
FW: February 3 Council Meeting Item 8.3 The Alameda Business Improvement District Protest Letters

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 1/27/2026 1:45 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

 1 attachment (963 KB)
899 Park Ave Protest TABID.pdf;

From: Alvarez, Salvador <Salvador.Alvarez@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 1:27 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Information ABA [REDACTED]; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>; Roche, Megan <megan.roche@sanjoseca.gov>; Rodriguez, Joy <Joy.Rodriguez@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: February 3 Council Meeting Item 8.3 The Alameda Business Improvement District Protest Letters

Hi,
Four letters of protest were received by the City Manager's Office of Economic Development [REDACTED] postmarked January 17, 2026 by four businesses [REDACTED] LLC, Professional Maintenance Company Inc, Higdon Union Properties LLC and Columbia Roeder Properties LLC, see attached.

Thank you.

Sal.

Salvador C. Alvarez

Business Development Officer | City Manager's Office of Economic Development and Cultural Affairs
City of San José
200 East Santa Clara Street, 17th floor
San José, CA 95113
Office: 408-793-6943
www.sjeconomy.com | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#)



NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may be protected by law. If you receive this in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error and delete this communication and any attachments from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.

COLUMBIA ROEDER PROPERTIES LLC

[REDACTED]
San Jose CA 95126

January 14, 2026

Office of the City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
Tower 14th Floor
San Jose CA 95113

Re: The Alameda Business Improvement District (TABID)

Please consider this an official protest to the proposed TABID, which our address falls into. This Improvement District will have no positive effect on our business and with all the constant increase in expenses we want it clear that Columbia Roeder Properties, LLC is a NO VOTE.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Allen Hulme
Member

HIGDON UNION PROPERTIES LLC

[REDACTED]
San Jose CA 95126

January 14, 2026

Office of the City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
Tower 14th Floor
San Jose CA 95113

Re: The Alameda Business Improvement District (TABID)

Please consider this an official protest to the proposed TABID, which our address falls into. This Improvement District will have no positive effect on our business and with all the constant increase in expenses we want it clear that Higdon Union Properties, LLC is a NO VOTE.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Allen Hulme
Member

PROFESSIONAL MAINTENANCE COMPANY INC

[REDACTED]
San Jose CA 95126

January 14, 2026

Office of the City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
Tower 14th Floor
San Jose CA 95113

Re: The Alameda Business Improvement District (TABID)

Please consider this an official protest to the proposed TABID, which our address falls into. This Improvement District will have no positive effect on our business and with all the constant increase in expenses we want it clear that Professional Maintenance Company Inc is a NO VOTE.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Allen Hulme
Corporate Officer

1878 PARK AVENUE LLC

[REDACTED]
San Jose CA 95126

January 14, 2026

Office of the City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
Tower 14th Floor
San Jose CA 95113

Re: The Alameda Business Improvement District (TABID)

Please consider this an official protest to the proposed TABID, which our address falls into. This Improvement District will have no positive effect on our business and with all the constant increase in expenses we want it clear that 1878 Park Avenue LLC is a NO VOTE.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Allen Hulme
Member



Outlook

FW: Public Comment on Item 8.3 of 2/3/2026 Council Meeting

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Wed 1/28/2026 10:34 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Greg Ripa [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 9:17 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment on Item 8.3 of 2/3/2026 Council Meeting

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Re: the Establishment of The Alameda Business Improvement District and Approval to Levy Assessments in The Alameda Business Improvement District for the Remainder of Fiscal Year 2025-2026 (Item 8.3 of 2/3/2026 Council Meeting)

To the City Council:

My business has filed a written protest on the formation of this district due to it being a home based business with not a single client having ever entered the home based business for the entire time this business has been operating (10+ years). There is not a need to increase foot traffic or have district events for my home based business since that won't attract new customers due to a lack of a storefront; in other words, my business does not require more visitation to the area. Thus, I do not believe that the district will provide a direct, measurable benefit to my assessed business, and as opposed to Finding 11 in the ordinance, my business within this district will NOT be benefited by the improvements and activities funded by the assessment to be levied. Coupled with rising costs of doing business due to inflation and the increase in the use of subscription based services, it is becoming harder to run a financially successful company in this climate, particularly with even relatively small required assessments that provide no benefit since the cumulative effect of all of these small changes (TABID assessment plus inflation plus increased subscription services) is a large change.

Per the attached TABID Service Plan (attached to the memo in this item), the reduced rate is being offered to people such as rideshare operators. Again, what use would a rideshare operator have for such a district? Same for almost all home based businesses such as mine.

The current ordinance removes some of this language and only discusses reduced assessments for businesses with less than two (2) employees and all non-profit organizations. Why the change or difference from the Service Plan?

Also, the district boundaries are not drawn well. The proposed district of "The Alameda" encompasses businesses on both Park Avenue and San Carlos Street. What benefit do these companies get for drawing people to The Alameda, away from their businesses? Will events, marketing, seasonal decor, banners, wayfinding, wine walks, etc. be provided to these businesses that are not located along the primary business street of The Alameda? The Service Plan is silent on this issue. It seems as though

the district boundaries were made to gain as much assessment money as possible while providing the least benefit to the outlying areas, at least as written currently. Perhaps more clarity on how the district will benefit these outlying streets would change my mind. Or, perhaps better boundaries to reflect The Alameda, such as Tillman Avenue and San Fernando Street, would be better.

The Community Benefit District is working well and should be left as-is. The new business improvement district, if formed, should overlap the same boundaries (or extend in a similar fashion towards 880 of mostly just the properties that have frontage on The Alameda) since that is the core of "The Alameda".

Please note that I would be supportive of this district if solo artists, home based businesses, nonprofits, and rideshare operators were exempt from the assessments since these categories of businesses are not expected to benefit from the district nearly as much as someone with a storefront along The Alameda. I would likewise be supportive of the district if the boundaries were changed to better reflect businesses along The Alameda since that is the district name.

Until such time as exemptions from the assessment are granted, the boundaries are changed, and/or the benefits explicitly extended to streets other than The Alameda, I will not support the formation of this district.

Thank you,
Greg Ripa

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.