PATRICE Y. LATTIMORE CITY CLERK

RUBEN VIRAMONTES EXECUTIVE OFFICER

City of Los Angeles



KAREN BASS MAYOR OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Election and Business Improvement District Division 555 Ramirez Street, Space 300 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Election: (213) 978-0444 Election FAX: (213) 978-0376 BIDs: (213) 275-3373

> JINNY PAK DIVISION MANAGER clerk.lacity.gov

October 16, 2025

The Los Angeles City Council City Hall, Los Angeles, California

REGARDING: ASSESSMENT BALLOT PROCEEDING FOR

SILVER RIDGE AVENUE AND SILVER RIDGE WAY LIGHTING DISTRICT

COUNCIL FILE NUMBER 25-0900-S31

Honorable Councilmembers:

In accordance with Proposition 218, the City of Los Angeles provided notice to the property owners of the parcels in the proposed Silver Ridge Avenue and Silver Ridge Way Lighting District, as specified in the subject Council File. Along with that notice, each property owner received an assessment ballot weighted by the amount of the parcel's proposed assessment. I have tabulated the assessment ballots delivered to my office by the final hearing date of October 14, 2025.

The proposed assessment district failed because it received a weighted majority of "no" ballots as defined in Article XIII D (Proposition 218) of the State Constitution. As a result, the City may not impose an assessment for the improvement and maintenance of lighting in the proposed district. The certified results of the tabulations are attached. I have also forwarded a copy of these results to the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Lighting, for their information.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:

In accordance with Council policy adopted on December 19, 1997 (CF 97-0843) and the report of the Board of Public Works adopted by the Council on May 9, 1998:

- 1. FIND that a majority protest exists in the Street Lighting Maintenance Assessment District and therefore the proposed assessment cannot be enacted.
- 2. ADOPT the abandoning Ordinance attached to the Council File.
- 3. INSTRUCT the Director, Bureau of Street Lighting, to assure that the streetlights are not installed or are removed from service if previously installed, in accordance with Council policy.

Sincerely,

For

PATRICE Y. LATTIMORE

City Clerk

Attachments

cc: Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Lighting

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, PATRICE Y. LATTIMORE, City Clerk of the City of Los Angeles, hereby certify to the City Council that two ballots were submitted on or before October 14, 2025, in connection with the assessment ballot proceeding for the proposed Silver Ridge Avenue and Silver Ridge Way Lighting Maintenance Assessment District, as specified in Council File Number 25-0900-S31. I further certify the attached report to be a true, correct and complete tabulation of the returns of that assessment ballot proceeding.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 16th day of October 2025.

Sincerely,

For

PATRICE Y. LATTIMORE

City Clerk

Proposition 218 Assessment Ballot Tabulation for Silver Ridge Avenue and Silver Ridge Way Lighting District

Final Public Hearing October 14, 2025

Election # 5693 Council File # 25-0900-S31

Ballot Tally

Assmnt	County	Owner	Assessment	Ballot	Weight	ted Vote	No Vote/
No.	APN		Weight	Vote Y/N	Yes	No	Challenged
1	5440-022-025	TAHMASIAN,RAZMIK ET AL	\$99.08		Not Cast	Not Cast	
2	5440-022-023	ADNER, JAMES M	\$49.54		Not Cast	Not Cast	
3	5440-022-013	RAE,BRANDON AND LEVINE,TAMAR E	\$57.16		Not Cast	Not Cast	
4	5440-020-009	BIAZUS,ROBERTO F AND MARIA H TRS	\$101.62		Not Cast	Not Cast	
5	5440-020-010	REMINGTON,STEVEN R JR	\$50.81	N		\$ 50.81	
6	5440-016-024	MURPHY,MICHEAL AND KLEIN,BEVERLY	\$38.11	N		\$ 38.11	
	6	TOTAL	\$396.32		\$ -	\$ 88.92	
	J	TOTAL VOTES		2	0	2	0

Proposition 218 Assessment Ballot Tabulation for Silver Ridge Avenue and Silver Ridge Way Lighting District

Final Public Hearing October 14, 2025

Election # 5693 Council File # 25-0900-S31

Voting/Ballot Summary					
		Assessment			
Vote	Weighted Total	Percent of Votes Cast	Number of Ballots		
Yes	\$0.00	0.00%	0		
No	\$88.92	100.00%	2		
No Vote			0		
Challenged			0		

Assessment District Summary				
	Total	Voted	Percent	
Parcels	6	2	33%	
Assessment	\$396.32	\$88.92	22%	