General Comment

From:	Christian Arzola
To:	Ron Morrison
Cc:	Luz Molina; Councilmember Ditas Yamane; Marcus Bush; Jose Rodriguez; Attorney; Public Comment
Subject:	Demand for a Fair, Honest, and Accurate Public Record – 821 E 4th St MUNICIPAL & EXTERNAL PARTIES INVOLVED: Marilyn Villalba, Alex Cordova, Ronnie Soriano (Code Enforcement); Deliza Reserva license # 02223340 (Realty of America. NATIONAL CITY Case Numb...
Date:	Monday, July 20, 2026 1:48:45 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,We are writing to you to formally demand administrative honesty, fairness, and accuracy from our local government. A public record must serve as an objective reflection of verifiable facts. Unfortunately, the current Code Enforcement report regarding our residence at 821 E 4th St fails this standard. It functions as a biased narrative that documents unverified excuses from the landlord while actively suppressing concrete evidence submitted by the tenants.While investigators Marilyn Villalba, Alex Cordova, and Ronnie Soriano assert that they do not take sides, omitting a tenant's evidence while recording a landlord's justifications is, by definition, taking a side. We demand that the city uphold its commitment to fair housing and correct the official record to reflect the complete truth:Honest Documentation of Unpermitted Structures and Occupancy: A fair investigation requires an accurate mapping of the property. The city's report completely ignores the fact that the landlord's son, Osvaldo Partida, was actively residing on an entirely separate side of the property in unpermitted, bootleg units. Residing with him on that separate side were Gerardo Gonzalez and two other individuals. Our household had absolutely no connection to, control over, or involvement with these separate, unpermitted quarters.The Landlord's Explicit Admission of Separate Tenancy: There is clear, indisputable proof of an admission of fact that the division completely omitted. The landlord, Mr. Partida, explicitly stated directly to investigator Marilyn Villalba: "I know that I rent the other units as well." This direct quote is a clear confession that the landlord manages and controls the other side of the property as a separate rental unit. Omitting this statement from the final report is dishonest, as it completely clears our family of any false allegations regarding unauthorized occupants.Accountability for Selective Reporting by Licensed Professionals: Real estate agent Deliza Reserva license # 02223340 Realty of America has been actively involved with the property but has completely ignored these severe structural and tenancy violations. While she actively reported a gas leakage, she completely closed her eyes to the active occupancy of unpermitted bootleg units on the same lot. A fair and honest public record cannot allow a real estate professional's selective reporting to mask systemic building and safety violations.An honest report does not protect a landlord from the consequences of operating unpermitted units, nor does it penalize innocent tenants by ignoring their evidence. We formally request that the City Council exercise its oversight authority to mandate an independent review of this file, ensure our evidence is permanently attached to the record, and order Code Enforcement to issue a fair, balanced, and corrected report.

Sincerely,

Roxanne Juarez Tenant Contact Information [redacted], National City, CA 91950. [redacted]

Item 7.5

From: leslie johnson
To: Clerk
Subject: Fwd: golf course rates
Date: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 9:45:02 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **leslie johnson** [redacted]
Date: Tue, Aug 4, 2026 at 9:43 AM
Subject: golf course rates
To: <clerk@nationalcity.gov>

the american golf company wants to raise its rates to be comparable to other courses? well those other courses have sand in the sand traps and carts that are not in need of repair? bent wheel bald tires? ripped seats...they want good rates without giving us the best experience? Where is the bridge? the 9th hole has a single cart path and you have carts driving in 2 directions? people have to drive down the first hole while people are driving their tees shots at you? they turn the sprinklers on while you are playing? the club house is a mess with all the stuff they want out front now and cats driving in both directions? the amount tey are asking is too big of an increase for the return!!

Item 8.1

From:	Molly Kirkland
To:	Clerk
Cc:	Ron Morrison; Luz Molina; Marcus Bush; Jose Rodriguez; Councilmember Ditas Yamane; CMO; Josie Flores Clark
Subject:	SCRHA Letter - Item 8.1 – Business License Tax Reform (Gross Receipts Tax)
Date:	Tuesday, August 4, 2026 8:25:23 AM
Attachments:	National City Business License Tax Aug 4 2026.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I am respectfully submitting the attached letter in advance of today's council hearing.

Thank you,

Molly Kirkland, Director of Public Affairs

Southern California Rental Housing Association

9655 Granite Ridge Drive #200, San Diego, CA 92123

Office: 858.278.8070 | Direct: 858.751.2200

mkirkland@socalrha.org | www.socalrha.org

Southern California
Rental Housing Association

August 4, 2026

Honorable Ron Morrison, Mayor and Members of the City Council
National City
1243 National City Blvd
National City, CA 91950

TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY

RE: Item 8.1 – Business License Tax Reform (Gross Receipts Tax)

Dear Mayor Morrison and Members of the City Council:

On behalf of the Southern California Rental Housing Association (SCRHA), I am writing to oppose the placement of a new "gross receipts tax" on the November 2026 ballot.

Rental housing providers already pay a significant amount based on a tiered gross receipts model plus a flat fee based on unit count. The current proposal would triple that amount for many residential rental properties. Because rental housing serves approximately 70% of National City residents, the proposed increase would place the highest tax burden on properties that provide homes for the majority of the city's residents. Both Option 1 and Option 2 propose the highest rate on residential rental housing.

Slide 5 in Exhibit A (BLTR Presentation August 4), provides an example of $6.23 per rental unit per month. That equates to $74.76 annually per unit. The public opinion research conducted does not appear to have covered pass-through impacts on residents. In fact, the Public Opinion Survey Presentation (Page 15) reinforced the misconception with the statement: *This measure will NOT increase taxes on residents. It is paid only by businesses to support the city services they use and benefit from, such as crime prevention, 911 response, repairing potholes and roads, and keeping business and public areas safe and clean.*

Gross receipts do not represent profitability. Expenses such as insurance, utilities, maintenance, and compliance continue to rise. The proposed tax increase would almost certainly affect renters, as housing providers may need to account for yet another factor in higher operating costs. National City-based small businesses that service rental properties may also need to raise prices to offset the new tax, adding to the cost of property maintenance and services. These added costs could make local service providers less competitive and further increase operating pressure on rental housing providers.

SCRHA understands that the city has a deficit and is facing increased financial pressure. However, we remain concerned about such a significant increase at a time when cost-of-living concerns are already exceedingly high. For these reasons, SCRHA requests that you decline to place the proposed gross receipts tax on the ballot. Should the Council choose not to pursue the fall ballot measure, SCRHA will continue to serve as a constructive stakeholder in future discussions about the City's fiscal challenges.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Molly Kirkland
Director of Public Affairs

Item 8.1

From: David Garcia
To: CMO
Cc: Finance; Pedro Garcia; Clerk
Subject: Follow-Up Request: Gross Receipts Bracket Detail Above $1M
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2026 5:59:31 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Mr. Shulze,

Thank you to you and staff for the July 21st workshop and for the detailed materials in the agenda packet, including the HdL registry analysis.

I noted that the packet already includes some of the aggregate data I've been asking about — specifically that the top 100 businesses account for 57% of reported gross receipts but only 29% of total tax assessed, and that of the City's 5,480 active business licenses, 645 report gross receipts exceeding $1 million (with 4,835, or about 88%, at $1 million or below). This is genuinely useful, and I appreciate that it's already public.

What I'd like to request now is one additional level of detail: a further breakdown of that 645-business group above $1 million into brackets — for example $1–10M, $10–50M, $50–100M, $100–400M, and $400M+ — showing the number of businesses and aggregate (not individual) gross receipts in each bracket. The HdL registry analysis appears to already contain the underlying data to produce this; slide 7 alone tells us the top 100 are heavily concentrated, but not how that concentration is distributed above $1M.

I'd also note that the final ballot measure language moves to flat percentage rates by category (e.g., 0.1%–0.3%) rather than a tiered structure scaling with business size. Since your own commissioned survey found that 72% of likely voters preferred larger or more profitable business categories paying a higher percentage than smaller ones, over a flat percentage for all, I think the bracket data becomes even more important context for the Council's decision at the August 4th meeting — it would let the public and Council see how much of the tax base sits in the largest few businesses versus everyone else, regardless of which final rate structure is chosen.

I'm requesting this as aggregate, de-identified data only — not individual business filings.

I'd appreciate knowing whether this breakdown can be produced before August 4th, or whether it would need to go through a formal records request to HdL or the Finance Department.

Thank you again for your time on this.

David Garcia Ozua, PhD
Development Economist
[redacted] | garciaozua.com

From: donotreply@escribemeetings.com on behalf of eSCRIBE.Admin
To: forms@escribemeetings.com; Shelley Chapel; Tonya Hussain
Subject: Public Comment Received
Date: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 11:47:27 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

User Mitch Thompson has enter the following comment(s):

I own an 8-unit apartment community in National City. I paid $155 in business tax on my rentals in 2025. Based on .03% proposed rate in ballot measure, I would now pay $637 for the fee next year. That is a 411% increase in this tax. You propose that rental owners have the highest business tax rate of all. It's unfair. I also pay property taxes & my property paid about $3,600 in $ for City. You have many affordable rental units that pay no prop tax nor bus lic fee. Fix that. All should pay.

for Consideration of a Business License Tax Reform Measure for Placement on the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election Ballot. in Special City Council Meeting - 5pm Regular 8/4/2026 5:00:00 PM

Please log into eSCRIBE to review the submitted comment(s).