

---

**From:** Robert Eisele

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 7, 2026 6:02 PM

**To:** Lou Ann Texeira

**Subject:** Personal Note

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)



Lou Ann Texiera

I sent you a separate email that attempted to state my opposition to the current proposal at a high level and avoid missing some of the key points by discussing too much detail. My research also learned some disturbing facts on how the decision was made.....

**Rob Eisele**

**925-** [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Robert Eisele

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 6, 2026 12:31 PM

**To:** Lou Ann Texeira

**Subject:** Re: Alamo Police Services Consolidation and Inclusion of Alamo P-6 Residents

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#) ?

Ms. Texeira

I think you misunderstood the following sentence: *Can the manpower costs be reduced by already existing technology installed in our neighborhoods, such as strategically located Flock cameras and many residents have alarms systems in their homes.*

In other words, can existing INSTALLED technology assist in reducing the number of deputies from 7 to some lower number.

I suppose Sheriff Livingston could also consider the purchase of additional technology as a cost-effective way to reduce the number of deputies.....we had no expectation that LAFCo would have those costs but the Sheriff's team should.

I assume NONE of the Community's feedback to LAFCo has been forwarded or discussed with the Sheriff's team to date.....again, we don't know LAFCo or the County's processes.

I will forward to Supervisor Anderson's office as you suggested.

Thank you.

**Robert Eisele**  
**925-** [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Lou Ann Texeira

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 6, 2026 11:14 AM

**To:** Robert Eisele

**Subject:** RE: Alamo Police Services Consolidation and Inclusion of Alamo P-6 Residents

Greetings Mr. Eisele,

Thank you for contacting Contra Costa LAFCO.

Unfortunately, LAFCO has no authority regarding the costs (i.e., Flock cameras, alarm systems, etc.).

We suggest you contact Supervisor Candace Andersen or one of her staff members – Cameron Collins.

Lou Ann Texeira, Executive Officer  
Contra Costa LAFCO  
40 Muir Road, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Martinez, CA 94553  
925-313-7133  
[LouAnn.Teixeira@lafco.cccounty.us](mailto:LouAnn.Teixeira@lafco.cccounty.us)

---

**From:** Robert Eisele

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 6, 2026 7:48 AM

**To:** Lou Ann Texeira

**Subject:** Re: Alamo Police Services Consolidation and Inclusion of Alamo P-6 Residents

Ms. Texeira

We don't fully understand LAFCO's processes so.....

As a follow-up to my previous email (below), is Alamo resident feedback on the proposed Police Services consolidation shared with Sheriff Livingston prior to October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting so that he knows there is strong Alamo resident opposition to the cost (\$2,545,900/yr) (5417 parcels x \$470/parcel per annum)?

Can the manpower costs be reduced by already existing technology installed in our neighborhoods, such as strategically located Flock cameras and many residents have alarms systems in their homes. Bryan Ranch/Whitegate residents believe the fact that we only have one entrance/exit discourages crime in our neighborhood.

It seems to me that some compromise in cost, say \$250/parcel per year (including Roundhill residents) would ensure a rapid approval of the proposal and the avoidance of costs of putting the issue to a vote.

**Robert Eisele**

**Alamo, CA 94507**  
**925-**

---

**From:** Robert Eisele

**Sent:** Friday, October 2, 2026 8:01 AM

**To:** Lou Ann Texeira

**Cc:** Supervisor Candace Andersen; [Cameron Collins](#)

**Subject:** Alamo Police Services Consolidation and Inclusion of Alamo P-6 Residents

LAFCO/Supervisor Candace Anderson

To review, Alamo currently has three Police Services Districts (P-2B, P-5 (Roundhill) and P-6). The Bryan Ranch/White Gate residential developments are in P-6 Police Services District.

P-6 covers large areas of the unincorporated parts of Contra Costa County, see Figure 2-24 below.

As residents of P-6, BR/WG residents currently pay 1.2% of their individual 1% Countywide tax (estimate \$100-300/yr depending on the assessed value of your home).

Crime statistics in Alamo are low, especially in BR/WG

While there is some appeal to having a Police District solely for Alamo, as a community member, I am unaware of any poor service issues when police services are needed. My objection is the scale and cost of the proposed increase. The Sheriff's proposed plan is to increase the number of Sheriff's deputies from 3 to 7. To me, the staffing level and cost seem excessive both to the individual parcel owner (\$470/yr) and BR/WG as a community (\$263,000). In addition, it is difficult to believe the workload would require 7 deputies. One thing Alamo residents don't want is excessive tickets for minor traffic violations.

Therefore, I am opposed to the Police Services District Consolidation as currently proposed. If the cost element can be satisfactorily addressed, then I would support. I also believe the decision to support or reject the consolidation should only be decided by vote by the residents of Alamo. Unfortunately, I will be in South Carolina on October 14<sup>th</sup> and unable to attend the meeting.

Facts I learned in the process of this review:

- Total Cost of the new parcel tax to Bryan Ranch/Whitegate residents: \$263,000/yr

(BR 318 + WG 242) x \$470/per parcel)

- Loaded costs for each Deputy Sheriff: \$275,000/yr

## **Documents and Figure Reviewed**


[June2025 AlamoPoliceDistrict](#)

[slidesTownHallPoliceDistrictConsolidation 6 5 2025](#)

[Alamo Improvement Association - Home](#)

[CSAs-MSR-Final-Comm-Draft-March-2025.pdf](#)

[Figure 2-24](#)



Respectfully,

**Robert Eisele**

**Alamo, CA 94507**

**925-**

**cc: BR Board**

**Whitegate Board**