

VIA Email: LouAnn.Teixeira@lafco.cccounty.us

October 9, 2026

Ms. Lou Ann Teixeira
Executive Officer
Contra Costa Local Area Formation Commission
40 Muir Rd, 1st Floor
Martinez, CA 94553

RE: Alamo Police District Consolidation Proposal Objection Letter

Dear Ms. Teixeira,

My name is William Monheit, and I am an attorney residing at [REDACTED] Alamo, California. My wife and I have been residents in the Round Hill P5 District since 1997. I was made aware of the proposed Alamo Police District Consolidation proposal in July of 2025 and attended a meeting in Alamo on July 29th of that year that was attended by residents of the P5 and P2B Districts in addition to Committee Members of the P5 and P2B Districts and a representative from Supervisor Anderson's office. My objections were noted at that meeting, but the following points I would like to make to LAFCO in objecting to the consolidation proposal at your hearing.

1. Committee members of the P5 and P2B Districts **are not elected officials and have no legal capacity to contractually bind its residents** that I am aware of or could verify. The committee is comprised of resident volunteers appointed to strictly serve in an advisory capacity to the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors. **Consolidation of all districts into the P5 District and the potential financial consequences that could result therefrom to the P5 District and to other Districts were never voted on or authorized by the residents of these districts that I am aware of.** Please email me such authorizations if they were provided to you.
2. It was indicated in a public summary of information provided to me that if 25% of registered voters or landowners of the affected territory protest, an election would be required and that the cost of that election would be **solely** borne by the P5 District. **The cost of such an election and contingent liability was never authorized by the residents of the P5 District that I am aware of, and I believe this proposal would exceed the Committee Members scope of authority acting as representatives of the P5 District.** An approval of the residents of the P5 District should have been obtained prior to submitting the plan to LAFCO. If there is to be a vote on this consolidation proposal, the cost of any ensuing election should be borne by all parcel owners in Alamo and not just the P5 District parcel owners.

3. The P5 District accounts for only 740 of the total 5,417 parcels. The largest district is the P2B District accounting for 3,400 landowners. Each P5 District parcel owner current pays parcel assessments of \$470 per annum for 2 deputies whereas the P2B District parcel owners pay \$67 per residential parcel for 1 deputy. In a private conversation with a Committee Member of the P2B District, it was indicated to me that it was tough going getting their P2B District parcel owners to increase their assessment to the current \$67 per annum. **Where is the approval ahead of time from the 3,400 P2B parcel owners and voters for a 7-fold increase to their \$67 current assessment before asking for LAFCO approval on the consolidation proposal?**
4. The game plan indicated is to consolidate every parcel owner into the P5 District and for each parcel owner to then pay the same annual parcel assessment amount as the P5 District of \$470. I understand the logic that everyone pays the same amount and utilizing the P5 District as the consolidating district. **However, there is at least one more financial issue besides the proposed increase in annual parcel assessments, which is reserves.** Per the last summary distributed at the meeting, the current P5 District had \$696,000 in reserves which is about \$940 per parcel for 2 deputies. The current P2B District has about \$796,000 in reserves for 3,400 parcels which is about \$234 per parcel for 1 deputy. **Additional reserves to cover the proposed additional policing costs may need to be raised or a special assessment imposed to cover shortfalls in operating capital as well as to cover inflation and service cost increases over time. Unfortunately, any new assessment on the new P5 District would also include those parcel owners in the existing P5 District even though they have already paid in a high amount per parcel.** I have not seen a breakdown of how reserves or shortfalls for all parcel owners would be handled while waiting for collections to build up to an adequate reserve.
5. The P5 District's 740 parcel owners have been paying an assessment in their property tax bill for a while to build up to the \$696,000 current reserve account number. **The consolidation proposal would require that the existing P5 District reserves be shared with an additional 4,677 parcel owners in the new P5 District. The existing P5 District reserves account for approximately 46.65% of the total combined reserves with the P2B District but the P5 District account for only 13.66% of the total parcels their reserves were supposed to cover.** The P2B District existing reserves of \$796,000 would also need to be shared with an additional 2,017 parcel owners in the new P5 District. The P2B reserves account for 53.35% of the total combine reserves with the P5 District and **62.76% of the homeowners. In both cases, the existing P5 District members are having collected reserves disproportionately and unfairly re-allocated to other Alamo parcel owners without a vote or any approval of the consolidation or redistribution of their reserves, which may have legal ramifications.**
6. The Sheriff's department in Contra Costa County is the very best and we are lucky to have them watch over us. That is not the issue. The issue is that the Alamo Police District Consolidation proposal and P5 and P2B District Committee members need to address the issues set forth in this letter before a vote is taken by LAFCO. **Using LAFCO to vote on this**

proposal now avoids giving affected residents in both the existing P5 District and P2B Districts an opportunity to vote on the financial issues that were never authorized by a vote of the district's residents. LAFCO, with a vote of approval of the proposal, would be forcing thousands of Alamo residents to increase their assessments by 7 times and to have to scramble to obtain thousands of signatures for an expensive election paid for on the backs of the 740 existing P5 District residents. This is not a reasonable solution to the problem and does not avoid the legal issues that are present. I do not recommend approval of the consolidation proposal at this time.

I apologize for not being able to attend the hearing as I will be out of town next week. I am happy to discuss the points set forth in this letter should you wish to call me on the phone at any time.

Very truly yours,

William L. Monheit, Esq.

(510) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]