and flood protection fee.

Owners of property, 17 Garden Rd. alameda, CH 94502 Parcel Number 74-1035-59

Vadim Perlin and Zinaida Perlin, TRS. N. Muf, 3 Bolley August 27, 2019.



8.29.19

Dear Water Quality Committee, I already have Home Owners Inscrance. I do not want additional Fees from Alameda City Clerk. We I am not in the Flood Zone according to Islandia Hame Owners Association. Thank low,

Anne Faria-Paintes the twin kyntie

3212 Fiji Lane Alameda, CA 94502



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Project c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Avenue Rm.380 Alameda, CA. 94501

Dear Sir,

I would like to raise objection to such a raise in my property taxes with the proposed Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee. We are already paying a flood control fee. I own 1200 sq. ft condominium, pay an HOA of \$410 monthly and pay property taxes of \$7236 per year. I am a retired person and any raise in taxes is a hardship.

My address is 1041 Tahiti Lane on Bay Farm and my parcel number is 74-1070-69.

Please register my objection to this new tax.

Jill H Daly 1041 Tahiti Lane Alameda, CA 94502



August 30, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o Alameda City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380 Alameda, Ca. 94501



Re: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

Alameda City Council, Mayor, City Clerk and Public Works Director;

We are writing today with our very strong opposition to this Proposed Fee. We are the owners of 3 parcels here in Alameda and have included our parcel numbers and declare our 3 votes in complete and total Opposition to another fee against our properties and will continue to oppose any additional fees against our properties.

- Parcel #: 071-0234001300 (2145 Santa Clara Ave., Alameda, Ca.)
- Parcel #: 071-025500900 (2065 Eagle Ave., Alameda, Ca.)
- Parcel #: 074-125508900 (892 Union St., Alameda, Ca.)

All of our properties are in the name of Glenn B & Kathleen N Henderson, Trustees.

Slenn B. Henler

Glenn B. Henderson 892 ½ Union St. Alameda, Ca. 94501

Kattleen & Hende

Kathleen N. Henderson 892 ½ Union St. Alameda, Ca. 94501

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest

c/o City Clerk

2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380

Alameda CA 94501

August 23, 2019

Dear Sir or Madame

I am writing to respectively protest the proposed increases in the fees charged for Water Quality and Flood Protection.

I object on the following grounds:

- 1) Costs should be eliminated first before charging property owners. For example, street sweeping on Bay Farm is unnecessary because there are so many cars parked on the streets making the work meaningless.
- 2) Flooding has never been an issue
- 3) To saddle property owners with costs that may benefit the entire community (although benefits are not necessarily shown) is unfair;
- 4) To build in an inflation factor at 3% without regard to actual inflation or the CPI is arbitrary.
- 5) This is yet another charge born by the property owners in Alameda when there are more renters in the city with the property owner yet again bearing the burden that is not shared uniformly. While California law may dictate this, my only remedy is to object to this charge when given the opportunity to do so

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

enco Caha

Denise Cahalan

Property: 160 Cumberland Way; APN 074-1325-066

25l5 Central Avenue, #302 N APN 070-0170-032.



From:	Helen Simpson <hsimpson@mpbf.com></hsimpson@mpbf.com>
Sent:	Thursday, August 29, 2019 9:24 AM
То:	LARA WEISIGER
Subject:	RE: Opposing the Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any guestions. ***

Yes, please use the below name as my signature.

Helen Simpson

From: LARA WEISIGER [mailto:LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 8:09 AM
To: Helen Simpson <HSimpson@MPBF.com>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: RE: Opposing the Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

Hi Helen,

Can you please confirm that you would like your typed name below to serve as your signature for this protest? Thanks,

Lara

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk City of Alameda

From: Helen Simpson [mailto:HSimpson@MPBF.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 4:58 PM
To: City Clerk <<u>CLERK@alamedaca.gov</u>>
Subject: Opposing the Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Clerk.

I am a property owner and I am informing you that I am opposed to the new fee for the Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee that will only be paid by the property owners. This fee should be paid by all residents in Alameda, not just property owners.

Helen Simpson 307 Capetown Drive Alameda, CA 94502



P.O. Box 2291 San Francisco, CA 94126

August 24, 2019

2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk City of Alameda 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501

Re: 2358 Coral Sea Street, Alameda 94501

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am the owner of the above-referenced property. I object to the City's proposed "2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee." This "fee" appears to be a general property tax that has not been approved by the voters as required by the California Constitution.

Very truly yours,

Thomas C. Mitchell, Trustee

The City Council c/o City Clerk, 2263 Santa Clare Ave, Rm.380, AlamedaCA 94501 August 20, 2019



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

Property owner: Lee, Janet TR

Address: 1041 Holly Street, Alameda CA 94502

Parcel Number 74-1075-12

I protest against 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee which prosposal by the City of Alameda.

Janet Lee TR.

Signature: Dattel



2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Protest c/o City Clerk 2263 Santa Clara Ave., Room 380 Alameda, CA 94501

Paul Soo, Jr.

APN# 74-1320-100

308 Channing Way Alameda, CA 94502

I am protesting the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Sarah Henry Tuesday, August 20, 2019 1:09 PM LARA WEISIGER FW: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee001.pdf

From: Water Dogg [mailto:waterdogg8888@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 10:32 PM
To: Sarah Henry <SHenry@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear City of Alameda.

I am writing to let you know that I will not be able to attend the meetings about the 2019 Water Quality and Flood Protection Fee. However, I would like to formally voice my opposition to this extra fee. Attached is a copy of my property tax bill. As you can see, there are already 15 special assessments already added on to our bill totaling \$1381. Each entity or ballot measure claims "It's only \$10 per month or \$5 per month, but adding it all up and then multiplying by 12 comes out to a lot of extra money each year. It seems as though anytime someone wants money, they just add it on to the homeowner's property tax bill and the homeowner has no choice but to pay it or lose their house.

In addition, with rising values in homes, comes rising property tax revenue since property taxes are based on the value of the home. Shouldn't this extra revenue cover the cost of Water Quality and Flood Protection?

Lou Fong 205 Avington Rd. Alameda, CA 94502

2018-2019 For Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2018 and Ending June 30, 2019

ALAMEDA COUNTY SECURED PROPERTY TAX STATEMENT

Henry C. Levy, Treasurer and Tax Collector 1221 Oak Street, Room 131 Oakland, California 94612

Parcel Number	Tracer Number	Tax-Rate Area	Special Handling
74-1322-53	18237600	21-000	

Location of Property 205 AVINGTON RD, ALAMEDA Assessed to on January 1, 2018 FONG LOU J & LIZ

FONG LOU J & LIZ 205 AVINGTON RD ALAMEDA CA 94502-6433

հվիլիութինների,ներիների,իներիներուներիուի,իների,ին

Taxing Agency	Tax Rate	Tax Amount
COUNTYWIDE TAX	1.0000%	4,401.75
COUNTY GO BOND	.0112%	49.29
CITY OF ALAMEDA	. 0220%	96.84
SCHOOL UNIFIED	.09747	428.73
SCHOOL COMM COLL	. 0269%	118.41
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT	.0070%	30.81
EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK	.0057%	25.09
TOTAL	1.1702%	5,150.92

PLEASE READ IMPORTANT MESSAGES

A FEE OF \$ 61.00 WILL BE IMPOSED ON ALL RETURNED OR DISHONORED PAYMENTS.

Description	Phone	Amount
CITY SEWER SERVICE MOSQUITO ABATEMENT CSA PARAMEDIC CSA VECTOR CONTROL HEALTHCARE DIST * SCHOOL MEASURE B1 PERALTA CCD MEAS B SFBRA MEASURE AA HAZ WASTE PROGRAM CSA VECTOR CNTRL B MOSQUITO ASSESS 2 AC TRANSIT MEAS VV EAST BAY TRAIL LLD EBRP PARK SAFETY/M URBAN RUNOFF	(800)676-7516 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (800)273-5167 (888)512-0316 (888)512-0316 (510)670-6615	313.80 1.74 32.86 5.92 298.00 485.12 485.12 485.12 12.00 7.40 4.05 96.00 56.14
* Possible Sr Exempt - Call Agency		
Total Fixed Charges and/or Special A	Assessments	1,381.00

Description	Full Valuation	x Tax Rate	= Tax Amount
LAND IMPROVEMENTS FIXTURES	134,076 313,099		
TOTAL REAL PROPERTY PERSONAL PROPERTY	447,175		
GROSS ASSESSMENT & TAX HOMEOWNERS EXEMPTION	447,175 -7,000		5,232.83 -81.91
NET ASSESSMENT AND TAX	440,175	1.1702%	5,150.92
			5,150.92
First Installment	Second Installme	nt T	otal Amount Due
\$3,265.96	\$3,26	5.96	\$6,531.92

SECOND INSTALLMENT PAYMENT, 2018-2019 PARCEL NO. 74-1322-53

2



82019 0182376001 4000326596 0000000

ECHECK ACCEPTED THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019 ONLINE @www.acgov.org/propertytax/ .

VISA, MASTERCARD, DISCOVER OR AMERICAN EXPRESS CREDIT CARDS ACCEPTED ONLINE @ <u>www.acgov.org/propertytax/</u> OR BY PHONE (510)272-6800,MOBILE @ www.acgov.org/mobile/apps/ THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019 . A CONVENIENCE FEE EQUAL TO 2.5% OF THE TAX AMOUNT DUE WILL BE ADDED TO YOUR TOTAL PAYMENT.

SUBSCRIBE TO RECEIVE E-MAIL ALERTS ABOUT IMPORTANT PROPERTY TAX DATES ONLINE @ www.acgov.org/propertytax/ .

PLEASE SEE REVERSE FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Tax Collector's Office 龠 **Payment Questions/Credit Card Payments** (510) 272-6800
- Assessor's Office 82 Valuation/Exemption (510) 272-3787 (510) 272-3770

From: Sent: To: Subject: Sarah Henry Tuesday, August 20, 2019 1:08 PM LARA WEISIGER FW: Public works fee

From: Jay Schurman [mailto:jayschurman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 12:58 PM
To: Sarah Henry <SHenry@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Public works fee

*** CAUTION: This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any guestions. ***

Sarah,

We do not want to vote for this new fee, the 1/2 percent tax increase we just passed gives the revenue needed. How can we oppose this new tax?

Sincerely,

Jay Schurman 3321 Central Ave Alameda --Jay Schurman August 16, 2019

2019 Water Quality & Flood Protection Fee Protest

c/o City Clerk

2263 Santa Clara Ave. Room 380

Alameda, CA 94501



City Clerk,

We are the owners of 1517-19 Park St., Alameda, CA 94501.

Please accept this letter as my objection to the proposed 2019 Water Quality & Flood Protection Fee.

Sincerely,

Timothy Martini General Manager/Owner Trento Properties 4 LP 3669 Grand Ave. Oakland, CA 94610 510-832-5811