



DRAFT PBID MANAGEMENT PLAN: PUBLIC COMMENTS

02.09.2012

Page	Verbatim Comment
Cover Page	It should be clear in what section "Process to Develop the PBID Management District Plan" is located.
Cover Page	There should be another public comment period after all of the information is included (e.g. Engineer's Report, etc.)
Cover Page	I am in favor of it providing that residents are included more in the DLBA and the DLBA transforms from a business association to a downtown association. Let's bring the community together!
Page 1	I am in agreement with the geographic boundaries of the PBID.
Page 1	1. I would definitely like a Residential Coordinator. The role could include similar duties that Field Deputy's have for Council Members. (An example is Lena Gonzales and Mark Magdelano). They could really help with coordinating enhancement projects Downtown. 2nd. - Please nix the Community Court idea and allocate all money to Capital Improvements. 3rd. In general, I would like the DLBA to be an organization where every connection, corner, tree well, sidewalk, alleyway, empty lot could be charmed up to enhance Downtown Long Beach. We need to aesthetically improve the area to attracts residents and business alike who will want to spend their dollars Downtown.
Page 1	Improvement is needed in the area of "Economic Development." The lack of success in this area affects us all. Too many empty storefronts and those that are there do not cater to the full time home owners of the area nor adjoining area who would like to shop there rather than or in addition to 2nd street and beyhond. Wall Mart does not meet my needs for quality (and other reasons). Re. marketing and Special Events: The events that are held are enjoyable and they feel safe. the website has been a good resource for learning about events. The Environment is clean and feels pretty safe in the day and evening.
Page 1	I am not sure I see the need for a Community Court; DLBA should continue the initiatives it is curently involved-in and leave law enforcment as a government function. More should be made of the value of special events attracting people to downtown (expecially Taste)
Page 1	Explain how these functions differ from the ones already provided by the city. Would like to see the job description for the street team. I do not think they are necessary, there is not THAT much going on. Other cities' downtown areas do not have this.

Page 1	<p>beautification improvements. I have personal objections to paying for some of the expanded services that are included in the Environment section of the management plan, specifically the residential staff position, the community court and public art and banners. Incorporating a staff person focused on needs and services of residents is absolutely necessary, but not at an increase in revenue. I challenge DLBA to identify internal efficiencies, restructure staff positions and commit to finding ways to do more with less, as is the expectation of the rest of us (residents and businesses) in an uncertain economy. If the DLBA organization is effective at managing their existing resources and contingency, they will be capable of finding a way to reorganize and provide this core service now that residents are a core contingency of their PBID proposal. While the community court may be a new approach, it is not clearly undefined at this point to include as a baseline service. Also, I do not support funding public art and banners as a baseline service, since these two elements are a question of taste and can be a divisive issues for individuals in the</p>
Page 1	<p>I still see 'Increased Property Taxes' in a very good 'quickly turn and read the next page' spot, sometimes called a 'Cliff Hanger.'</p>
Page 1	<p>I notice you didn't mention any of the homeless outreach efforts the clean and safe teams provide. Can this be outlined in the plan?</p>
Page 1	<p>The boundaries are arbitrary and conveniently do not include First District Council Member or one of the current "homeowner"/DLBA Board member. Why? Clean teams and safety guides are a complete waste of resources for many portions of the PBID district. They duplicate services currently provided more professionally by homeowner associations. The proposed plan would, therefore, amount to double taxation for many homeowners. The plan does not include any concept community court initiative really is. It is clear that the DLBA staff does not know what is planned for community courts. The plan absolutely no basis for taxing businesses and homeowners \$100,000 for community courts. In addition, homeowners are already contribute to the beautification of the greater downtown area but large annual expenditures to maintain areas like Victory Park. The DLBA should concentrate on the core mission of serving the business community.</p>
Page 1	<p>there is ZERO need for community court; clean teams are unnecessary and guides are taking up space now... we need a vibrant downtown but this is not the way</p>
Page 1	<p>INterested in the Community Court. Condominium buildings with multiple absentee owners who have no interest in the liveability of the buildings for other residents will cause an overflow here.</p>

Page 1	who live across the street from md ate not included. This appears to me to be an arbitrary boundary. Condo owners receive no direct benefit from the PBID. The services listed above are duplicative of services for which our city taxes or our homeowners association fees pay. Being included in the PBID will increase my property taxes for what??? The PBID benefits DLBA not the condo owners in the downtown area. Moreover, a community court is unnecessary as the City Attorney's office already has a number of programs available for sanctions for offenders accused/convicted of misdemeanors/infractions. It appears to me that DLBA is looking for ways to spend an increased budget funded on the backs of property owners. Furthermore, we rarely see the guides and I'm the six years I have lived here I have only seen someone powerwash in front of my building once. While the guides provide a service to visitors and business owners they provide no direct service to condo owners. Our own maintenance staff and gardening service clean the areas outside of our buildings and our steep hownowners association fees pay god these services. Homeowners should not be taxed for the PBID as there is no direct benefit to us
Page 1	As a downtown resident, I don't need or should be required to pay for downtown guides. In addition, our HOA fees cover cleaning the streets adjacent to our building. Lastly, the community court is a redundant service, we have LBPD to take care of disruptive behaviors.
Page 1	this is apparsntly for business improevment and sounds good for that purpose
Page 1	I do not believe that the establishment of a community court is within the purview of permissible economic revitalization activities or improvements under existing California business improvement district legislation.
	I like the fixed rate method of assessments for residential contributions to the PBID. It is my understanding that an area-based methodology is under consideration. While I prefer the fixed unit basis I understand the desire to weight the assessments based on property value (as a surrogate for property value) for consistency with the commercial property methodology. That said, I believe the area weighting methodlogy utilized for commercial property also considers the relative contribution of impacts/costs associated with commercial properties (e.g., larger commercial propeerty = larger business = larger impact/cost). I do not believe this is the case for residential property.
Page 2	How will live/work units, such as those in 133 Promenade Walk, be assessed. As residential?
Page 2	Side note: as an exhibit, would be helpful to see how budget line items were estimated
Page 2	Harborplace Tower (525 E. Seaside Way) is geographically removed from the area where these "benefits" will be utilized. The boundaries of the PBID should be changed to remove Harborplace Tower and other residences that sit far from the downtown core.
Page 2	Well, clearly the budget reflects the success of the past 3-4 years. The streest are clean (\$800,000) and the business environment is weak (\$250,000). Money expresses priority and result. I would tolerate a few more cigarette butts on the street and some attractive businesses and shops that would complement Belmont Shore. My friends in Belmont Shore are not drawn to downtown theatre, restaurants, or shops. I would love to be able to attract them to my neighborhood.
Page 2	I storngly favor the addition of a Residential coordinator to the DLBA organization to ensure homewoners have an Ombudsperson

Page 2	First, the budget should NOT be expanded and instead be limited to DLBA's existing budget. The budget should either be locked for the duration of the PBID. Second, commercial property owners should pay more for the benefit they derive from the economic development activities, which should not be passed onto residents. As a resident, my dollars will be spent on attending downtown events, if I choose to do so. Third, the costs for residential and commercial property owners should be calculated as follows: first core services within DLBA's existing budget (Environment without community court, banners and art) should be divided 50/50 and spread between all residential property owners and all commercial property owners. Then any additional economy services are allocated to commercial property owners. This should ensure that commercial property owners pay for their additional services they receive and find important.
Page 2	Budget increase makes sense based on the service increase levels and the boundary expansion.
Page 2	\$10 a month is worth living in a clean and safe neighborhood vs. losing these services alltogether.
Page 2	WHAT IS THE DIFFERNCE BETWEEN A STANDARD AND PREMIUM RESIDENTIAL RATE ?
Page 2	The proposed budget is a farce. What is the current budget for each of these program areas? What is the proposed increase or decrease for each? For each program budget, what is the breakdown between personnel costs and those for services and supplies? A brief justification should be provided for any budget changes. A comparison with the current budget suggests that this is a 46% increase. This is obscene in these economic times.
Page 2	There is no need for community courts or for a residential coordinator (a proposed new staff position). Neither of these services are necessary. The Community Courts already exist and the program is ably run by the City Prosecutor's office. Other professionally-run organizations already exist. We do not need a residential coordinator and the DLBA should not be hiring new staff when the City is laying off. This budget is a 40+% increase and is obscene in such bad economic times. The DLBA should concentrate on its core mission of serving the business community and leave the homeowners alone.
Page 2	Why isn't there a comparison the proposed and current budgets and cost allocations? The court house will not be finished for a few years, the city and county maintain their properties why are homeowners being asked to pay for future cleaning of an ares that is not part of downtown?
Page 2	There seems to be a duplication of services city forces maintain landscaping on the promenade, what do the clean teams do ?
Page 3	An explicit assessment cap must be identified in final plan, preferably %3 or Tri-County CPI as max. Publish the Baseline Level of Services Agreement before the petition and ballot process.
Page 3	The duration of the PBID should be shortened (by half at least) whether homeowner's decide to participate or not.
Page 3	I trust the DLBA Board to hold he line on increases, taking economic cnditions into account. I do not have a problem with viewing residential contribution as sharing the existing burden with downtown businesses and woudl not expect 100% of my contribution going to direct services to me and my condo building

Page 3	I would like to see the value (%) to be used as the cap for raising assessments on an annual basis. I look forward to reviewing the Baseline Level of Services Agreement from the City once it is available.
Page 3	First, annual assessment should be locked at the current DLBA budget, with no escalator throughout the duration of the PBID. Second, under district governance, certain provisions should be required of the DLBA if they continue to be the governing body. Specifically, as a condition of collecting assessment funds from the public, issues of transparency should be addressed to a greater satisfaction of both residents and businesses. This should include policies and procedures for disclosing personnel costs and gifts, protecting assessment funds from questionable expenditures (purchasing alcohol, treating existing and prospective new businesses to free dinner and drinks), conducting annual audits, adhering to noticing and public meeting laws and being subject to public records requests. Also, the proposal should lock in a specific percentage for administrative overhead and personnel costs, not to exceed 10%
Page 3	I do not feel at all comfortable with a RED X%, a RED 'Baseline Level of Services Agreement from City of Long Beach PENDING' (which says again that I have nothing firm to start my calculations with AND then....a very locked in time period from 1/1/2013 through 12/31/2022. Bottom Line: I do not see exactly WHAT I am endorsing? It needs to have the 'Cap' described ie. what does Cap mean? and the RED X% filled in with an exact amount. Further, the 'City Services: RED 'Baseling Level of Services Agreement from City of Long Beach' ... either Summarized or Attached in detail. Simply Put: 'Something, something is asking me to sign/endorse/underwrite it..... from 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2022. I cannot underwrite an abbreviation I do not know (Cap) or a TBD% or a non-described 'Pending Agreement.'
Page 3	Will the 'X' be replaced by a not to exceed increase number?
Page 3	HOW MUCH OF AN INCREASE PER YEAR, THERE SHOULD NOT BE ANY INCREASES DONE
Page 3	Why is there no number for the % increase per year and why is the DLBA Board going to set this and not the City? Why is there no completed base line report from the City? Why is it assumed that the DLBA will continue to "govern" the PBID funds? Have we looked at any alternatives - such as a city-appointed oversight commission?
Page 3	Why isn't there a number in the annual increase? Again, how are we supposed to comment on a plan that isn't finished? Will the DLBA determine this number or will the City?
Page 3	There is no specification of the membership of the board of directors; it is not clear what role homeowners in the downtown area will play on the board. Without information concerning the amount of increase allowed under this management plan, it is impossible to assess the potential impact on those on whom this tax is to be levied.
Page 3	Any attempt to pass assessments on properties zoned exclusively for residential use without a concomitant increase in accountability and transparency to the current District Governance structure is irresponsible. Residential property owners have a right to know that district governance members are performing their duties in an impartial and objective manner free from bias attributed from their financial interests. If residential assessments will be passed then members should be subject to the requirements of the California Political Reform Act.

Page 3	The annual assessment increases should be capped at 3% per year. Residents should hold at least 5 of the 12 Board of Directors seats. It should not matter if the resident board members are also downtown business owners.
Page 3	How can we be assured that the two members for residents on the PBID will act in the interest of residents, does not seem there is a mechanism to prevent a resident with a business in the area from not serving on the PBID.
Page 4	How will the PBID be accountable to residential property owners?
Page 4	No indication of respondent's status as property owners, business owners or renters in survey results.
Page 4	I think a lot more attention needs to be paid the Atlantic. I do not think that it is particularly clean or safe. If I am expected to pay into this program, I expect to see these people cleaning up my street as well.
Page 4	I like the words under Item 3. The PBID is More Important Than Ever in Challenging Economic Times.....'economic recovery'. These 2 words are powerful ie. 'economic recovery' and could possibly be included in the First Index Page to offset 'economic fear' with the proposed Assessment of potentially +\$120. per year.
Page 4	I see no information concerning what fact-finding efforts were undertaken, what the results of those efforts were, what methodology was employed in collecting, aggregating, and analyzing the data to support the conclusions enumerated in this analysis. This failure to include information concerning the methodology used (if any) is irresponsible.
Page 5	The preceding themes from residents as listed in item # 3 were never accepted or emphasized in any of the meetings I attended. In fact, it was just the opposite. In every meeting I attended (including the November 15 community forum at 133 Promenade where the PUMA consultant facilitated), the overwhelming majority of comments have been against homeowner's joining the PBID. We don't want redundant services, and we don't want to be taxed for services we already pay taxes to the city of Long Beach to provide. This page is extremely dishonest, as is the PUMA consultant in his review of the November 15 meeting back to the DLBA steering committee the very next day. The City of Long Beach should not permit such dishonesty and lack of transparency in any process, especially this one.
Page 5	I would like to see more DRC Specific Reps on the DLBA Board.
Page 5	Again, I would like to see more attention on Atlantic. There is still a strong transient presence and trash along the streets. I often pick up trash in front of my house myself. Also, I think this group should do something about the cheap motels on Atlantic that attract transients and drug addicts.
Page 5	I appreciate the DLBA reconsidering and extending the deadline for comments to January to avoid trying to ram this through on downtown residents during the holiday season. This shows a good faith effort to follow an accommodating process.
Page 5	I agree with the three points made by the downtown stakeholders.

Page 5	Would like to see a partnership with MHA, the Multi-Service Center, CATHolic Charities and other entities that assist in rehoming homeless people. I agree that homeless people often create quality-of-life problems, but they're also people. It's unseemly that they be considered simply as something to be swept off the streets.
Page 5	I believe that making downtown more attractive should be a bigger focus of the PBID. New businesses will follow after seeing the investment in downtown.
Page 5	Items 2 & 3 again refer to a non-representative sample of homeowners. How is the plan being made available to those who either can not afford a computer or are not versed in using a computer? Why do you give stats on a non-scientific survey?
Page 6	I like the move to two service zones instead of three as I believe it will lead to a more consistent approach to enhanced services throughout Downtown. I also like treating owner-occupied residential the same as non-profits. I would like to see more information included here (or elsewhere) to better delineate proposed services. For example, it would be helpful for residents if a table is provided that shows City Baseline Services under the existing PBID compared to the PBID services under the existng PBID.
Page 6	How are "economy related activities" determined? I thought the whole purpose of the PBID was to benefit the economic self-interests of the private business community.
Page 6	The boundaries of the PBID should be changed to remove residences such as Harborplace Tower that are geographically removed from the core of downtown. The convention center should be included in the PBID district.
Page 6	I like tyhe idea of reducing to two zones and extending the area West to encompass the priary area of downtown growth. Those on the fringe of the district can always wish they were excluded or live ont heother side of the street, but there has to be some boundary and I think as long as you are within walking distance of the promenade, I do not think it is unfair to contribute to the effort to improve downtown
Page 6	The boundaries are arbitrary. We have been provided with no criteria for inclusion in the "downtown" area. The district which is charged through business license fees is much larger than the PBID. Why aren't the boundaries the same for both? Without an engineer's report, we cannot assess these questions properly. An engineer's report justifies the boundaries and justifies the assessment. Without it, the plan is meaningless and just meaningless double talk.
Page 6	Want to hear the last bullet explained.
Page 6	525 E. Seaside Way should not be included in your service zone.
Page 6	Who keeps the convention center out of the taxing area? It's well within the boundaries above and you are going to tax the city and non-profits? You are joing about all of the non-profits, right?
Page 6	There is no justification for the change in boundaries; it is not clear why the decision to include residential properties in the PBID was made.

Page 6	I believe attempts to add owner-occupied residential units for assessment is contrary to the legislative intent of the district improvement enabling legislation. It matters not if such an action is consistent with other major California downtowns, but only if it is consistent with state law. No facts regarding the legality of such proposed actions have been provided.
Page 6	I believe business owners and residents have a common interest in seeing downtown Long Beach become a better place for people to live and shop. It's only fair that we all pitch in.
Page 6	There should be only one service area.
Page 7	The new 545,000SF Gov. George Deukmejian Courthouse will house over 800 daily workers, 4,500 daily visitors and will attract additional retail customers to its approx. 5,000 SF of retail space. This will have a substantial impact on the surrounding West Gateway neighborhood. Shouldn't the Courthouse pay a higher assessment more due to their major impact on the area? This could be accomplished by creating a premium area around the perimeter of the Courthouse on their side of the street.
Page 7	Why is the Convention Center and Arena not included in the PBID?
Page 7	The PBID boundaries should be changed to remove the residences south of Ocean Blvd and east of the Performing Arts Center (Aqua, Harborplace Tower, International Tower).
Page 7	In the following ten years I can see the premium district expanding West, but considering they are coming out of the minimum classification, I think this is a pretty good map for now.
Page 7	Keep the boundaries as proposed.
Page 7	If Atlantic is included in the fees, IT MUST BE CLEANED UP!
Page 7	Perhaps two maps or better delineation of services are in order to clarify what this map shows.
Page 7	the premium areas don't include the Pike - why not? there is no reason to go north to 8th street - do you really want more blight when people have to give up their homes due to taxation without representation?
Page 7	Long Beach Blvd. to Alamitos and Seaside to Alamitos are primarily residential and should not be included in the PBID.
Page 7	Why eliminate the extremely large and revenue generating Arena and Convention center? Why not include the very profitable marina?
Page 7	Your map is too small to read most of the streets. But why does the premium not go a few blocks east of Long Beach Blvd.?
Page 7	There should be only one service area.
Page 8	Share with the community the existence of the DLBA Public Safety Task Force, the link between the Task Force and Clean/Safe plus the fact that there is residential representation on the Task Force. You might wish to meet with all residential reps on task forces and board to gauge their willingness to have contact info, such as email, hosted on the DLBA website. Many residents do not know there is residential representation today.
Page 8	This is separate from management plan, but does the DLBA track the effectiveness of the homeless outreach/assistance? What percentage of the homeless reached utilize the resources made available to them by the guides?

Page 8	Too much is spent in this area of the plan. Why are these services not covered by our existing tax dollars that go to the city. Use more of the PBID revenue for economic development.
Page 8	This might be a good place to provide the table comparing PBID services to City services under the existing PBID.
Page 8	I see thm power washing in the premium district on a regular basis and I am particularly aware of he safe team checking-up on businesses in the East Village which I think is particularly helpful. I know the clean and safe ems are operating along Ocen Blvd, but I know they are concentrating their activities along the Promenade where they are most needed. I am willinbg to pay even if I don't receive significant personal benefit
Page 8	How are these statistic collected? I do not think it is necessary to have someone giving directions. Install a directory or one tourist booth! Problem solved!
Page 8	Third, the PBID proposal should guarantee acceptable levels of service and performance measures for both Environment and Economy services, a public reporting mechanism to share this information with the PBID contributors and penalties if the guarantees are not met and performance is unsatisfactory. Residents and businesses alike should be a part of this discussion, determining their expectations for what satisfactory performance looks like from DLBA and its contractors.
Page 8	The success of the Clean and Safe team is more about what you don't see then what you do see. The decrease in homeless and the absence of grafitti, shopping carts etc are all signs that they are working.
Page 8	I find that all of these efforts are critical to a safer and cleaner downtown.
Page 8	No information is presented supporting the effectiveness of meeting stated objectives two and three above. Further, no information is presented showing whether said activities have actually made the affected areas safer.
Page 8	Safety guides are a great resource to have downtown. They provide "eyes on the street" throughout the day. A "secret shopper" type program should be used to ensure that the safety guides are knowledgable and helpful to visitors.
Page 8	How many of the 9,287 citizen assist were to residents or people trying to find residents? What does service contacts with homeless individuals mean? It should be explained.
Page 8	It would seem from the stats above the safety guides have done nothing to deter graffiti tags. If that being the case concentrate on graffiti removal and staff down on safety guide positions.
Page 9	The alleys in/around Pine and Promenade are "used" by club goers. Will the alleys be cleaned in the premium service zone? Steam cleaned?
Page 9	The residences south of Ocean Blvd and east of the Performing Arts Center should be removed from any PBID zone.
Page 9	In order to attract business in the surrounding areas it must be clean. I rarely see Safety guides on Atlantic let alone cleaning it.
Page 9	This answers my question about the Premium zone service differences. Now, if residents notice issues with that service is there a way to address? IE- homeless sleeping in our parking garages

Page 9	Where is the complaint process in the draft plan when the DLBA does not deliver on their promised services? Until the last two months, we had not seen any of the services and we expect that we won't see much in the future. How do we complain?
Page 9	Cleaning of the transit stations? Again, don't our property taxes cover public transit?
Page 9	What is the Downtown Long Beach management group doing about all the store front vacancies in Pine between 4th and 7th Sts? That area looks and feel like a blighted area. That area should be considered downtown not the civic center. However, if anything is being tried to improve that section of downtown it is not noticeable.
Page 9	These bike and segway patrols are over sold. Gangsters think they're a joke, the only solution to the gangsters in the area is the police. Staff down on the guides and fund more police.
Page 10	I like the idea of exploring the community Court; however, I would like to see provisions for removal if it is deemed unsuccessful. Please discuss if the overall budget could be reduced if this activity or any other activity were deemed unsuccessful. Alternatively, explain whether or not the funds simply be reprogrammed for other activities.
Page 10	The community court concept needs a lot of work. What is it? Are there employees? Who do they work for? How does this not duplicate public efforts by police, city attorney, DA, courts? What other cities have tried it and what was the result?
Page 10	Community Court: The concept of the community court is interesting, but would like to see examples of the proven effectiveness of this type of program in other cities. How effective is/was the program in reducing and preventing violations over time? If the program goes forward and it's not successful, would like be the flexibility to reinvest the monies/time into a different program to help abate issues. What is the age range of most violators? If they are 18 and below, I would like to see a program tailored to youth violators and converting them into productive members of society. Beautification: Would like the beautification plan to work in tandem with already existing downtown beautification and/or capital improvement plans for downtown. With an already cash strapped city government, it would be beneficial to leverage the funds of the PBID to help accomplish some of the city's downtown plans. Would like to see specific language that state beautification will work in tandem with city's downtown planning.
Page 10	The DLBA has already usurped the legislative branch through their ability to tax, and is now looking to take over the judicial branch? We have a court system for a reason. We should not leave any judicial activities whatsoever to an unelected body.
Page 10	This should be paid for by the organizations/companies/etc. who sponsopr these events. If the city wants to provide with their limited tax dollars, okay. But this PBID is too much government. and the priorities should be on economic development
Page 10	We ABSOLUTELY do not need the community courts. This is the city's job and should not be handled by this organization.

	existing PBID proposal relies solely on residents and business owners assessment fees and does not include other resources or revenues to augment the proposed expanded services. If the PBID asks something of me as a resident, I expect the PBID proposal to be strategic and creative, bringing other forms of revenue to the table to demonstrate the value added. The strategic plan refers to one of the overarching goals as 'employ a more strategic and long-term outlook for Downtown' and it seems that relying on a single form of revenue is far from strategic. Page 25 of the DLBA 2010: A Strategy for Leadership and Development acknowledges this, saying 'As part of the next PBID renewal, a variety of financing sources should be evaluated based upon the improvements and priorities that emerge'. Identifying additional revenue sources outside of the assessment for items that do not have consensus (public art, banners, guides, etc.) are recommended to be evaluated as part of the PBID update and will be something I expect if I agree to allow the DLBA to manage my assessment. I challenge DLBA to identify internal
Page 10	
Page 10	COMMUNITY COURT IS RIDICULOUS. SOUNDS LIKE RUSSIA AND/OR CHINA
Page 10	I don't think the Community court should be included in the PBID
Page 10	STOP WITH THE EXPENDITURES FOR PIECES OF ART!
Page 10	If the City wants to increase the City Prosecutor's budget for the community court program by \$100,00, then do it directly. Why funnel this amount through the PBID/DLBA? The homeowners beautify their area by paying substantial amounts to landscapers and maintenance services. We do our part already and we do not need the DLBA's superfluous services. And, we are tired of being told that the homeowners do not contribute to the downtown area. We assert we contribute significantly.
Page 10	The City Prosecutor's office already has a good community courts program. If the City thinks their budget should be increased \$100,000, do it but don't funnel the money through the DLBA. What a waste of time.
Page 10	NO COMMUNITY COURT - IT'S UNNECESSARY AND A WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY... and as for the banners and other bullshit, shouldn't the city be doing that? why do we need another layer of wasteful government, which DLBA certainly is? I think you should be disbanded and a proper Business Improvement District put in place
Page 10	\$100,000 for a service that is already provided by the LBPD? Redundant!
Page 10	These may be included by the city for less cost, maybe?
Page 10	It is not at all clear that the jurisdictional issues associated with the community court have been considered, much less resolved. I don't understand how a business association can take responsibility for law enforcement activities. I don't have a need for any of the beautification activities enumerated on this page.
Page 10	I believe the proposed Community Court is not permitted under existing state law.
Page 10	ANOTHER F-ING LAYER OF UNWANTED GOVERNMENT - THE COURTS ARE QUALIFIED TO HANDLE THIS CRAP - NO COMMUNITY COURT!!!! are you getting my drift yet?
Page 10	Nix the community court and use those funds for beautification. The PBID shouldn't spend money on an experimental program. The money would be better spent on tangible beautification projects.

Page 10	What street furniture and amenities? What are they? Why and how are seasonal banners and decoration, public art and other activities not listed?
Page 10	\$100,000 is a poultry amount for beautification. Here is a possible solution staff down on the safety guides and use the savings for beautification.
Page 11	Downtowns and Buskerfest. Not sure if this is appropriate for management plan, but would like to see more coordination on events with other Downtown organizations (ie CVB, Symphony, Aquarium, Chamber, etc.). Would be great to leverage major convention visitors with DLBA events. For example, are there DLBA events that can be piggybacked w/ TED to better showcase Downtown businesses. Would like to see more education provided to businesses to teach them how to better promote themselves and connect and collaborate with neighboring businesses. I feel like East Village businesses do this naturally on their own, but wish the businesses in the core of Downtown did something similar. Economic Development ED department doing great job, considering small staff. Would like to see a greater budget for Economic Development, considering the elimination of ED and RDA at the city. Does the PBID proposed budget account for these losses? Also, would like there to be a mention of a focus on attracting employers/companies to downtown. Having Ignify relocate to the City of Long Beach is a huge win for Downtown LB. We need someone dedicated to doing more of this.
Page 11	This should be the number one priority of PBID and as such should receive a larger share of the budget. And given the lack of success over the past 5 or so years, new leadership is needed.
Page 11	Although businesses shoulder the costs for Economy, I think it is a valuable service and should be continued.
Page 11	The economy needs to be a larger part of the budget, if anything we should give businesses incentives to come to Downtown instead of forcing them into the DLBA and assessing them fees. Why do you think Belmont Shore is so much more successful and safer than the downtown even though it has no safety guides? It many great businesses! It is not totally desolate empty area with crappy ghetto stores! How are we supposed to keep the area safe with Walmart in the downtown?? We need more upscale stores...but hell at this point we need anything! More upscale stores will attract a higher end crowd and it will just naturally become safer. We need less taxing and more business!
Page 11	I understand that the residential contribution to the PBID will not be used to fund Economic activities and I agree with the logic behind that decision. However, the mix of Downtown businesses is a contributing factor to the quality of life here. Consequently, I could see a benefit attributed to residents for this activity, although there would need to be a strong residential contribution (volunteer effort and associated representation). In addition, the value of this activity is clearly more weighted to the businesses so I think the current approach is adequate for now. It might make sense to revisit this issue if a substantial increase in owner-occupied units occurs in the future.
Page 11	Downtown large scale events are an inconvenience/nuisance for the homeowners. DLBA should compensate the homeowners.
Page 12	Residential Coordinator is interesting. What would they do?

Page 12	Budget Budget seems small for advocacy. In reviewing the Retail Visioning plan, does the proposed advocacy budget account for efforts to meet the Retail Visioning advocacy focused items? I imagine there would need to be some lobbying down at the state level. Resident Coordinator I'm in support of the coordinator. Would like to see position improve communications among residents and business and DLBA.
Page 12	Increasing a budget by 46% is outrageous in today's horrible economic environment.
Page 12	Administrative costs are too high. Who are "new residents" that need coordinating? sounds like fluff.
Page 12	the resident coordinator is good. for those who advocate splitting the DLBA and concentrating on smaller areas, I thin the overhead of that approach would be greater than one umbrella organization applying resources to problems facing downtown and bein able to direct those resources to the program and geographic areas most in need. i do not expect all benefits to be returned to the geographic area from which funds wer collected. there are benefits of DLBA which go beyond your specific block
Page 12	I would like to see an itemization of the other 10%
Page 12	the proposal should lock in a specific percentage for administrative overhead and personnel costs, not to exceed 10%.
Page 12	Advocates? We have representation in the City Council.
Page 12	Who want's a resident coordinator
Page 12	The PBID should hold a meeting in the community twice a year to get resident and business owner feedback. It's not practical to assume residents can attend the regular board of directors meetings. The resident coordinator is a great idea. Residents should be have an easy way to express their concerns to the PBID.
Page 12	Most non-profits have less than 10% of the overall budget. What is DLBA doing to cut costs? Please list these items so we know you are doing something to do more with less like those in the bubble of DLBA.
Page 12	What can be done to cut costs here ? This amount should be more in the line of 10%.
Page 13	I look forward to reviewing the ten-year budget once it is available, along with the actual revenue and cost increase values to be used during the ten-year life of the PBID.
Page 13	Should be made clear that budget percentages for activity categories are fixed for 10 years. Again, I feel like more should be budgeted for ED.
Page 13	There should be a public hearing on the 10-year operating budget.
Page 13	RIDICULOUS PRIORITIES 66.7% on enviornment and 20.3% on Economic Development. This makes no sense for long term planning.
Page 13	We are spending TOO much on safety guides and not seeing enough benefit. Also, if we are encouraging people to shop locally I truly hope that we are hiring locally!
Page 13	This plan should NOT include an increase in budget, use the DLBA's existing budget, lock in the same budget over the life of the PBID and remove an escalator.
Page 13	X% should be replaced with a number

Page 13	Budget increase is too high - what are other public organizations doing? They are cutting back - why isn't the DLBA? Again, the plan isn't complete so the final draft will not have the benefit of complete discussion and feedback.
Page 13	HALVE THAT BUDGET - YOU DON'T NEED ANY MORE MONEY, MR KOJIAN, YOU NEED LESS! live like the rest of us and you'll understand why we don't want this and you - and where the heck do you live, anyway?
Page 13	You're going to need a heck of a lot more money for the community court.
Page 13	Community Court appears go bs unnecessary bureaucracy. See prior comments made on this subject.
Page 13	See previous comments regarding community court and annual assessment cap.
Page 13	What can I comment on if the proposed budget is not listed? Is there no indication of what the PBID budget will be for say the next three years? The missing percent number in the two bullet points above are less than helpful.
Page 13	These safety guides should only be use in peak hours and only for special events. Cut costs and add savings to fund more beautification and attract retail business not bars.
Page 14	I look forward to reviewing the Engineer's Report once it is available.
Page 14	It appears that most of the above should already be done by City services. Why the duplication and double taxation?
Page 14	remove community court, banners and public art from standard service
Page 14	This information above is meaningless without an engineer's report. We object to any assessment on homeowners and do not believe that the case has been proven, nor will it.
Page 14	Without an engineer's report, this is meaningless.
Page 14	this, too, is ridiculous - your bike and Segway patrols are useless, your escort services are performed better by residents and your community court/beautification efforts are a power play, nothing more... if you're responsible for the new sculptures outside the soon-to-be-replaced courthouse, let me tell you they are misplaced and unwanted
Page 14	Plan looks good.
Page 14	READ MY LIPS - NONE OF THIS IS NECESSARY AND IS ANOTHER LAYER OF UNWANTED GOVERNMENT IN PARTICULAR THE COMMUNITY COURT... regular judicial can assign community service... you don't need to hire another layer of government to do it - just let the courts know this is what the people want - hell, I can do that
Page 14	Why are we in the commentary 45 day period when the most important part of this thing is the explanation that the engineer will provide. Is it really responsible to begin the comment & education period with out at least the preliminary engineering report?
Page 15	I do not have a problem with the way fees are proposed to be allocated and believe the DLBA Board should have the authority to determine where those fees will be spent based on changing needs and the measured effectiveness of existing programs.

Page 15	With the change in demographics over the past ten years the privately provided safety and visitor escort really necessary at the current levels? Can residential owners get the guides to help carry in groceries and other essentials, or what is escort assistance? If residential owners are going to pay for what is listed as safety should be not expect some direct benefit?
Page 15	Why do the residents have to pay more if they live in a premium area ? Most of the services required, trash removal, graffiti removal are the result of the type of businesses in the area like bars. These business should fully fund the removal of trash, graffiti removal cause by their patrons not the law abiding homeowners.
Page 16	Thank goodness the RDA no longer exists. Maybe replace the lost revenue by including the Convention Center and Arena in the PBID boundaries. Why are they excluded?
Page 16	The benefit zone should be redrawn to remove residential properties that are south of Ocean Blvd and east of the Performing Arts Center. We are geographically removed from the downtown core and do not want or need any PBID services.
Page 16	Speaking of parking...That is definitely an issue that needs to be addressed and is completely absent from this plan. Permits should be issued to homeowners during large events (Grand Prix, etc).
Page 17	No % for annual increase (left blank)
Page 17	I would like to see the data for the rate calculation.
Page 17	all references to an annual adjustment and do not include any percent increase
Page 17	No information is provided on exactly what are "appropriate assessment variables" in owner-occupied calculation rates.
Page 17	Do rented condos not have to pay the assessment? The calculation talks about owner-occupied residential units. If so why?
Page 17	Homeowners already pay for maintenance of the promenade through our HOA fees. Seems like we will have to pay more. These assessments will result in homeowners leaving the area.
Page 18	Would remove Issuance of Bonds.
Page 18	no bond issuance - we're in enough debt as it is
Page 18	My biggest concern is that the DBLA is not public agency, they are being given public funds and there is no accountability as to how they use these funds. They are not required to follow parameters set by state law as to how funds can be spent.
Page 19	Need to add greater residential representation to the DLBA Board and Executive Committee
Page 19	Would like to see a greater residential presence and voting rights on board.
Page 19	It is inconceivable that the City Council would allow for a 46% increase to the DLBA's slush fund in today's economic environment.

Page 19	<p>behoove them to rearrange their board membership to include a better balance of business and residential board positions. In fact, page 25 of the document DLBA 2010: A Strategy for Leadership and Development actually calls out "the DLBA should explore a bylaw amendment that would ensure a more diverse board composition that is representative of the emerging downtown neighborhood' and 'Additionally the make-up of the executive committee should mirror the diversity of the board and therefore may need to expand in size'. The DLBA should heed the recommendations provided in this report, because without including residents in the DLBA organizational structure, the very real divide between businesses and residents will be institutionalized into PBID for the next 10 years, if passed. Regardless of what is minimally required by law, incorporating residents into the PBID board and neighborhood activities should be embraced, and in particular, one of the reasons the other areas (Belmont Shore, Bixby Knolls) are seen as successful is because of the acts of volunteer groups made up of residents (Justin Rudd, We Love LB, etc.).</p>
Page 19	<p>heard about the residential coordinator but didnt see it in the plan. I think a liason would be beneficial, but is that cost in the budget outlined currently. thank you.</p>
Page 19	<p>Attempts to pass assessments on residential property owners should subject PBID board members to the California Political Reform Act to implement true proper accountability and transparency in order to ensure management and oversight is impartial and free of financial conflicts of interest.</p>
Page 19	<p>See previous comments regarding residential representation of the BOD.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>The community court funding should go to beautification</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>Residents should have a choice to elect premium services if they are currently defined as standard.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>The service areas should be defined to the alleyways instead of the streets to fully encompass properties and make it less confusing for those bordering on two service areas.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>The community court should not be part of the DLBA's work. It will only relieve municipal courts and turn the org into a quasi judicial body. The DLBA can use community service hours for clean up and beautification but doesn't need to operate the program..</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>The sidewalk washing schedules appears skewed to benefit premium service areas with 4-6 times the cleaning whereas standard service areas still pay 60% of premium rates. This is an inequity that should be adjusted by reducing premium frequency and increasing standard service times.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>The 10 year plan is actually ten years, one year at a time with the property owners option to discontinue The PBID by petition. This has not been acknowledged sufficiently.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>There is no boundary inclusion of the marina area that has businesses and residents who are live-aboards.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>support a resident coordinator role who can staff the urban residency task force, assist downtown resident orgs and help ensure their input.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>There should be an example on how the calculations for front footage and square feet fit into the assessment determinations.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>Explain how the flat rate for the two categories of residential assessments was determined</p>

Indiv. Sub.	DRC would like to see additional language incorporated throughout the PBID Plan that acknowledges that residents will now be invested stakeholders in the PBID and key stakeholders in the development and management of the PBID.
Indiv. Sub.	DRC supports incorporating into the Plan's "Improvements and Activities" section language that also emphasizes the importance of attracting and maintaining a residential base to support the business environment in Downtown Long Beach. The purpose of including such language is to recognize the shift of the PBID from being business centric to community focused. Suggested areas within the Plan where language
Indiv. Sub.	and activities, but feels it is important for the DRC to have a role and take part in the development of the job description and communications process for this position. The purpose for this is to ensure the position can truly
Indiv. Sub.	DRC would like to see a revised budget that is more in line with the austerity measures being taken by other public and non-profit organizations. Given the current fiscal constraints that the vast majority of stakeholders who will be assessed to pay DLBA's operating expenses are facing, and will likely continue to face for the next several years, we do not believe it is appropriate or tenable to seek a more than 40 percent
Indiv. Sub.	DRC would like to see DLBA's projected 10-year operating budget in the Plan. We feel that the language in the Plan as proposed is inadequate in this area and that projected expenses and revenues must be included in the Draft plan, not merely the final Plan. As proposed in the Plan, the DLBA's budget is presented for the first year only. If residents are to be responsible for paying PBID assessments for the 10 year life of the Plan, then the projected 10-year budget for the Plan - including any projected increases - should be included in the Plan.
Indiv. Sub.	DRC feels that the value of the Community Court concept needs to be proven. We do not oppose the idea, but the funding for this concept should be contingent upon demonstrated benefit in year one of the new Plan's implementation. Explicit language to this effect and a specific provision for eliminating the Community Court AND the funding associated with it (as opposed to reallocating the funds elsewhere), including a clear and simple means of doing so that gives residents a say in the decision should be included in the Plan.
Indiv. Sub.	DRC feels that the annual adjustment should not exceed the Tri County CPI.

Indiv. Sub.	<p>DRC would like to see any language in the Plan for PBID relating to the issuance of bonds stricken, and any and all language related to the ability of DLBA to issue bonds or otherwise take on debt removed from its charter and/or bylaws unless or until a detailed explanation of the potential impact to residents of DLBA debt is provided. Asking residents to contribute to DLBA/PBID services is one thing, but requiring residents to serve as a backstop for debt associated with DLBA/PBID administration and operations is another. The details of any bonding ability of DLBA must be described in detail so that residents and other stakeholders clearly understand what if any financial responsibilities/obligations PBID assessment commits them to.</p>
Indiv. Sub.	<p>DRC supports greater resident voting representation on the DLBA Board. Specifically, DRC would like the existing DLBA bylaws, which now allow voting Board seats to be held by one resident from each of Downtown's two council districts, to be amended to respect the structure and representative nature of DRC to allow six voting seats to be held by residents on the DLBA Board, each of which would be filled at the recommendation of the DRC, consistent with our bylaws. DLBA knows well that, regardless of the linear frontage or square footage that owner-occupied buildings account for Downtown, Downtown residents themselves are a critical component of a thriving Downtown business community, and DLBA cannot succeed in its mission without us. This understanding should be made explicit in the Plan for PBID and DLBA should embrace the participation and subsequent buy-in of residents via the DRC and its representation from all six Downtown neighborhood associations.</p>



DRAFT PBID MANAGEMENT PLAN: N/A PUBLIC COMMENTS

02.09.2012

Page	Verbatim Comment
Cover Page	I just want reminder to make sign for cyclist and pedestrians. Also protect old building. For remodeling or demolition part of old building connect to new building.
Cover Page	We get zero benefits from this tax! Our building takes care of EVERYTHING! We are on the periphery.
Cover Page	YOUR PLAN TO TAX AND/OR SET FEES TO PRIVATE RESIDENTS, APT AND CONDOS OWNERS IS POORLY CONCEIVED, ALLOWS FOR DOUBLE OR TRIPLE TAXATION, MISINTERPRETED AND JUST ANOTHER MONEY GRAB. IF BUSINESSES WANT IT THEY SHOULD BE FREE TO JOIN. IF ANYONE DOESN'T THEY SHOULD BE ABLE NOT TO CONTRIBUTE. MOST BUSINESSES I'VE SPOKEN TO DO NOT THINK YOUR EXISTING PLAN AND THE ONE YOU ARE PROPOSING IS EFFECTIVE OR WORTHWHILE. WE SEE NO BENEFIT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Cover Page	No info
Cover Page	Engineer's report should have been included with the draft plan. It is required by state law. Otherwise there is no basis for proposed assessments. There is no baseline report from the City.. This is also required by law. Otherwise one does not know whether proposed services duplicate existing services - like tree trimming and graffiti removal.
Cover Page	An Engineer's report should have been included with the Draft Plan. This would have provided an independent verification that the benefits match the assessment and that the assessments are proportional between commercial and residential owners. Also, the baseline study from the City should have been included.
Cover Page	The residential property owners should not be assessed.
Cover Page	why did you have to hire someone to prepare this proposal - particularly an out-of-town entity?
Cover Page	none
Cover Page	formal and uninspired

Cover Page	It's not clear to me how you can submit a management plan for public comment when such crucial information as the engineer's report, the list of properties to be benefited, and the map with parcel detail are not included. I am also troubled by the fact that the table of contents and the entire document make no reference to any methodology employed in attempts at fact finding; the entire document appears to be an effort at public relations, rather than a genuine attempt at community needs assessment.
Cover Page	None.
Cover Page	poorly constructed
Cover Page	None
Cover Page	Why is downtown guide program cost being proposed to be paid for by homeowners? Unless you have a business the guides are not of any value for homeowners. Whatever safety they provide is for the business community not residents. Why on earth is the proposed budget increased 46%? Downtown is much better than it was in 2003, but I do not feel it is necessary to beef up the cost. There are two foreclosures posted this week. If people are having trouble making the home loan payments, how does DLBA think they can afford additional costs. The economy is tough, but you wouldn't know it by the proposed budget.
Cover Page	It is outrageous to impose the PBID on residents without a ballot measure. This is taxation without representation. The hotels and large business votes for including residents will swamp any resident issues. There will be trouble in the downtown if this is passed without the consent of the governed (residents).
Page 1	overlaps the services provided by the city and by homeowner associations - community court is a farce... judges can assign community service - another overlap! city should do beautification and your safety guides are a farce... any resident can give directions and any business owner knows how to dial 911 - your clean team is nasty, disobeys traffic laws and, for the most part hates their jobs
Page 1	No "opt out" procedure even though Prop. 218 specifically says that "no benefit" equals "no assessment"
Page 1	How would my HOA dues cost which include the cost of maintaining the landscape and cleaning of the Promenade be reduced? The HOA is collecting funds for the clean up that the proposal doesn't cover, yet there is nothing in the plan that talk about mitigating double payments. The Guides do not work with our HOA. The proposal is misleading when it says otherwise. The community court idea is a joke! We have police and courts to hand people who commit crimes. Creating another layer or legal system is definitely not necessary.
Page 1	DO NOT AGREE WITH YOUR PLAN
Page 1	totally against the asssessment

Page 1	We do not want anything to do with this!
Page 1	Why not be honest and use the word "TAX"? How is it that the Convention Center is not included?
Page 1	I watch these clean teams everyday, they sweep the gutters, we already pay for this service
Page 1	The boundaries of the District are arbitrary. Some of the properties (like ours) are not benefiting from any of the "improvements and activities". The services directly benefit the business community and are not a direct benefit to homeowners. In addition, the money that the City contributes to the PBID is paid by homeowners through their city taxes - this would be double taxation. Bottom line: no benefit to homeowners and we already pay.
Page 1	Homeowners already pay for clean teams through our homeowner's association. We also pay for our own security and our own property beautification. These "services" are redundant. Homeowner's should not be assessed at all!
Page 2	Nothing the PBID does benefits the Cooper Arms, so why are we included in the tax proposal?
Page 2	This is a ridiculous proposal, all of these services are redundant.
Page 2	the services you aim to provide with this taxation without representation is already fulfilled by our homeowners association - we have no representation here
Page 2	We already pay a business fee for the units we own downtown, so it's a moot detail for us. HOWEVER, resident homeowners hanging on by the skin of their teeth to their homes will have one more fee that will have an impact on them. We've already seen numerous foreclosures and people leaving to rent the buildings, with blight resulting in many cases.
Page 2	I never see any of the Cleaning Crew members on Atlantic. As part of the benefits, I think that should be included. Otherwise I do not see any personal benefit from this assessment.
Page 2	I am totally against being taxed to benefit a private business association. While \$73.85 is not a large amount is the PBID is reauthorized DLBA will have the ability to raise the tax over the next 10yrs.
Page 2	These services are set up to primarily benefit business. What benefit do residential owners gain from marketing? Downtown guides? Economic development?
Page 2	residents get NO benefit from this, What do you do for us? we already maintain our property including security and maint. Do you need our monies to fill a suspected loss of revenue for some reason? 15 years and suddenly you need my money? Why?
Page 2	I believe that properties zoned exclusively for residential use are conclusively presumed not to benefit from annual assessments under current California business district improvement legislation and may not be subject to assessment regardless of any attempt to make a distinction between economic or environmental benefit. No such distinction is made under existing law and therefore any attempt to assess owner-occupied residential units is impermissible.

Page 2	LIVE WITHIN YOUR F-ING MEANS... DO NOT ROB THE POOR SO YOU CAN GET YOUR INFLATED PAYCHECKS... this is a ridiculous budget and way inflated for the needs of downtown - doesn't this amount cover Kraig Kojian's paycheck? we need a BID, not a PBID - if you want to continue your existence
Page 2	against the assessment
Page 2	DO NOT AGREE DO A BETTER JOB WITH THE MONEY YOU YOU ALREADY HAVE. STOP TRYING TO ADD MORE ASSESSMENTS ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Page 2	The City of Long Beach should be providing these services through the taxes we already pay to the city. The public should be able to comment on the Baseline Level of Services Agreement from the City of Long Beach once it is in draft form. Homeowner's should be able to vote as a group first to determine if the homeowner's want to be involved in the PBID and assessed for perceived "benefits".
Page 2	The residential owners should be counted separately due to the weighted contribution system of voting.
Page 2	I do not want anything to do with the PBID, I already pay my HOA fees on time monthly for all these services.
Page 2	This assessment doesn't include me, BUT, I don't see the benefit to HOMEowners. Clearly we all who use the downtown benefit from a robust DTn. BUT, I don't see the benefit of the PBID to any of us, they are quite ineffective in getting great downtown business thriving. Since BUSINESS and Government are the beneficiaries of PBID, then they should be the ones who are charged for there service. As they are more effective and we all benefit, then sales will increase and business will as well and this Tax becomes another cost of doing business. This should NOT be levied on homeowners and the managment of PBID needs improving.
Page 3	DISAGREE
Page 3	against the assessment
Page 3	why can't the residents who are affected by these taxes vote on them? this is a money grab, pure and simple with NO REDEEMING FACTORS
Page 3	DLBA does not represent the residents it proposes to include in the PBID. This feels like taxation without representation!
Page 3	This is a new property tax on homeowners; there are no parameters on what you can raise or collect? What happened to Prop 13?
Page 3	Why does this city continue to fund this group? Long Beach could hire, or not lay off, 100 people at \$35 million if your original \$3.5 million reported moniew were considered. We need Police and Fire not conctrct laborers!
Page 3	love your X's... no money should be paid by condo owners for your business "enhancements"... and how about this - ONE VOTE PER PERSON IN THE AFFECTED AREA, NOT YOUR BIASED VOTES BY PEOPLE YOU'VE PAID OFF

Page 3	Why isn't the baseline study from the City included? Have we considered any alternatives to the PBID being administered by the DLBA? Why not an independent, volunteer City oversight commission (appointed by the City, not the DLBA) similar to the one in Belmont Shore
Page 4	Why are the annual budget cap and breakdown of city services missing? How can I comment on something that is not in the proposed plan but will be part of the final plan?
Page 4	If the businesses want to keep the PBID as it is, then the businesses should be allowed to keep the PBID as it is. Homeowner's should not be involved. Most condo owner's in downtown pay extremely high HOA dues to keep our piece of downtown safe and clean. We are our own self-contained PBID! Our properties have dramatically declined in value of the past several years. Many of our neighbors have already lost their homes, or are in the process of foreclosure. Most downtown homeowner's are struggling to pay our underwater mortgages and our hefty HOA dues. We simply cannot afford another tax. And, I take great exception to the issue of downtown unity. The inference that downtown will not be unified unless we pay more taxes is insulting. There is currently no divide between businesses and homeowners in downtown. The downtown homeowner's are the customers for these businesses. We are the ones eating in your restaurants, drinking in your bars, opening accounts at your banks, organizing company-related or personal events at your hotels, and bringing our friends and families to our downtown attractions.
Page 4	A good marketing piece. A little self serving since it doesn't say anything about improvement.
Page 4	I like the word vibrant and think the doubters should come to grips with how much worse things might be if there had not been a PBID and even if they can't be quantified, I think there is real benefit to all downtown stakeholders of having DLBA and the PBID
Page 4	I would rather take the money the PBID wants us to pay and patronize a downtown business, if the PBID goes through I will not patronize the downtown business any longer.

	<p>my property if the PBID was not renewed, primarily because something will likely be derived to take it's place. In particular, I believe people are dynamic and display ingenuity - if there is a need, our downtown community will find a way to fill it. This might be in the form of HOAs sharing costs and services valuable to them, paying a contractor directly for services, organizing a downtown community group to provide services (tree planting, clean-ups, etc.), forming public-private partnerships, engaging local schools/CSULB, partnering with the city, or another form of supplementing city services with things that our neighbors find valuable. I actually think it is offensive, demeaning, and outright absurd to tell downtown residents and businesses that without the PBID update, the downtown would go back to pre-1998 conditions. (This assertion was a huge turn off coming from the facilitating consultant at Tuesday's meeting.) This argument relies on there being only two options - PBID or no PBID - which is simply not accurate. I understand that this argument is intended to lead residents and businesses into 2-dimensional thinking that is beneficial for the long-term security of the DLBA as an organization. I can also see DLBA's</p>
Page 4	DISAGREE
Page 4	As a homeowner, I would not want property values to be adversely affected by the loss of these services.
Page 4	I agree with point #1. I believe that the general appearance of downtown has improved, is cleaner and I feel safer there than I did years ago.
Page 4	For 15 years, the PBID served the needs of the business community. It is for them to decide if it should continue. The homeowners have nothing to do with it and are being denied an opportunity to vote on the issue. The weighted assessment method of voting marginalizes homeowner vote to only 8% of the total. the homeowner vote should be counted separately and all parties should abide by the results when deciding whether to include homeowners. The Downtown area was unified until the DLBA decided to try to include homeowners. The only influence that is being increased is the DLBA's. The homeowners have always been capable of speaking for themselves and they make a significant contribution to the downtown area.
Page 4	If the commercial property owners want to continue the PBID and pay the huge assessments, they are free to vote for it. But I fail to see what any of this has to do with the homeowners. For 15 years, this PBID has existed to service the business community. What changed? Nothing changed. The DLBA is simply seeking to broaden its scope with more unnecessary and duplicate services. The downtown area has always been unified until the DLBA began to try to force homeowners to pay twice for services and suggesting unnecessary services (resident coordinator; community courts). They also continue to make the unwarranted assumption that homeowners do not already contribute - of course they do. Come and let me give you a tour around our building so you can see what we contribute. You could go to any building included in the PBID and see the same thing.

Page 4	clean and safe doesn't work - the "clean team" is belligerent and disobeys traffic ordinances; the guides talk and text all day long and run people over with their bikes and Segways (and who paid for that?) we can go "backwards" and get better placement of trash receptacles - and more of them - to replace belligerent and law-abusing "clean team" members
Page 4	I do not agree, residents of downtown should not have to pay for these services.
Page 4	As a condo owner on Ocean, I already pay the city for these services, I am not a business owner, I see what your team does on a daily basis, your employees on the street cannot be making much money, I am sure where the money goes, it is going to this redundant form of government that we do not need here in Long Beach.
Page 4	Forcing the PBID down homeowners' throats does not unify downtown! It is causing a division and trust me if you increase my taxes I will be less likely to patronize the downtown business. Homeowners are very upset about this proposed tax and the word boycott has been mentioned by some owners
Page 4	The proposed PBID is to be funded by public money, I don't see any plans for oversight or accountability on how the money spent.
Page 4	Talk about self serving statements. These are like saying we can't go back to a political party that was in power because you don't like them, right or wrong we can change.
	This page contains nothing more than opinions rendered by the author(s) of the report.
Page 4	While paragraph two above argues that PBID services are accountable, they are not transparent as the system is currently structured.
Page 4	DLBA IS A FARCE - YOU SHOULD BE DISBANDED WITH A PROPER BID ENACTED... your presentation to The Lafayette, where I live, was demeaning and, yes, filled with entitlements... this is NOT the time for you
Page 4	I have lived in downtown Long Beach for almost 4 years and have seen positive changes in the area. I believe that the services and programs of the PBID are important in keeping downtown a great place to live.
Page 4	Raising the PBID budget does not make sense with economy that way it is. People are or have been laid off and many of those who work are earning less than they did before the this current deep recession and the PBID wants to spend more money? That is nonsense. The survey referenced in point 1 is not a valid survey. Online surveys do not yield. The meeting your organization had at our community room this last Thursday did not have majorities. The PBID should not go away but it should not cost more when the real world is having to do with less!
Page 4	The survey is highly suspect "65% agree that it is safer." I don't feel safe there are too many bars in the area. Enough with the bars we don't need any more they contribute to drunks, trash and litter in the area.

Page 5	#3. Never happened at the Cooper Arms!
	I need to understand how the interests of people like me are represented in decision making. This just seems like TOO MUCH GOVERNEMENT. It is not enough to fight big government on the national level we need to do the same at the local level. This TAX SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED (who pays) and the City should play a closer role in management with the plan to eliminate this agency (smaller government).
	Downtow Homeowners Unite are a bunch of johnny-come-latelys who did not even care enough at the time to attend the homeowner meetings over the summer and get in on the ground floor of the planning process for the PBID reauthorization. Their criticism of an out-of-state consultant is also unfounded. We live in a global economy; if the expertise to put together an approval plan exists in Denver, let's use that expertise. If anything it should be an incentive for a local organization to develop the expertise to be involved in the next reauthorization!
	DISAGREE
Page 5	I do not like anything on this page. I do not care about the 'other cities' that have PBID's. I perceive this as just an extra group of wanna-be-politicians taking my money. I think that DLBA should support itself instead of asking me to foot their bills and stop trying to bully their way into local politics. They are astute business people who already have a viable way to make their desires happen. It is call the voting process.
Page 5	Personally I was too busy to attend but have seen a lot of information and newsletters on the subject.
Page 5	IN REGARD TO NO. 6 - APPARENTLY THE PROPERTY OWNERS VOICE WAS NOT HEARD
Page 5	I do not agree that the DLBA made a good faith effort to include homeowners in the initial planning. Further, they have not been open with the results of the initial survey. The DLBA has hired an engineer but the engineer's report isn't included - why not? The DLBA had talks with the City but no baseline report. Again, why not? How effective is the DLBA? Are the homeowners (and commercial property owners) going to have an opportunity to comment on the final plan? When is the City going to hold hearings? Will discussion occur prior to the petition/balloting process on the final plan? Why was the planning done by an outside consultant? Were local business owners and commercial property owners involved in the process, as well as homeowners? We seriously doubt it.

Page 5	As a homeowner, I can attest that no real effort was made to include us in the planning process. Some perfunctory meetings were held so the DLBA could say that they had homeowner input. It would have been so simple to have made a good faith effort and really include the homeowners. We have been promised the results of the on-line survey several times but have never been shown what homeowners had to say. Why not? What is the DLBA unwilling to share? I wonder if the \$85,000 spent on consultants was an appropriate expenditure of taxpayer funds? It certainly didn't produce any real involvement activities for the homeowners. The consultant was dismissive and patronizing to homeowners. If the DLBA had an engineer hired, why wasn't her report in the Draft Plan? If the DLBA had discussions with the City, why wasn't the base line plan included with the Draft Plan? Finally, how much input are we going to have when the Final Plan is presented? Will the City hold hearings prior to the petition/voting process?
Page 5	Downtown residents should not be penalized for buying in a downtown area. We have actually benefited the environment and raised the property value and taxes.
Page 5	no comment on this page - it's all ludicrous anyway
Page 5	Residents of downtown should not have to pay for these services.
Page 5	We don not need your services.
Page 5	There is no mention of the opposition of the homeowners who opposed being taxed for things that donor directly benefit them. The City is responsible for providing a clean & safe environment. We pay HOA fees to maintain the outside of our buildings, lawns , graffiti removal, etc. We don't need the services ofthe PBID.
Page 5	I find it very hard believe that you have 300 RESIDENTS in the downtown area that have agreed to pay for services they will not benefit from.
Page 5	You were not sucessful in communicating with residential HOA's and you now that. You have NEVER provided the responce information to others. There needs to be goverment oversite. How can an organization, especially a non profit oversee it's self. You're answerable only to yourselves.
Page 5	I don't recall any outreach to my homeowners' association during this alleged process. I saw no solicitation of my opinion on this process. I had to read about it in the business section of the Press Telegram after the draft report was completed. No one has been able to enumerate just what benefits my property will accrue from the tax levied on my property. When we invited DLBA representatives to present to us, vague reference was made to improved property values, street cleaning--items that appear specifically not included in benefits to be counted in the language of the statute governing these activities (Proposition 218)

Page 5	I do not believe that outreach efforts regarding the district plan have been rigorous or robust. More effort is needed to contact and inform affected stakeholders regarding developments.
Page 5	the city should be covering your services - and yeah, don't they fund most of what you do? get out of town now... we want a BID not a PBID
Page 5	This plan will do nothing to improve the life quality in the area. No one listens to the residents.
Page 6	some of this seems primarily RESIDENTIAL, and as such should not be included in the assessment.
Page 6	No "opt out" procedure even though Prop. 218 specifically says that "no benefit" equals "no assessment"
Page 6	What benefits exactly are the residential units being assessed for that is separate from the businesses?
Page 6	DISAGREE
Page 6	Why doesn't the PBID boundaries match the BID (DPIA) area? Why are there two different districts one for property tax assessment and one for business license fees. Why aren't the same people involved in both? What arbitrary measure was used to define the PBID separately from the BID? Both are administered by the DLBA - that is the DOWNTOWN LONG BEACH ASSOCIATION. This would suggest that they are both part of downtown. Something doesn't make sense. Who is running downtown? The DLBA? The City? The commercial property owners? Only the DLBA made the decisions about the boundaries, the benefit zones and the changes. This is not acceptable practice. On another note: without an engineer's report we do not know what we are being charged for.
Page 6	NO TAXATION OF OWNER-OCCUPIED RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND PROPERTIES OWNED BY NON-PROFITS you know, the ones that really are "non-profit", unlike yourselves
Page 6	Arbitrary boundaries. Why should I be forced to pay a new tax when my neighbors directly across the street won't be taxed.
Page 6	Creating 2 zones instead of 3 is just a method of collecting more fees from the homeowners who would have been in the third category and stand to benefit the least.
Page 6	why aren't you taxing the Marina area? this is another ridiculous exclusion - does Kraig live on a boat there?
Page 6	Golden Shore is too far away from downtown to be in this plan. Why isn't the plan focused the the first word in your name - Downtown Long Beach PBID Management plan? How many residents shop or walk even to Magnolia? Most residents in our complex consider downtown to go no further west than Pacific. The civic center should have its own PBID separate from downtown.

Page 7	I would like to see the Art Zone be invigorated. the "art" that is offered does not appeal to a broad art interest. Most events are poorly attended and lack pizzazz.
Page 7	We do not benefit, the PBID is a parasitic group.
Page 7	The map is unclear to me for the following reason. The map lists that my residence is in a premium zone, likely due to ground floor commercial in my mixed use building. However, as a resident, I do not support paying a premium for premium service. It has been relayed during community meetings, that as a resident, I will only be assessed the standard level of service, but this is not what this map shows.
Page 7	The boundaries have been set arbitrarily with no criteria. Proposition 218 specifies that there must be an opt out procedure which can be used to exclude properties which do not receive benefits. The burden of proof for demonstrating direct benefits to a property is with the City and the DLBA. No such procedure is in the draft plan - will it be in the final plan?
Page 7	Again, how were these boundaries determined? By whom and by what measure?
Page 7	No comment.
Page 7	get rid of them all... no premium areas - oh, never mind, NO PBID EVER
Page 7	Residents of downtown Long beach should not have to pay for these services.
Page 7	We do not benefit, the PBID is a parasitic group.
	Our staff has been cleaning the sidewalks and street in front of the Cooper Arms for decades. Your service is not needed! Most of what is proposed is already done by City services and paid for in our existing property taxes.
	Homeowner's pay for the Clean Teams through their tax payments to the City of Long Beach. We should not be taxed again for services we don't want or need. Our HOA dues pay for a maintenance staff to regularly clean our sidewalks, immediately remove graffiti from our building, pick up trash around our property, and maintain the overall look of our building from the outside in. Our HOA dues pay for a landscaper to keep the parkland on our property aesthetically pleasing and well maintained. Our HOA dues pay for a security team to monitor perimeter cameras, patrol our property, and communicate any suspicious or life threatening activity to Long Beach Police or Fire Departments. Our security team is the eyes and ears for Long Beach's first responders. We already pay for, and provide the services that the PBID is claiming to introduce into our neighborhood. We are already our own self-contained PBID!
	INACCURATE WE HAVE SEEN LOW PERFORMING EMPLOYEES THROUGH THE YEARS. WHY SPEND MORE MONEY ON LOW PERFORMERS

	<p>Regarding "clean and safe" program: apparently this is the DLBA's flagship program. It does not apply to our building's HOA at all. We have three full time employees devoted directly to cleaning. Their duties include cleaning the sidewalks. We don't, however, take the time to weigh our trash before removing it. As to the "safe" part - we contract with Platt Security for our security issues. Our costs of over \$165,000 a year include 24 hour onsite guards, extra staffing during city-sponsored events such as the Grand Prix, and daily patrol of the perimeter as well as Platt car patrol of the area. The landscaping costs of \$22,000/year include maintenance of the Victory Park in front which is a City-owned park. This is a prime example that the proposed plan would constitute double taxation. We don't want and we don't need the DLBA's safe and clean program.</p>
	<p>If the business community is willing to pay for these services, why not? But, as a homeowner, these services are unnecessary and duplicative.</p>
	<p>we've noticed you've stepped up the pressure washing since this proposal has come out - I guess it'll go back to nothing once you get this PBID barged through the city... none of this works to the benefit of ANY homeowners - except perhaps those on the Promenade - tax them and be done with it</p>
	<p>I watch your employees pick up trash, there is no way they removed 192 tons of trash, they sweep up leaves, I have watched them pass right by trash and not even pick it up.</p>
	<p>The Clean Teams & Service Guides provide no direct services to condo homeowners. We pay city & county taxes and HOA fees and do not need an additional tax burden to support a business association.</p>
	<p>In the 22 years I have been downtown I have never seen a guides do any of the services outlined. Removing weeds? Cleaning Graffiti? Asking homeless people to leave? I have called the City of Long Beach to provide these services in the past and they have responded. Again, these services are redundant and unnecessary.</p>
	<p>this are a lot of self serving comments.</p>
	<p>Our homeowners' association already undertakes substantial maintenance operations on public property in front of our building--which is a public park. It is not at all clear how "Clean and Safe" benefits our association. In addition, these putative benefits are not recognized as "special" benefits under Proposition 218.</p>
Page 8	<p>our building is washed daily by our service as is every other condo - stick it to businesses that don't tend to their properties... and dump your environmentally and financially inept Segways... you have ENOUGH "guides" no more are needed and the clean team is abusive to residents and disobeys traffic laws</p>

Page 8	we've noticed you've stepped up the pressure washing since this proposal has come out - I guess it'll go back to nothing once you get this PBID barged through the city... none of this works to the benefit of ANY homeowners - except perhaps those on the Promenade - tax them and be done with it
Page 9	This all appears to be 'make work' projects to justify the existence of the PBID and the well paid jobs created by this agency.
Page 9	We already pay for the services listed above through our HOA dues. We already do our part to maintain a clean and safe environment in our section of downtown.
Page 9	This is City responsibility, not this speciall agency. Too much government.
Page 9	I HAVE NEVER SEEN A CLEAN AND SAFE SERVICE OR A SAFETY GUIDE IN MY LOCATION. NOR WILL I EVER. YET I AM EXPECTED TO PAY FOR A SERVICE THAT I DO NOT RECEIVE?? EXPLAIN THAT ONE TO ME. YOU INCLUDED BY DEVELOPEMENT JUST TO RAISE FUNDS, THAT IS NOT FAIR!!!
Page 9	Homeowners pay for their own security, their own landscaping and maintenance. Why should we pay the DLBA for what we already provide? The DLBA has never services our area and probably won't in the future. What complaint process is in place as part of the plan if we don't receive promised benefits?
Page 9	I see ZERO red-shirted clean team members in downtown on Sunday but have seen your pressure washer people - the guides have been non-existent over the past few weeks, except when they're talking on their phones in the bus center area
Page 9	I have never seen them once clean up graffiti.
Page 9	The guides are never seen in my area. There is no need for them in what is a residential area albeit considered downtown for PBID tax purposes. Moreover, the Clean Teams are rarely in my area and are unnecessary as our association maintains our property.
	Until mid October of this year no one on our block had seen your clean team or anyothers from your group, why now? Why are all of a sudden are your people showing up?
	some areas on the East Village have NEVER been cleaned - your services are a SHAM
	Again, nothing above benefits the Cooper Arms!
	If community court is eliminated, use the money to decrease the fees for businesses. The residential fee is not unreasonable
Page 10	As previously stated, condo buildings that have multiple ownerships and crime from the renters will feed in to this. Units owned by banks that have squatters and undesirable "tenants" in them are also difficult to deal with as things are now. Would like to see some sort of
Page 11	Downtown is still a MESS! after 15 years of DLBA/PBID taxing and spending and continues to get worse!

Page 11	The activities of the PBID are clearly aimed towards attracting and retaining businesses. That is perfectly fine. Keep the homeowner's out of the PBID. We already do our part as customers of the many downtown businesses, and through the services paid through our HOA dues.
	DON'T BITE THE HAND THAT FEEDS YOU. WE SHOP/SPEND MONEY AS HOME OWNERS..
	DOESN'T EVERYTHING ON THIS PAGE BENEFIT THE COMMERCIAL PART OF DOWNTOWN? WHY SHOULD A RESIDENT PAY FOR A COMMERCIAL BENEFIT?
	If the business community and commercial property owners are satisfied, let them pay the bill. But first, have a look at Pine Avenue and then compare it with Victory Park fronting Ocean. Who is doing their part?
	Has the DLBA really delivered on their promise to the business owners? Should they continue? Have a look at Pine Avenue - what does that tell you?
	New Year's Eve was awful - great way to promote downtown bars and restaurants by cording people off and forcing them to buy your expensive drinks - I went and hated it... your budget should be lowered, not increased - DLBA should not be governing residents
	The last thing I would do is "shop local". More thought should have been put to the development of the catastrophes on Pine and in the Pike. The retail mix is totally off and does not cater to local residents. Most of the visitors to the area are not downtown residents. Again, the benefit to downtown residents is not evident!
	I thought you were supposed to be activating store fronts already? So where are they? Did they leave your area for Belmont Shore?
	These activities are precisely those that I as a homeowner in downtown Long Beach object to paying for. To the extent that these activities are underwritten by the assessments levied on homeowners under the proposed plan, this represents a taxpayer subsidization of the cost of doing business in Long Beach.
	let's see, people come downtown, make a mess, get drunk, wreck windows, throw trash everywhere and we should pay for this? we don't want any of your activities - we can't find anywhere to park when you have your special events and we're accosted by drunks and druggies - maybe if you lived here you'd understand WE DON'T WANT YOU
	For the reasons listed above under economy, beautification and guides should be included as benefiting commercial property, not residential property. Frankly, your organization get an F for improving business. We have fewer boutique stores than we did three years ago.
	Economic development is great. But we don't need to attract anymore bars we need a total shopping experience.
	Homeowner's do not want to contribute to a greater bureaucracy. I doubt downtown homeowner's would reject higher taxes paid to the City of Long Beach to retain police and fire personnel, or teachers. But, not to build Kraig Kojjan's empire.

	If this is a mandatory tax why is there a delinquency reserve? And what happens to that money?
Page 12	The DLBA should be trimming their staff, not increasing it. Every other public agency is cutting. What makes the DLBA different?
Page 12	There is already too much overhead the draft plan suggests adding more unnecessary staff. Don't do it.
Page 12	bet you take all of this out of area and hire people that don't exist in LB - this is totally unnecessary in economic trials... and even in good times - whoever wrote this has never been to downtown and seen how DLBA has thrown away good business in favor of empty storefronts
Page 12	Who decides who will hold the position of resident coordinator. It is not clear that the DLBA has the homeowners best interest at heart. This is a business association looking out for business interest.
Page 12	No comment.
Page 12	apparently, the only advocacy you're doing is to keep your jobs... WE DON'T WANT YOU HERE
Page 13	TEN YEARS OF AN UNFAIR TAX!!
Page 13	Again, for the homeowner, it is difficult to see the value of these kind of expenditures. How's that for an understatement!
Page 13	How can the DLBA office operate with only \$350,000 including management and staff as indicated by this budget?
Page 13	Who oversees that the budget is adhered to?
Page 13	YOUR BUDGET IS RIDICULOUS - THE ONLY REASON IT'S THAT HIGH IS BECAUSE YOU'RE RELISHING THE IDEA OF RIPPING OFF PROPERTY OWNERS WHO DON'T WANT YOU HERE
Page 14	There should be a public hearing on the Engineer's Report. The Engineer's Report should have been produced by an unbiased firm, not hired by the DLBA. This smells of corruption. Homeowner's already pay for these services through our monthly HOA dues. We should not be charged twice.
Page 14	Residents need to see a copy of the Engineer report prior to the end of the comment period.
Page 14	This is a farce! The benefits listed under the standard heading are not provided to the homeowners in the standard area, nor are they needed. We take care of our own properties.
Page 14	Again, most of the services here benefit downtown business. What services are provided to the residents only?
Page 14	your joining again, yes?

Page 14	As a homeowner, I fail to see the direct benefit to me of the following services included in the plan for the standard service area: sidewalk sweeping (our association does this), power washing sidewalks, graffiti removal (our association already does this--it is our responsibility), bicycle and segway patrols, escort and visitor services, community court (see previous comments), beautification (our association already does this), meeting and special events, economic development.
Page 15	Once again, I don't believe that the Cooper Arms will "receive full benefit from Environment Services". We have already paid for the City to provide these services!
Page 15	If new residential units are build within the PBID, will they pay the assessment? Will the assessment for others decline if new assessment comes in?
Page 15	Homeowner's should not be assessed whether their properties are owner-occupied or rental units. We already pay for the PBID services through our HOA dues.
Page 15	No "opt out" procedure even though Prop. 218 specifically says that "no benefit" equals "no assessment"
Page 15	OWNER OCCUPIED RESIDENTIAL WILL RECEIVE FULL BENEFIT FROM ENVIRONMENT SERVICES(CLEAN AND SAFE, COMMUNITY COURT AND BEAUTIFICATION) AND WILL BE ASSESSED FULLY FOR THEM. WE DON'T GET THOSE NOW, WE DON'T NEED THEM, AND WE DON'T WANT THEM. KEEP YOUR SERVICES AND YOUR ASSESSMENTS
Page 15	I hope the commercial property owners are weighing in on these issues. Are they being asked for input on the interactive survey also?
Page 15	The homeowners object to being included in the assessment in any form. I hope the commercial property owners are carefully reviewing the proposals that apply to them and will voice their opinion accordingly. Why aren't the commercial owners provide links to this interactive survey like the residents. The link only appears in the residential version of the DLBA newsletter.
Page 15	OWNER OCCUPIED AND NON-PROFIT PROPERTIES RECEIVE ZERO BENEFITS NOW AND WILL RECEIVE ZERO BENEFITS ONCE YOU'VE RAMMED THIS CRAPPY IDEA THROUGH THE CITY COUNCIL - WE DON'T WANT OR NEED IT... YOU'RE ASKING US TO PAY AT LEAST TWICE FOR SERVICES WE ALREADY RECEIVE FROM OUR HOA
Page 15	Homeowners do not receive full benefit and as such dshouldnot be included in the PBID.
Page 15	This is not something ment to be understood. How many of the general public can comprehend this?
Page 15	Residential owner-occupied property is conclusively presumed not to benefit from any activity under existing law regardless of the attempt to make a distinction between economic or environmental services. No support in law has been provided to demonstrate that any distinction is warranted.

Page 15	NO DOUBLE DIPPING OF PROPERTY OWNERS - WE PAY FOR CITY SERVICES AND THE CITY PAYS YOU - THAT'S DOUBLE DIPPING, KRAIG
Page 16	As a homeowner, I object to any assessment on my property.
Page 16	I would like to see the City take a active part in reassessing the value of the PBID and the DLBA. Also, the commercial owners should be encouraged to have a voice. I hope that public hearings conducted by the City Council will take place prior to the adoption of the final plan and prior to the petition/balloting process.
Page 16	oh great, now our parking fees will go up, too... just what we need when we can't find jobs
Page 16	what is this a change in a previous page?
Page 16	LOTS OF WORDS BUT NOTHING OF VALUE ON THIS PAGE EITHER
Page 16	Again the most important part is missing. And the assessor's office is responsible for valuing the property within their jurisdiction. The tax collector is who issues property tax bills with special assessments. The gentleman from PUMA should know that.
Page 17	UNFAIR TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION..
Page 17	No comments except those provided previously regarding the items discussed on this page.
Page 17	C. appears to allow annual tax increases approved by those government bodies that directly benefit. Interesting!
Page 17	Owner-occupied residential assessment rates should be zero. We already pay for services through our HOA dues. Homeowners should not be assessed for services we already receive and already pay for.
Page 17	against the assessment
Page 17	I REFUSE TO PAY FOR A SERVICE I DO NOT USE
Page 17	I hope the business community and the commercial property owners are weighing in on these issues as well. They should be commenting as well as homeowners
Page 17	As a homeowner, I object to any assessment.
Page 17	read my lips - NO NEW TAXES ON RESIDENTS - we just can't afford to pay your salary and that of Mr Larsen and the out-of-area people that drew up this ridiculous proposal
Page 17	We already pay for these services, residents should not have to pay for these redundant services,
Page 17	I resent having to pay any assessment. This feels like a money grab by DLBA to advance their personal agenda. This tax can be raised every year by "X" amount. Every dollar you tax me will e a dollar I don't spend downtown!!
Page 17	Again, this PBID should only apply to downtown business.
Page 17	STOP ROBBING THE PEOPLE OF LONG BEACH FOR YOUR OWN APPEASEMENT... COMMERCIAL DOESN'T WANT YOU, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PEOPLE YOU HAVE IN YOUR POCKET - AND ISN'T THAT A BIG PART OF YOUR "BUDGET"?
Page 18	No comments.
Page 18	I believe the time has come to disestablish the PBID and disestablish the BLBA.

Page 18	This is taxation without representation. Due to the weighted voting system, 2500 homeowners will have no voice versus the 20 or so largest businesses and government entities in downtown that control 50%+ of the PBID assessments. That is not Democracy! The City Council should demand the removal of homeowners from the PBID and let it remain a business entity.
Page 18	The homeowners should be counted in a separate category in the PBID and should have a separate vote of disestablishment. At present, our vote will have no impact and that makes it not representative of our interests.
Page 18	The business community and the commercial property owners should conduct a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the DLBA and then use the "disestablishment clause"..
Page 18	I would hope that the BID and the PBID both will consider a thorough evaluation of the DLBA and its effectiveness. And, if the DLBA is found wanting, they will move to have a petition drive to cut off the funding to the DLBA.
Page 18	It's time to disestablish you.
Page 18	No comment.
Page 18	NOT A FUCKING PENNY, KRAIG
Page 18	None
Page 18	Can the residents see the detailed breakdown on administrative costs including staff by position? It would be helpful.
Page 19	thank you to those volunteers who serve on the DLBA Board. i trust them to do their best on behalf of all downtown stakeholders
Page 19	I would encourage DLBA to re-read the DLBA Strategic Plan (DLBA 2010: A Strategy for Leadership and Development available online at: http://downtownlongbeach.org/plans-reports/), revisit the recommendations provided and follow the advice given while putting together the second draft of the PBID management plan, specifically as it applies to engagement of residents, changes to bylaws, and benefit/value of existing service levels. Page 24 of DLBA 2010: A Strategy for Leadership and Development states that the 'DLBA Strategic Plan is built upon the assumption that the Top Four Priorities can be implemented with existing staff and resources'. Most of the elements proposed in the PBID update are included in these top 4 priorities and so I am left feeling unsure if there is actually increased need.
Page 19	The DLBA has proven itself to be non-transparent and not trustworthy in its PBID renewal process with homeowners.
Page 19	It is also inconceivable that the City Council would entrust tax dollars from the homeowners of downtown Long Beach for a duplication of services by including us in the PBID.

Page 19	REDUCING COST IS GOOD, BUT WHY AN ADDITIONAL LEVY, FEE, TAX IS NEEDED AT THIS TIME WHEN REALESTATE IS NOT DOING WELL. I BELIEVE THIS WILL BE A BURDEN ON THE SALE OF PROPERTIES IN THE AREA AND MORE CAUSE OF VACANT BUILDINGS AND UNITS.
Page 19	The draft management plan is taking the DLBA further and further away from its core mission of serving the business and commercial property community. If I were a business owner or a commercial property owner, I would definitely want to join my associates to develop a plan to meet the needs of downtown and not use a consultant from Denver to draft a plan. As a businessman, I would recognize that downtown homeowners are my customers and should not be treated as just another source of income for business programs.
Page 19	This is an unnecessary layer of government in Long Beach and the City Council should re-evaluate whether the DLBA continues to serve as the "face" of downtown.
Page 19	if DLBA proposes to govern this PBID, does that not remove you from being a non-profit and make you another parcel of government? we need less governance and more self-responsibility
Page 19	Marketing is a business function. Our property taxes cover maintenance. This PBID is redundant.
Page 19	As previously noted, I saw no evidence of an active effort to obtain public input in the preparation of this report. I saw no flyers, mailings, or any other form of communication soliciting my (or anybody else's) input on these issues. The only presentation I was was a result of our association asking for a DLBA representative to make a presentation to us--AFTER THE REPORT WAS WRITTEN.
Page 19	IF YOU'RE A NONPROFIT, WHY THE FUCK ARE YOU EARNING SO MUCH MONEY AND DOING NOTHING? WHY DIDN'T KRAIG TALK TO THE LAFAYETTE? AFRAID OF HOMEOWNERS? YOU SHOULD BE
Page 19	How are assessment payers informed about their ability to participate in program design and development of services, etc. And where and when are these meeting?
Indiv. Sub.	Residence DO receive benefits from economic development activities and should share in the cost.
Indiv. Sub.	Add an Urban Residency task force as a primary forum to encourage resident input.
Indiv. Sub.	
Indiv. Sub.	Since the engineer does an annual review of properties, the preliminary engineering report should have been included in the draft management plan.
Indiv. Sub.	There should be a special assessment category to encourage live/work properties with a lower rate.

Indiv. Sub.	DRC would like to see an explicit, side-by-side comparison of the existing DLBA budget vs. the proposed DLBA budget. This side-by-side comparison should not only present the existing and proposed budgets as a whole, but should include any line items within the existing DLBA budget for which changes are proposed - including any new line items that are being proposed, but do not exist in the current DLBA budget. Without such a comparison, it is not possible to understand the proposed budget relative to the existing budget.
Indiv. Sub.	DRC would like to see not only the current year DLBA budget in the Plan, but also the budget and actuals for each year since the 2003 renewal of the existing PBID. We request this because understanding how DLBA has performed over the past 10 years with regard to managing its expenses and incorporating additional revenues will inform stakeholders with regard to how we can expect DLBA to perform in these same areas over the next 10 years. We would like to see these annual budgets included at a line-item level of detail for both revenues and expenses so that it is clear how expenses have shifted over time and whether or not revenues have increased over time through increased assessments, and if so, by how much. We feel these budgets could easily be incorporated as an appendix to the Plan and formally request that they be included.
Indiv. Sub.	DRC supports DRC participating in the DLBA Board nomination, budgeting, and strategic planning process to ensure that residential priorities are incorporated in a cohesive manner into the DLBA governance, planning and management processes.

Indiv. Sub.	<p>DRC would like to see an explicit table of assessment changes since 2003 to understand how much CPI indexing has added to the DLBA budget over time and how these additional revenues have been allocated and spent. We feel that treating the DLBA budget as you would an HOA budget is inappropriate because Downtown ownership and PBID voting representation is not clear cut. Rolling over surpluses makes sense, but rolling over deficits and increasing assessments to cover gaps is akin to the City raising taxes each year as necessary to balance its budget. Such a tactic would not be accepted by the general public at a Citywide level, and DRC feels that Downtown residents, who are a minority voice Downtown despite our compulsory inclusion in the PBID assessment, should not be coerced into supporting such a tactic as relates to PBID. DRC believes DLBA should commit to dealing with deficits as opportunities to review existing service levels and cut expenses and/or reduce services as appropriate in order to remain within budget, not as opportunities to increase assessments without regard to the actual performance of PBID administration.</p>
-------------	--

