

[Sue S.Martha Rd](#) • [7 Oct 20](#)

Yes on Measure R has broad local support. Those in Orinda who know the issue best, support Yes on Measure R, including the mayor, all city council members and candidates, ten former mayors, all school board members, Citizen Infrastructure Oversight Committee members, Orinda Firewise Council, Moraga-Orinda Fire Chief and directors, etc and hundreds of residents. Measure R provides funds for immediate and significant wildfire risk reduction, as well as stable and predictable long term funding, to maintain wildfire safety and critical infrastructure, so we don't find ourselves facing the same problem in a few short years. The problems are urgent now, the solutions are available now. We can't wait for what ifs. Voting Yes on R is the right thing to do for our community now!

Posted in

Recommendations

to

41 neighborhoods

3 reports. Review ›

153 Comments

Share

[Le Yu](#)

• [Estates](#)

You posted a similar msg 4 hours ago. R or not stop spamming political ads.

7 Oct 20

[Jamie McClay](#)

• [Oak Springs](#)

Haven't meet a mayor or councilman or woman, current or retired who won't vote for more money 💰 to spend anyway they want. Let's not forget our California gas tax for roads alone at 17 cents a gallon. Just checked my property tax for Orinda ZN FIRE TAX and Orinda Roads BD 14 and 16. Poorly thought out and written. I'd keep the old tax, but no more left to give let alone this tax and Contra Costa Measure X another 1/2 cent sales tax on the ballot. We really don't get our moneys worth.

7 Oct 20

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

While we need fire prevention funds, Measure R does NOT have wide support because it is a long-term general tax. Even the SF Chronicle, which generally supports fair tax requests, sees Measure R as regressive and ill-timed and warns that "Voters should hesitate to support long-term, regressive tax hikes at a time of great but temporary turmoil." The East Bay Times also urges voters to reject Measure R and faults it for its 20-year length and reminds voters that "Elected leaders could spend the money for any program, employee salaries or fatter labor benefits" because it is a General Tax. We already have a sales tax that doesn't expire until March of 2023. We need a dedicated fire-prevention tax, not a general tax that doesn't expire until 2041.

7 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

I will take the advice of long term, UNPAID, public servants over the advice of the "vote no" people. What is it that most of vocal "vote no" people are really after? They want Orinda to raise taxes to maintain their private roads. If this tax had that purpose, every objection you see from Kathy Finch, Steve Cohn, et al would be dropped. They say "even though i) I agreed to maintain my road when I bought my house and ii)

there is NO PRECEDENT FOR ANY MUNICIPALITY IN CALIFORNIA TO ASSUME THE OBLIGATION OF ITS PRIVATE ROAD RESIDENTS' TO MAINTAIN THEIR PRIVATE ROADS, we want Orinda to do that for us." Every time you see a "vote no" suggestion, check the name against those that appear on the "Orinda Road Facts" website. Most of these people are part of a small group of private road homeowners who want the city to relieve them of the obligation to maintain their private road. An obligation that they agreed to when they bought their house and which was reflected in the price they paid for their house.

7 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Jlm - You live on La Cresta. In 2014 La Cresta had a PCI of 25, on the cusp between Poor and Very Poor. It probably needed to be completely rebuilt. By 2019 it had a PCI of 90 meaning it had been completely rebuilt, probably at a cost of about \$1 million a mile. Since La Cresta is 1,500 feet long, it probably cost close to \$300,000 to repair. Since you are one of 35 homes on La Cresta, why do you think you deserve a publicly funded benefit of \$8,500 when the 1,500 families living on roads the City has yet deemed public, even though their roads serve the same function as La Cresta (providing access to your home), don't?

7 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

Steve Cohn

Steve, You live on La Fond. You bought your house knowing "the deal". The deal was that you would pay for the maintenance of La Fond AND pay taxes to maintain all public roads in Orinda. Presumably, if you were thinking about this issue at the time you bought your house, it was reflected in the price you paid for your house. You have expressed how, historically, you were quite pleased with your decision and the fact that you live on a private road. As you have noted, La Fond was maintained better than La Cresta and the other the public roads in Orinda. Maybe you assumed you would sell your house before Orinda, obviously inevitably, would tax its residents to maintain its public roads? If so, it appears you made a bad assumption. So, now that the inevitable has occurred, you no longer are happy with your decision. Sorry that you made a bad assumption. Don't ask Orinda's taxpayers to bail you out. And don't pretend that that this wouldn't be the "right tax at the right time" if it did bail you out. Too transparent. What you ask is unprecedented. Orinda is one of thousands of municipalities in California with public and private roads — none have done what you are demanding. And no, sorry, this is not comparable to a civil rights issue. Stop making that comparison, please.

7 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Jim Evert

- For the same reason women wanted the right to vote and blacks wanted access to the same facilities as whites. It's called equality. And yes, there may be a cost in providing it.

7 Oct 20

[Patrick Beaham](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Steve Cohn

...because he lives on a Public Road, not a Private Road. Current Taxes collected are spent on the present Public Roads. We maintain use Taxes to maintain Parks & Public Schools, not Private Golf Courses or Private Prep Schools. ...fairly simple.. Nobody kidnapped you, put a gun to your head and force you to buy a property on a Private Road.

7 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Patrick Beaham

Country Clubs keep the public out if you are not a member. There are miles of 100% publicly-used roads categorized as “private” for byzantine reasons that don’t serve the city AS A UNIFIED WHOLE well. For many reasons (including safety), some of their residents want a roadmap or path for those roads to move into the public system. In the face of the largest tax measure in history of Orinda, some of these residents want a path here. Isn’t that in the spirit of Measure R language .. that all of our safety matters .. including the safety of our roads and infrastructure? Why is it “selfish” for some residents to simply want a path to get public service?

7 Oct 20

[Shaheen Tonse](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

La Cresta and La Fond are quite close to each other. Using Google Maps it is apparent that Steve and Jim make equal use of Orinda's public streets. Assuming they pay the same dollar amount towards tax I see them getting equal benefit in terms of miles driven per dollar tax paid. If I were a private road resident I would realise that, be satisfied, stop wasting my own time, the council's time, the staff's time and city's money and get on with my life. The City has already spent oodles of money researching this issue.

8 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Steve Cohn

one of the great non-sequiturs of all time. Women didn't choose not to vote, and Blacks didn't choose separate facilities. Really!

14 Oct 20

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

Correct, they didn't choose -- they were required not to vote, or to have segregated facilities; and many of us were REQUIRED by the city to live on private roads. Orinda has REQUIRED all developers to make their roads private so the city would not have to maintain them.

15 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Kathy Finch

no one required you to buy a house on a private road. You knew what you were buying into. You consented. Developers, who by the way have made untold millions, are free to develop elsewhere. They consented.

(edited)

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

A city that refuses to grant the most basic services to tax-paying residents, such as road and storm drain maintenance, is a city that fosters inequality. The city REFUSES new public roads and has since its inception. People are forced into buying homes in the East Bay wherever they can find them. The city knows that they have prospective residents over a barrel because they know people need homes, which

are hard to find. The city takes advantage of its own constituents in this way. it may be technically legal, but it's not ethical. And we expect our government to be ethical and not take advantage of its taxpayers.

15 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Kathy Finch: Actually, consent is at the core of ethics, justice, morality and contracts. No one forced you to buy on a private road in the very nice Wilder community. There have always been plenty of houses available on public streets. But you chose Wilder. With that choice comes private roads that you have to maintain. I am sure this was all disclosed when you bought your house. You made a choice as a consenting adult. Live with it. In your Sep 4, 2018 Nextdoor Post you wrote, " Private street residents might want to keep this decision in mind when voting in November for their City Council representatives, and in the coming year or so when they are asked to vote in favor of the next Bond to fund road maintenance of public streets but not their own.". You are implementing that strategy and denying fire prevention funding to the rest of us for your own selfish reasons.

(edited)

[Rupa Joshi](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Wake up! Till 2041 there will be no voter review as to how the money is being spent and Measure R is just a piggy bank for the Council to spend as they wish. PLEASE VOTE NO ON MEASURE R!!

15 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

Quite the rhetoric. You start by implying Kathy did dubious work assessing her self interests buying in Wilder with "plenty" of other options, then close calling her "selfish" to vote against a public roads infrastructure bill.

(edited)

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Rupa Joshi

You are WRONG. Just as the current council proposed this measure, which prematurely ends the existing sales tax Measure L passed in 2012 effective in 2013), any future council could modify Measure R. There IS voter review every two years. This isn't an ad valorem tax to pay off a bond that, after the bonds are issued, cannot be changed. This is a sales tax. You should know this. You are another of the Wilder folks who knew and voluntarily agreed, when you bought your property, that you were on a private road that you would have to maintain.

(edited)

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

I did not imply Kathy did dubious work assessing her self interest. I stated that she made a knowing choice and now should live with it. I further stated that there is nothing unethical (her word) about requiring her to abide by a deal that she voluntarily consented to.

15 Oct 20

[Rupa Joshi](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

Here are the comments from The Contra Costa Taxpayers Association: Orindans pay enough taxes now. Measure R increases local sales tax even before their current ½% sales tax expires in April of 2023. The city already collects about \$3.5 million/year to spend on essential services until then. Orinda residents have serious concerns about fire protection. The city has known about fire risk for decades, but has never addressed it. Are we to believe the city will spend an appropriate amount now? Measure R indicates a small allocation for this purpose, but future councils may decide that there is another project they prefer. Accompanying Measure R, are other potential tax increases like the possible countywide increase in the sales tax and the statewide Proposition 15, making it easier to raise property taxes on commercial real estate. Measure R proponent Sen. Steve Glazer, at press time, is pursuing a Senate bill, unique to Contra Costa, to raise the allowable cap on local sales tax. If successful, we expect to see more tax measures ahead. When is enough going to be enough? Long term effects from the pandemic are yet unknown and this is not the time for a new 20 year commitment. Higher sales taxes depress the demand for goods. This drop in demand would lead to lost income for local sellers and can kill jobs. This measure is promoted by the City of Orinda because it only requires a simple majority to pass and, as general fund revenue, does not commit the city to any specific purpose. Vote NO on Measure R. www.cocotax.org

15 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Rupa Joshi

The Contra Costa Taxpayers Assn opposes every tax. <https://www.cocotax.org/ballot-positions> It is not a surprise that they would oppose Measure R.

15 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

voters can call for change. We don't have to "abide by the deal" when the deal stinks - and the spin is rotten to the core.

15 Oct 20

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

So it is "selfish" for private road residents to desire the same help from their taxes as public road residents have. Really? But it's not "selfish" for a city to deny some residents of equal treatment? And your reasoning regarding "consent" is equally illogical -- people expect their government to treat them equally and ethically.

16 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Kathy Finch

Yes, it is selfish to deny everyone protection from wildfires because you want to get out of a situation that you previously agreed to when you bought your house. It is not ethical to try to get out of something you consented to. The City IS treating people equally: it is holding everyone to what they agreed to.

16 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

do you know the story behind their name change? The roads people suddenly because fire safety evangelists?

10:05 ↗
◀ Mail cityoforinda.org

1 of 7 General Purpose Committee
Sponsored
 Small Contributor Committee
 Political Party/Central Committee

3. Committee Information

COMMITTEE NAME (OR CANDIDATE'S NAME IF NO C
Safer Orinda Yes on Measure R 2020
(formerly Fix Orinda Roads Now!)*

STREET ADDRESS (NO P.O. BOX)
117 Overhill Road

CITY STAT
Orinda CA

MAILING ADDRESS (IF DIFFERENT) NO. AND STREET
117 Overhill Road

CITY STAT
Orinda CA

OPTIONAL: FAX / E-MAIL ADDRESS

16 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

Yes. There was an existing campaign committee FPPC ID#1343654 that supported the 2016 road bond issue and rather than form a new committee, they changed the name of the existing committee. Has nothing to do with the merit or lack of merit of Prop R, which was passed by the Council.

16 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

So it has nothing to do with "reimagining" a sales effort to exploit community fire worries to secure more money for roads in THE NEXT 20 years. Got it.

16 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

Your sarcastic comment is actually correct. The name change is about saving a govt filing fee. Moreover, you are improperly conflating a volunteer campaign committee with the actual measure, which was enacted by the Council, not the committee. Measure R stand on its own two feet, regardless of whatever issues you think you have with the independent, volunteer citizen campaign committee.

16 Oct 20

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Charles Brotman

Wow! If I am reading this correctly, Charles, the people calling themselves "Safer Orinda" are actually the "Fix Orinda Roads" group just until last month? So "Safer Orinda" is actually the people lobbying for public road maintenance? They are in favor of taxes for road maintenance, which is what Measure R is, but they changed their name to make it seem as if they are in favor of fire safety? Even though most of Measure R goes to maintaining public roads rather than fire safety? Am I reading this correctly?

16 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

Kathy Finch

This is shocking! And, if you can believe this, I also hear that the people behind "wrong tax wrong time" are the same group behind the private roads civil rights movement. Will wonders never cease?

16 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

to save a \$50 filing? Nothing to with ongoing roads and infrastructure advocacy?

16 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Jim Evert

yes. Many of us are the same people. Maybe we should have renamed ourselves "Even Safer Orinda" to match the honesty of the Measure R committee.

16 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

Charles Brotman

Tough to call out the pot when you are the kettle

16 Oct 20

[William Wagner](#)

• [Manzanita Miner](#)

I am a private road person and I already know this city will never help me. Ever. I am on my own as are 15-20% of us - sucks but its true. I've moved on. But this measure isn't about Fire prevention, its not specific at all. If we want Fire Prevention - then write a Fire Prevention proposal, with the funds 100% earmarked for Fire Prevention and lets do it. Otherwise, stop taxing us and playing the "Fire" fear card - its misleading.

(edited)

[Rupa Joshi](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

I so agree with you William Wagner 😊

7 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Although an accurate count has not been made I estimate that the private road residents are now over 20%. More are being added all the time. At what % will we be "the public"? 25%? 51%? And then what happens to public residential roads?

8 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Charles Porges

Can you imagine if 25% of residents were prohibited from mail delivery and then told by others, "you should have known this when you bought your house. Stop complaining and now pay a lot more in mail delivery fees as mail delivery is a critical service for the rest of us!"

8 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

My problem with Measure R is that there is no plan. There is literally no plan for fire prevention. Where the \$500-750,000 a year for 3-4 years is anyone's guess. For a City that LOVEs plans (how many have been done on downtown), there is no fire prevention plan. The idea to spend any of the Measure R funds on fire prevention was a last minute hail-Mary move by the City when the February survey on a road maintenance tax showed that 86% said that Fire Prevention, not road maintenance, was their top priority. So Public Works Director Larry Theis came up with the \$500-\$750,000 number, knowing nothing about fire prevention because the City has spent virtually nothing in the past (and still has only \$50,000 in the budget) on fire prevention, because that was more than nothing but not enough to disrupt his road maintenance plan. There is a road plan but it only includes 75% of Orinda's roads. The roads that 1,500 Orindan's live on are ignored and we are treated like we are lepers looking for a kiss. And then there is the storm drain plan. Great as long as all you are talking about is the existing storm drains that take water down public roads. For all of those drains, or lack of drains, that veer off the public roads an pour millions of gallons of water onto and through private property, nothing. Not the City's problem (until the water causes damage; the City gets sued; and loses the suit). Until there is a plan for all of these, I am NOT writing the City a \$60 million blank check. For more details see www.OrindaRoadFacts.info

7 Oct 20

[Lynda Hay](#)

- [Del Rey](#)

Thanks Steve. I agree that this is the wrong way to go about solving our problems. R goes too far out without citizens' ability to assess if they're getting what they voted for. We all want fire safety but this piggy backing is not going to tell us how much of our money is effectively going toward that. I'd like to see 2 separate measures.

9 Oct 20

[Narayanaswamy Krishnamurthi](#)

- [Stein Way](#)

I already voted NO on R

7 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

Although we all agree that we need to address our fire risk, some Orindans disagree that Measure R is appropriate. There are some Media Recommendations against Measure R that in summary state: Wrong Tax (too long, too big); Wrong Time (in the middle of a pandemic); No Plan East Bay Times (<https://www.orindaroadfacts.info/east-bay-times>) San Francisco Chronicle (<https://www.orindaroadfacts.info/sf-chronicle>) With highlights. Originals here: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/editorials/article/Editorial-Bay-Area-ballots-crush-of-ill-timed-15623401.php> <https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/10/03/editorial-during-covid-voters-should-ok-only-two-contr-a-costa-sales-taxes/> No the private road group is not alone in opposing Measure R. VOTE NO on Measure R.

7 Oct 20

[Rupa Joshi](#)

- [Stein Way](#)

Are you spamming political ads? Absolutely no plan with Measure R!! Please vote NO, We Seniors don't need more taxes for MEASURE R that has no plan

7 Oct 20

[Sandy Anderson](#)

- [Donald](#)

We need Measure R for our safety and security. Thank you Sue for your thoughtful post here.

7 Oct 20

[Skip Shaw](#)

- [Stein Way](#)

I would agree with you if this was a fire safety measure. It is not. It is part 3 of the road tax. If they had told us it was going to cost \$100 million, would you have voted for it the first time? Or would you have asked a for a detailed plan of where all the money was going to go? They knew we would have said, hey wait a minute. Show me a plan for fire safety and I will vote for it whatever the cost. However, that is not R. I urge you to read it carefully.

7 Oct 20

[Rupa Joshi](#)

- [Stein Way](#)

Really!!! We know that of the \$60 million the tax will generate over 20 years, the City has only claimed that a few million (\$500-750,000 for 3-4 years) are needed to "solve" our wildfire problem.

7 Oct 20

[Skip Shaw](#)

- [Stein Way](#)

The city claims. Have you seen a plan? Is it written by an expert? Is it costed out? I would be happy to read it and change my vote. Please post it if possible, I think it would change a lot of minds in this string.

8 Oct 20

[Paulette Taylor](#)

- [Meadowlane](#)

Let's hope the town doesn't burn down while we bicker over the best way to meet the challenge. (I lost a house in 1991 in the Oakland Hills; it's an event I wouldn't wish on my worst enemy.)

7 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

- [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Paulette - This is not bickering. This is demanding a working plan before we lock in a 20-year tax. We have no idea what we should be spending to make Orinda as firesafe as possible. The City has never asked the question and is only providing this knee-jerk reaction to sell its road maintenance tax which I agree is also needed. But once this tax is passed, if it is passed, that's it. If the City then does a study and finds out it needs two or three or four times as much, what does it do? Pass another tax? Not gonna happen. Do a quarter of the work? There is a small community outside of Santa Rosa that spent \$300 per home for years on fire prevention. When the Tubbs Fire roared through it went around this community. \$300 per home in Orinda is almost the entire proceeds of the proposed tax. The Council is NOT thinking about spending the entire tax on fire prevention. They are thinking of a fraction of the tax. We need a plan before we fund a 20-year solution.7 Oct 20

[Mark Mahoney](#)

- [Ivy Drive](#)

Steve Cohn

You just wrote a very comprehensive 2 decade explanation of our past tax debacles. I read and was commenting on it and it disappeared? Hoping it wasn't censored.

10 Oct 20

[Mark Mahoney](#)

- [Ivy Drive](#)

Not my response disappearing, but your text disappeared.

10 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

- [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Mark Mahoney

do you mean https://nextdoor.com/news_feed/?post=163942530 ?

10 Oct 20

[Mark Mahoney](#)

- [Ivy Drive](#)

Steve Cohn

Yes, Thank you!

10 Oct 20

[Tish G.](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Steve Cohn

gone again

11 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Tish Gleason

- This was only posted in South Orinda thanks to the incompatibility of Nextdoor to the needs of communities like Orinda which do not "fit" into their "circle of next door neighbors". If you would like to see it and re-post it in North Orinda (all of North Orinda, not just the North Orinda neighborhood) please send me your email in a personal message or to OrindaRoadFacts@comcast.net and I'll send you a Word.doc.

11 Oct 20

[Dan Sinnreich](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Just a very elitist comment from

Sue Severson

Just a very elitist comment from **Sue Severson**. She and the others whose profession has been to spend the money know best, and we that fund it are rubes that couldn't possibly know better. If the city needs more money, perhaps we should expand the tax base by having a plan for downtown, and attracting new business and therefore additional taxes. But no - this is hard work, and it's much easier to push another tax on the current citizens. Some of the same people who are now asking for more taxes are the same ones that enthusiastically denied the building of a new Montessori school on the Phair's lot - one that was supported by a large number of people but did not fit in with certain of these people's views. So instead of new construction, new business, and new taxes, below is a visual of what we have, several years later. This is where we are thanks to some of the people now vouching for another tax.

(edited)

[Richard Needoba](#)

• [Canyon Ranch](#)

Vote No, we have had enough.

7 Oct 20

[Eric Fischer](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Citizens and comrades..., lets keep it simple.... a \$60 million dollar tax over 20 years is a massive overreach for the city ... with FEAR as the tool! Reducing the fire threat is simple -- keep your property clear of brush, this will reduce the threat significantly -- follow the guidelines issued by the fire dept. Yes ... some added funds are needed for public places and to push us citizens to take on our responsibility.... but NOT \$60M! As for the roads, where did all the other money go... that i voted for?? -- do you really know? If you doubt what I have noted go to a few Council / Fire meetings and listen or zoom in. This is obvious NO on R!!!

8 Oct 20

[Suzanne Roosevelt](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Has the current sales tax for road repairs funding been used to address fire safety? It's the same system as proposed now, so past decisions can serve as a model for what officials would make with an additional

tax. I don't know the answer to the question, but I do think that the answer would help those who are undecided. If anyone has an answer, I would love to know.

8 Oct 20

[Shaheen Tonse](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Certainly I see evidence that fire-safety work is being done (tree-cutting, inspections) but like you I do not know which pot the money came from. One could ask the council before Nov 3rd or check with staff. if I find out I'll post it in this same thread. OK, here: I guess the city budget pages could help:

<http://www.cityoforinda.org/Archive.aspx?AMID=36> Sorry, I didn't want to wade through the budget myself and find the answer!

(edited)

[Suzanne Roosevelt](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Shaheen Tonse

thank you. I'll try to get an answer.

8 Oct 20

Add a reply...

[Shaheen Tonse](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Some of you might still be undecided on Measure R. Of course some have pre-decided, because of another issue, to oppose it regardless of its content, and would adamantly oppose it even were it to promise a free daily ice-cream to every Orinda resident. There have been many claims that "there is no plan". I feel there is a decent outline of a plan. I got a general idea what they were thinking about back in June. Check out the minutes of the 30th June City Council Meeting to get a feel for it. Start at Page 7, Item F2. It is a 7 page read:

<http://orindaca.igmp2.com/Citizens/FileOpen.aspx?Type=12&ID=1433&Inline=True>

8 Oct 20

[Kim Applegate](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Thanks

Shaheen Tonse

for sharing this. The direction from the City Council with respect to the distribution of funds is designated as non-binding (page 8). The rest of this is really just a discussion IMHO. I think many of us would like to see a spreadsheet with valid estimates for work that is expected. As the council changes frequently and the tax will be there for 20 years unless the use of the funds is well defined we really have no idea if it will be spent wisely.

9 Oct 20

[Shaheen Tonse](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Sure, valid points all, and I too would have preferred for things been as you wanted. Instead we have to make educated guesses. Read on, it's a long post, (for me): Yes it's non-binding, but from the level of discourse and the points discussed between City and MOFD, the general idea for the near future (1-2 years) came across. A Spreadsheet would be nice. But as you say the council changes frequently, as does the financial environment, and more worryingly so will the physical environment (climate-wise), so any detailed spending plan will only be good for 2-3 years anyway. If we can estimate that, that's "good

enough". After that the environments, and where to spend the money will change. (I doubt we'll ever be in the situation where we'll say, "Why did we make this tax so long-lived; we don't need them money.") That logic is what put me over the hump to swallow a 20-year tax rather than a 5 or 10 year tax. I assume road repair maintenance (public) will take up a significant fraction (0.3 to 0.5?) of the money, those projections are available on slides with graphs that Larry Theis has displayed in the past, but they depend on which of several repair scenarios the city chooses. These scenarios mainly differ in how long the city will allow the newly fixed roads to "coast" without repairs. My guess is that most of the remainder goes toward Fire, an issue we have to address strongly within 1-2 years. If you click on the link in my last post and go back to Page 2, Item F1 will give you some guidance on how it might be spent. (I personally bristle that we have to spend anything, given that MOFD gets 24% of property tax receipts and the city gets a sad 7%, but that's the reality on the ground today and probably for ever. We are well below the state average of a mouth-watering 20% (Ref: <https://lao.ca.gov/LAOEconTax/Article/Detail/163>) but I think that's the deal you cut with your county when you incorporate as a city.? And perhaps those "20% cities" have their own city-owned fire districts.) In addition to the physical danger of fire, there is also the matter of demonstrating to insurance companies that Orinda is a safe place which takes effective wildfire-prevention measures. If they do not realise this, the resulting rise in premiums that we will all see will dwarf any piddling extra amount we would be paying as sales tax. Fortunately the state Insurance Commissioner has put a 1-year moratorium on insurers, prohibiting non-renewal of policies due to wildfire risks. But that expires 2-3 months from now. Ending, that's basically the logic I used to decide, as a result of which I'm voting Yes. I hope you do too!

9 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Shaheen Tonse

- there is no plan for fire prevention. There may be some money (no where near as much as you assume) available for this critical need, but there is no plan. No professional assessment of what it would take to maximize Orinda's fire safety. There is a partial plan for roads. Based on bi-annual road surveys and Accompanying 200 page reports, it is projected that it will cost \$60 million to maintain 94 miles of roads over the next 20 years. But, this does not include 30 miles of roads which provide the same service to residents and taxpayers as those included. And now that the 1,500 households living on those road are spending hundreds of dollars a year in road bond costs, sales taxes, and increased garbage bills to fund road maintenance on roads they never use, which they never used to have to pay, they are demanding to be treated equally. There is also a partial plan for storm drains. But only for those drains that run down public roads. There are innumerable, possibly hundreds of instances of water collected on public property (streets) and dumped onto private property. Water laws are complicated but if this water causes damage the responsibility is the City's. So the City is just being a bad neighbor by not proactively solving the problem and has historically been a really bad neighbor by fighting the damage in court. There should a comprehensive storm drain plan in Orinda. If you take all this into account, there will not be enough money and fire prevention, which has never been funded before, and may again draw the short straw. Are you feeling lucky or would you rather a "tax with teeth", like a parcel tax which would require the City to spend the money on fire prevention?

9 Oct 20

[Kim Applegate](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Shaheen Tonse

"A goal without a plan is just a wish." I hope your wishes come true.

10 Oct 20

[Michael Brown](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

A couple of points here. First, the CIOC issued a report in December of 2019 which detailed a need for \$30M in public storm drain repair and replacement over the next 20 years so that is half the revenues right off the top. <http://cityoforinda.org/DocumentCenter/View/2976/2019-Road-and-Drainage-Repairs-Plan-Adopted-12-17-2019> The second is that there will be a citizen oversight committee and mandatory audits preventing future city councils from spending willy-nilly. Third, virtually all of the opposition I've seen is from private road advocates who are trying to hold hostage any future progress on infrastructure unless they are included. This tactic may work in the short term but eventually people will get fed up with decaying infrastructure and vote for more funding. The downside to this is that kicking the can down the road is going to cost more for everyone, private road residents included. This happened with two road bonds that were rejected in the mid 2000's so we had to wait another 8 to 10 years to get started on road repairs that were already decades overdue, all of which is costing us more because the roads were in worse shape.

10 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Michael Brown

- What happened in 2006 and 2007 was that the Council did a bad selling job, ignoring valid concerns of voters instead of addressing them, just like now. (One lost by 215 votes and the other by only 117) Then the 2008 recession hit. Maybe a 2021 recession will hit too and we will be in the same place but even if we are, the City has \$2 million a year (from other taxes and fees, excluding any sales tax) for roads and storm drains and most of the roads are virtually new and can weather a dry spell. Plus, we are overpaying MOFD by \$3.5 million a year which, if the Council had any guts, they would go after like the 1997 Council did when they walked away from ConFire (not that I suggest we walk away from MOFD but rather force it to serve us like it's supposed to). Don't believe that all of the opposition is from private road advocates. 20% of Orinda lives on "private" streets (streets that have been banned from becoming public). The City's survey showed that 35% were opposed to the tax (without even understanding the facts about it) and 7% were undecided. This is a lot more than the 20% living on private roads. True, the people living on private roads have more at stake; a 20 year extension to being treated as second class citizens, not deserving the benefits the rest of Orinda is provided. But there is a lot more wrong with Measure R than just being exclusionary. It will most likely under-fund fire prevention and give people a false sense of security until it is too late.

10 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Michael Brown

"hold hostage"?? Let me say this differently. If the city wants to sell publicly-used roads and drains infrastructure as "safety" for everyone, we want a roadmap to be safe too since many / most publicly used "private" roads fall in this category. Otherwise, we went to focus on fire prevention revenue raises as the top priority. Please don't assign motives without knowing all of your facts

10 Oct 20

[Kim Applegate](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Michael Brown

Thanks for those details. Regarding the mandatory audits. What would be the result of the audit if only \$1 was spent on Fire Prevention/Safety? Maybe I am completely naive but I do not understand why we cannot define upfront how we plan to spend the money. Here is a copy of the part of the measure discussing this. When I read this, I see no metrics to guide an audit.

[Michael Brown](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Charles Brotman

check me if I'm wrong but the city conducted a survey to see if a dedicated tax would garner the necessary 2/3s majority for passage and found that it would not. This is our choice instead.

10 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Michael Brown - I don't think that is true? Please share specifics. In a recent survey, 86% of respondents said fire prevention was either extremely or very important. They want lots of money now, while fear is real, because it makes it easier for them to budget this and that down the line. But they certainly don't want to commit to work for 20% of us on publicly-used private roads. Why do the right thing? A lot easier to label us and then use fear

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

it isn't a we versus they as you posit. The money does not go into council members pockets. But there are legitimate questions being raised about whether the present and future councils will spend the money prudently and as promised. Why didn't the council re-allocate \$25,000 last Tuesday from a creek consultant (which is urgent now because?) to a tree removal contractor when we are in the midst of the worst wildfire season in Calif history? I am troubled.

(edited)

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

a divisive tone comes more from some of the Measure R proponents. it's clear the elected officials, unpaid and paid, avoid accountability for planning and budgeting by getting such a huge financial commitment in the form of a 20 year tax increase. There is clearly a calculation at work. Dismiss the "irritating private road crowd" because others will see them as pests. Get the money now while the iron is hot because we can do a lot and figure things out later

10 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Measure R is truly the opposite of accountability. "Oversight committees" notwithstanding

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

i still don't see it as "we versus they." All of the money will be spent in Orinda. Today's council members have no vested interest in how money may dribble in over the next 20 years. You cannot complain that there is no plan while also complaining that there is a "huge financial commitment." The tax can be re-examined every two years, which makes it accountable to the extent that the council itself is accountable. That is my concern. BTW, i do not find the private road crowd "irritating" or annoying. You folks make legitimate points. I agree with some; i disagree with others. On balance, to me, the determining facts are

that most knew what there were getting into, and that we all pay taxes for things like schools that we don't use, and that no one has proposed a feasible path to resolution.

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

I think you may be missing the point about accountability. The committee would shine a light on the facts. The council members would be accountable at election time. It is a different kind of accountability than a parcel tax, which would require litigation to enforce accountability. There is no self-enforcing mechanism available.

10 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Michael Brown - No they did not. It was a seat of the pants decision, probably made at the outset because specific taxes "are harder to pass".

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Porges - It was not a "seat of the pant" decision. Read the minutes of the several meetings at which the tax was discussed. They examined the data concerning parcel tax failure rates and made a decision.

10 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Nick Waranoff

There was no polling done to validate their claims.

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Porges

Actually, there was polling, followed by the exercise of judgment after a public debate in which you participated.

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Steve Cohn: You can continue to repeat the false statement that Orinda is overpaying MOFD, but repetition does not make it true. You are a master at manipulating data. Arguably Orinda is underpaying. It has more people, more parcels, a higher assessed value (residents have more to lose), and has a much greater risk.

(edited)

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Sue Severson: you are the original poster of this thread. Are you willing to call your friends on the Council and ask them to re-allocate the \$25,000 from the creek consultant to a tree removal company that would

get to work right away? You are, i believe, a former mayor and long time Orinda resident. How can we trust the present and future councils to prioritize fire prevention with Measure R funds when they won't do so now, in the midst of the worst wildfire season in California history?

(edited)

[Sue S.](#)

Author

• [Martha Rd](#)

A Special City Council Meeting regarding Planning for Measure R Election Results, will be held by zoom on October 14 at 7pm. This is an additional opportunity for community input and to hear more details. Yes, I will contact the city council about re-allocating monies for the creek consultant or other funds as can be made available immediately to address urgent wildfire prevention measures.

10 Oct 20

[Tish G.](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Sue Severson

Thank you

10 Oct 20

[Susan Porter](#)

• [Donald](#)

Nick, You make a very good point. Given that fuel mitigation is a current emergency, then why aren't funds being reallocated now and being used now for this emergency? Measure R is vague as you have pointed out and the only reason for why it was written this way is so that the money can be used for other things. That is very troubling.

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Susan Porter it was written this way so that it would only need a simple majority to pass I would not ascribe a nefarious motive. As for reallocation, you should ask at Wednesday's meeting

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Nick Waranoff

you are not suspicious enough.

11 Oct 20

[Susan Porter](#)

• [Donald](#)

Nick Waranoff

Thanks for your input!

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Sue Severson: or better yet get them to in ADDITION allocate some money from the general fund to address this emergency. Starting right now, by first removing brush and then identifying all pine and eucalyptus trees on public city land and scheduling their removal. - 10 Oct 20

[Cat D.](#)

- [Overhill Area](#)

No , more development Wake up ! Seriously people !

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

- [Miner Road](#)

Charles: there isn't additional money. The budget is balanced. You have to identify a source from which you will take money if you want to add money to something. You need to make the hard decisions.

10 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

The general fund has over \$10 million in reserves for “emergencies like the Miner sink hole”. Excess fuel in fall is also an emergency.

10 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

- [Miner Road](#)

I do not support use of reserves for fuel reduction. What is your proposal for replenishing the reserves if you draw them down? How much would you draw them down? You are very vague. Easy to sit at a keyboard and type vague statements.

10 Oct 20

[Jo McKinlay](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

Given this measure would support fire mitigation at orinda oaks park, the community center, library and city hall only, your description makes the measure sound way more broad and helpful than it actually might be.

(edited)

[Sue S.](#)

Author

- [Martha Rd](#)

Wildfire mitigation would be throughout Orinda.

10 Oct 20

[Jo McKinlay](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

I appreciate your reply. Where exactly would mitigation occur throughout Orinda? The funds can only go so far. And what impact does it have on home owners?

(edited)

[Charles Porges](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

To be more exact I believe the city is planning to provide the chipper service throughout Orinda and to clear the city owned land. No plan to clear trees next to the roadways, which had been considered, but Nick Waranoff talked staff out of that idea. At least trees within 3' of the asphalt by code must be removed and by law it is the adjacent property owners responsibility to pay for this. I believe that a cooperative

effort by the landowner and city with some cost sharing would result in many (most?) such trees being removed. It is a major expense but absolutely needs to be done.

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Porges

I know you think that you are better informed than Chief Winnacker about our fire prevention needs, but for those interested in Chief Winnacker's view, it is that brush removal, not tree removal, is the key. As for my role: the Orinda Muni Code, like most cities' codes, requires that adjacent property owners are responsible for maintaining the right of way adjacent to their properties, except for trees, etc., planted by the city. Larry Theis, Public Works Director, without consulting the chief, proposed to change that and have the city assume that responsibility but provide no chipping. I didn't talk him out of that idea; I told him the chief had a different idea and urged him to talk to the chief. By the way, this occurred over the weekend preceding the June 30 council meeting; Larry graciously spent an hour on zoom with me that Sunday after the Chief and I had communicated several times about this. Larry and Steve Salomon talked to the chief, and changed their recommendation when it was presented to the council on June 30. Frankly, I consider my role in causing the coordination between Larry and Chief Winnacker to be the highlight of my civic participation in the 18+ years that I have lived in Orinda. I am extremely proud that I was able to get them to work together to address the all-important subject of fire prevention. Of course, if like Charles, you think you know more about fire prevention than the Fire Chief, I suppose you might be critical of what I did.

11 Oct 20

[Michael Brown](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Nick Waranoff

I get the brush over trees approach but did you get a sense of where chief Winnacker comes down on pines and eucalyptus?

11 Oct 20

[Tish G.](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Michael Brown

The new Ordinance adopted on 9/22/20 says you are required to remove Eucalyptus and Monterey Pine within 6' of structures by 5/31/21.

11 Oct 20

[Michael Brown](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Tish Gleason

okay, I read that too, but what about further than 6' from a structure? How do pines and eucalyptus compare to brush more than 6' from a structure?

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Michael Brown

Pines detonate embers and eucalyptus is called gasoline in a stick. Brush forms ladders for fire to climb into the canopy which is much harder to fight. The idea is to create islands across which fire won't spread, keeping them all away from structures. MOFD has a bunch of videos which explain this. Even mulch or

leaves next to a building is prone to igniting a building. A single brush 6' away from a building is less dangerous than a pine or eucalyptus at the same distance, but personally I would clear either and go to 15' or more. The big fires are wind driven which makes flames horizontal-ish.

11 Oct 20

[Michael Brown](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Charles Porges

back to my original question...what is Winnacker's take on pines like the ones at the community center park?

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Michael Brown

he has not mentioned them specifically. But he hates pines in general.

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Jo: I spent many hours with the the Fire Chief, and some time with Larry Theis, the City's Public Works Director, to persuade Larry to adopt the Chief's recommended plan. That plan is to run three chipper crews with advance scheduling on the public and private roads. The homeowner's would clear brush from their property and from the right of way, and the chipper would dispose of it. Under the City's Muni Code, as is common, property owners adjacent to the city's ROW are legally responsible to maintain it. In the winter, when people are less likely to be interested in chipping, the chipper crews would remove brush from City property. A lot of work has already been done on Orinda Oaks Park. Clearing brush and removing dangerous trees from that park, and from the community center, is important not just to protect those properties, but to prevent the spread of fire. If you take the chief suggestion of a \$75 parcel tax (which was done in Marin) for Moraga and Orinda, and apply it just to Orinda's 7400 parcels, you get the sum of \$2.775M over five years. You can round that to \$3M or \$3.5M. That is his best estimate of what it will cost to catch up for decades of neglect. The exact amount needed cannot be calculated to any degree of certainty. We could become paralyzed by over-analysis. If not enough, we will need more. There are some problems, as I listen to the critics and study Measure R in detail. The biggest problem, which no one seems to have brought up, is in this language: the money would be used for "wildfire risk reduction throughout Orinda, preparation for emergencies and disasters, repair of public storm drains, continued public street maintenance, and other city services". That final phrase ("and other city services") is troubling. The phrase does not include the modifiers "essential" or even "similar". Presumably, that phrase is needed to make it a general sales tax and eligible for approval with a simple majority vote. The same phrase was in Measure L, the 2012 sales tax measure. We saw a stark example of what those might include last Tuesday, when the council declined to reallocate \$25,000 from a creek consultant to tree removal. To those who say it is a small amount of money, I would point out that the city's entire fire prevention budget is only \$50,000, a small sum that I have repeatedly asked the council to increase (without much support from anyone else). That is the good, the bad, and the uncertain, and I am uncertain at this point as well as to whether I will vote for Measure R. It comes down to trust, and faith in the accountability of future councils at the ballot box.

(edited)

[Tish G.](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Do you how quickly we could adopt the \$75 parcel tax that would just be for fire prevention only?

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

They haven't bothered to figure out that detail. I already asked. There are a number of steps that involve other actors

11 Oct 20

[Susan Porter](#)

• [Donald](#)

Nick, which way are you leaning to vote on Measure R?

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Susan Porter I am undecided at this point. There is a special council meeting Weds night (agenda will be posted tomorrow) which is intended to shed more light on Measure R.

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

• [North Orinda](#)

Nick Waranoff

I think that for a vote in March the funds accrue starting on July 1 but get paid on Jan 1. The city may be able to start spending in July against the accrual (possibly by borrowing from the general fund which will get repaid later). Even if R passes it is not clear to me when funds will be available nor when the earliest the city can start chipping and/or eliminating trees. Everything in government goes sooooo slowly.

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Porges

In light of her use of the word "adopt," I think Tish was asking about the path to the bollot. sig collection and certification, prep of title and summary, and those kinds of things. You have no timeline. If you do, spell it out for us. Do you even have the wording of the measure?

11 Oct 20

[Richard Needoba](#)

• [Canyon Ranch](#)

We are tired of more taxes, vote NO!

11 Oct 20

[Susan Porter](#)

• [Donald](#)

Richard Needoba

I am also tired of more taxes but am voting YES on R after studying this issue.

12 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

I only stated the facts. It starts with "If". No I don't know how fast I can gather signatures nor how much help I may get. The other timelines can be looked up. I'm counting on you as a lawyer and wordsmith to give us the exact wording soon after measure R fails. -11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

- [Miner Road](#)

Charles: before you lure people away from Measure R by offering them the "candy" of your parcel tax, i respectfully suggest that you research the timeline (look it up as you say) and prove to folks that there is time between the results of the Nov 3 election (Nov 10?) and the March (2021? 2022?) election. Are you suggesting a special election and if so, what is the cost? How much time does the city attorney have to prepare the title and summary? How much time does the registrar have to validate the signatures? How many days in advance of the election do the sigs need to be certified? You are a nice person, but all too often you shoot from the hip without a full analysis. I will not be helping you with this and i am done responding to all of your posts.

11 Oct 20

[Charles Porges](#)

- [North Orinda](#)

If the council and residents are motivated it can be done rather fast IMO. And I think that if measure R fails you will assist if the path is the fastest one to fuel reduction. But I may be overly optimistic about this. (edited)

[Nick Waranoff](#)

- [Miner Road](#)

Charles Porges

There are legal time frames during which people other than the council and residents have time periods to act. The council does not get involved in a citizen initiative. Instead of playing badminton with me, why don't you research the timeline backwards from the election date? Are you thinking March 2021? (edited)

[Wil Thomas](#)

- [Oak Springs](#)

I don't think fires care if the property is on a private road or public. As far as roads go, either add private to the list or exclude them from some of the tax

11 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

- [Miner Road](#)

Measure R would provide chipper service to all properties along private roads as well as public roads.

12 Oct 20

[Richard Needoba](#)

- [Canyon Ranch](#)

If I remember what the fire chief said, I think it already is available....

12 Oct 20

Nick Waranoff

- Miner Road

Richard Needoba - MOFD runs one chipper to cover both Orinda and Moraga. The Measure R funds would add two additional chippers just in Orinda.

12 Oct 20

Martha Erisman

- Lower El Toyonal

They claim that Measure R provides funds for immediate and significant wildfire risk reduction. In other words, it is all about fire prevention. It is not. It is all about public road maintenance. The council refused to consider adding Orinda's "private" roads, despite the fact these roads are publicly used. We know that of the \$60 million the tax will generate over 20 years, the City has only claimed that a few million (\$500-750,000 for 3-4 years) are needed to "solve" our wildfire problem. There is little to no basis for those numbers and the cost is probably much greater. Opponents have suggested that a \$150 parcel tax (41 cents a day per household) for 3-5 years would generate more funds for fire prevention and be dedicated to fire prevention. That will give the City time to create an INCLUSIVE road plan and it has over \$3 million a year without the new tax to operate with until such a plan is derived. Note also, that both the Chronicle and the East Bay Times recommend a NO vote on Measure R (<https://www.orindaroadfacts.info/media-recomendations>) for some of the same reasons we express (Wrong Tax – too long; Wrong Time – in the middle of a pandemic).

13 Oct 20

Susan Hurrell

- Overhill Area

I am voting yes on R to generate funds for safety repairs. If the powers that be decide it is for roads, drains or fire prevention so be it. There is plenty of deferred maintenance to be covered. For those who don't trust the powers that be, you can get elected, volunteer or go to public meetings to sway the way the funds are spent. The folks deciding this are not secretive or nefarious. They are long time civic leaders and volunteers who are making decisions based on the current facts and circumstances. Sure they make compromises. That's the way things get moved forward. They have done ton of work evaluating this measure and moving it forward. This is a lot of money for the community safety. I would love to see safety funds flowing as soon as possible.

13 Oct 20

Valerie C.

- Stein Way

You obviously don't routinely come to the city council meetings and read all the data and follow all the analysis and actions for years.

13 Oct 20

Nick Waranoff

- Miner Road

Valerie Colber

actually, speaking as someone who has attended almost every city council meeting for years, and has followed all of the analysis and actions, I think Susan has correctly and succinctly stated good reasons for voting for Measure R. Saying she has not is not an argument against Measure R, assumes facts not in evidence, is ad hominem, and does not address any of the issues.

(edited)

[Valerie C.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

I believe that all the facts and evidence have been compellingly and independently stated and verified by numerous sources who are not city council insiders and their fervent supporters.

13 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

The reference to "safety funds" is what causes some of us to pause and feel a little poked in the eye. Either define it about fire prevention - or if they wanted to go broad we "private road" folks want a roadmap for our safety.

13 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

you are nitpicking and looking for grounds to oppose. It is another tactic in the strategy of opposition that you folks -- especially your colleague Steve -- actually publicly announced. Given that announcement, much of what you say does not pass the "BS test."

13 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Valerie Colber

what "fact and evidence" and on what issue or issues, and by what independent sources?

13 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

"Safer Orinda" - THAT is what fails the mother of all BS tests. Hardly seems like nitpicking to highlight the gaps between rhetoric and reality

13 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Fire prevention and storm drain repairs to avoid sinkholes and flooding will make Orinda safer. The fact is, you would oppose regardless of the name of the measure. Unless the city does something about your private road. So it is nitpicking to complain about the name of the measure, which has not, in fact, misled anyone.

13 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

really? How many voters think this is just fire prevention because of naming and posts like this. The name of their game is to mislead ...

13 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

You would oppose it regardless of its name.

13 Oct 20

[susan cole](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Charles Brotman

These ads are misleading. However, I'm not falling for their deception. I'm voting NO on R.

13 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick Waranoff

you are correct. But I would respect its honesty even if brazen. This is very different.

14 Oct 20

[Steve Cohn](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Even the "Measure R information sheet" on the City's website is slanted. This is pure hucksterism. This is a 20 year tax but the "information" sheet only "focuses" on the first five years. And the focus is on fire prevention for which the City is going to send \$2.25 million. But it has \$10 million it needs to spend on storm drains. And what about the next 15 years? Not mentioned are the other \$20 million of storm drains or the \$60 million of road maintenance or the fact that lots of storm drains and roads are just left out. This is raw electioneering at the people's expense. The City should be ashamed.

15 Oct 20

Add a reply...

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Orindans for Fair Road Funding has never changed its name, which is clearly on its signs. Wrong Tax (because we already have a sales tax), Wrong Time (in the middle of a pandemic/recession). They are just telling the facts: Measure R is a road tax, not a fire prevention tax. Safer Orinda, on the other hand, changed its name a few weeks ago so as to suggest that it is a group for fire protection, when it is actually a group for road funding. Big difference -- Orinda for Fair Road Funding is upfront and Safer Orinda is not. Look, we need fire prevention, and we need money we can count on. Let's get dedicated fire funds that can't be used for anything else. And let's put on the ballot in 2022 a new sales tax when the present one runs out.

16 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Kathy: your group should, for truth in advertising, change its name to Orindans for Reneging on the Consent We Gave and Shifting Our Financial Burden to Others.

16 Oct 20

[Kathy F.](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Nick, the real issue is that we need fire funding we can count on; we have a sales tax already. Let's re-up the sales tax when this one runs out and we are not in the middle of a pandemic. For some reason you lose sight of what is important here and just resort to attacking people who are against Measure R. You seem to think anyone calling R into question must be a disgruntled private road resident. Some private road residents are against R, and so are some public road people. Cases in point: the SF Chronicle, which generally promotes progressive taxing, and the local East Bay Times, are also against R. It isn't fruitful to discuss this issue with you since you can't seem to divorce being for dedicated fire protection from private road maintenance. Everyone in Orinda wants fire prevention; I am in favor of reasoned discussion, but your comments skirt the real problem of fire prevention, so it doesn't make sense to engage with you any longer.

16 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Kathy Finch

i know the real issue and haven't attacked anybody. I have defended the volunteers who have been attacked. I don't think everyone opposed to Measure R is a disgruntled private roads resident. But I know some are, and I know some vowed to block any future tax measure unless the city provided relief to them. I will be happy if you do not engage with me any longer. I too find it unproductive when someone who consented to something then tries to renege and has the audacity to claim their position is the only ethical one. You draw a false dichotomy and misrepresent the ads when you say Measure R is falsely presented as a fire prevention tax and not a road tax. In fact, the logo shows the three uses of the proceeds: fire prevention, drains, and roads. No one to my knowledge has denied that some of the funds will go towards roads. In fact, much will go to the arterial and collector roads used by all; some will go to maintain the recently rehabilitated public residential roads. This whole complaint about the volunteer supporters backing Measure R is disingenuous to say the least. As is invocation of the pandemic; the tax increase is 25 cents per adult per day.

16 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Here's what I got in the mail. Need quite the magnifying glass to find those three logos from the group formerly known as "Fix Orinda roads now!"

(edited)

[Youssif Abdulhamid](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Yes, yes, yes on R. Everyone throwing a hissy fit over this: \$.01 consumption tax is NOTHING. I'm more than willing to take a bet on this proposal. These fires will only get worse....

17 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Why do you trust a city that's done nothing for 30 years? How much of this tax are you under the impression will go to fire prevention work? You might yourself throw a hissy fit when you learn how little has been done by elected officials now endorsing R.

17 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

Charles Brotman

And you have been focused on remediation of fire risk since?

17 Oct 20

[Charles Brotman](#)

• [Stein Way](#)

Jim Evert

Why do you ask? Is that a requirement to call out disingenuous Measure R marketing?

17 Oct 20

[Youssif Abdulhamid](#)

• [Ardor/Valley View](#)

Charles Brotman

if I could price the amount of time I've spent reading this thread and replying to it, it has probably outweighed the personal cost to me this tax will actually incur for the first few years of it going into effect.

17 Oct 20

[Jim Evert](#)

• [Del Rey](#)

Charles Brotman

"... a city that's done nothing for 30 years" is why I ask.

17 Oct 20

[Nick Waranoff](#)

• [Miner Road](#)

Charles Brotman

marketing isn't the key. The terms of Measure R are what matters. Fifty cents per adult per day.