

Melanie Hadden

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Melanie Hadden
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 3/19 Harbor Meeting - Public Comment - Rate Increases

You don't often get email from craig.gerbi@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**** External Sender ****

Dear distinguished Harbor Board,

I'd like to comment on the proposed rate increases for tenants at Pillar Point Harbor which I disagree with.

After a quick review of the actual budget last year and the projected budget this year, the harbor district is projected to run a surplus of over \$3 million this year and recognized an actual surplus of over \$4M last year. This is to say that, according to the year-over-year budget surpluses, it does not appear that the harbor needs additional revenue from tenants in times of continued economic stress.

In general, there have been year-over-year continued delays and cancelations of commercial and recreational fishing seasons while the harbor continues to try to increase costs to the tenants without offering increased services. These proposed increases are on the heels of other economic stress for tenants including Covid, moving from a flat rate to sell fish from the dock to a percentage of catch as well as absorbing duplicative capital projects like the Surfer's Beach bathroom project (when a harbor-owned bathroom existed within the RV park), relatively empty properties (like 504 Alhambra) and continued interest and negotiations to purchase unneeded vacant lots in Princeton.

Also, sending out public notices on a Friday afternoon before a Wednesday meeting asking for public comment and then requiring comments to be submitted by 5 pm Tuesday is rushing the process. If the district wanted honest feedback they would allow ample time for the public to comment in a meaningful way. Without that ample time, the process is "garbage in, garbage out", and the District will likely haphazardly move forward greenlighting projects it wants rather than truly serving the needs of the public.

If the Harbor District actually needed revenue, there are plenty of other areas to raise money (sell 504 Alhambra, not purchase Princeton property, charge harbor visitors to park in outer lots, etc., etc. Since the district does not need additional revenue and there is not an honest exploration of all revenue streams nor a vision for why the revenue stream is needed the proposal to increase rates and fees on tenants is tone-deaf at a minimum.

Sincerely,
Craig Gerbi