

Communication from Public

Name: Jerome David McAlpin

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 11:54 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: * Los Angeles is already experiencing a severe housing affordability crisis, and additional property-related taxes will ultimately impact both housing providers and renters. * This proposal creates a concerning precedent by shifting traditional government responsibilities onto a smaller group of taxpayers. * Labeling street lighting as a "special benefit" instead of a general public benefit is misleading and difficult to justify. * Public streetlights are a citywide, public safety service that benefits everyone, not just nearby property owners. * Small housing providers are already facing rising insurance premiums, inflation, increased maintenance costs, mandated appliance requirements and endless regulations. We cannot continue to absorb all the costs of running the City of Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: Monir Ehsani

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 12:01 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: In one hand city talks about affordability of rental units and in other hand raises taxes and fees to own a rental property. Which one you planning to do? Please stop raising fees for owning a rental property for small business owners such as pop and mom business

Communication from Public

Name: Sharlotte Wilson

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 11:01 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: As a property owner of a small four Plex placing this tax burden on us could push a small business owners out of business. Please stop with these unnecessary tax burden.

Communication from Public

Name: Edgar Akopyan
Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 11:07 AM
Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose this assessment because street lighting is a fundamental public service that benefits the entire community and should be funded from existing public revenues, not from additional taxes on a limited group of property owners. The City should focus on preventing copper theft, vandalism, and infrastructure damage rather than shifting those costs onto residents. Many small property owners are already struggling with rising operating expenses and cannot absorb another assessment that may increase over time. Before creating a permanent assessment district, the City should improve maintenance practices, strengthen anti-theft measures, and explore more cost-effective alternatives. Residents should not be asked to pay new taxes to maintain basic public safety services that are core responsibilities of local government.

Communication from Public

Name: Brenda Rossberg

Date Submitted: 05/28/2026 04:17 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly. Los Angeles is already facing a severe housing affordability crisis. Adding another property tax assessment will only increase financial pressure on housing providers and ultimately harm renters and working families as well.

Communication from Public

Name: Margie Barnes

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 11:45 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Public street lighting benefits the entire community - renters, homeowners, businesses, pedestrians, drivers, and visitors alike. It should not be funded through a targeted and permanently increasing assessment imposed primarily on property owners. Suggested talking points for your public comments include: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly. Los Angeles is already facing a severe housing affordability crisis. Adding another property tax assessment will only increase financial pressure on housing providers and ultimately harm renters and working families as well.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 09:24 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 04:20 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose this. Our taxes are already tons. This puts more pressure on small business owners and Mom and Pop shops that have too many expenses already.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 01:10 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent.

Communication from Public

Name: William Lorenzen

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 01:10 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: • The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. • Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. • Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. • The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. • Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. • Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. • Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. • The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. • Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. • Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. • This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly. The City has installed and repaired the Street Lights and have determined where, what kind and when to install and maintain these lights for the public good not for individual preparty owners the same as streets, sewers and other public works projects.

Communication from Public

Name: Olivier Schreiber

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 01:31 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly. Los Angeles is already facing a severe housing affordability crisis. Adding another property tax assessment will only increase financial pressure on housing providers and ultimately harm renters and working families as well.

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Broussalian

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 02:18 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Susan Broussalian, and I strongly oppose the proposed streetlight assessment tax. Streetlights are a basic government responsibility that benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes, yet instead of addressing the real issue — copper theft, vandalism, and poor infrastructure oversight — the City is attempting to shift those costs directly onto homeowners and housing providers. This isn't fair!!! Before creating a permanent and increasing assessment district, the City should focus on catching and prosecuting the criminals damaging public infrastructure, improving maintenance oversight, securing utility access points, and exploring more cost-effective solutions such as solar-powered lighting and private repair contracting. Many small property owners and Mom-and-Pop housing providers like us are already struggling under rising insurance costs, utilities, maintenance expenses, and existing taxes. Adding another assessment will only increase financial pressure, reduce housing affordability, and push more small owners to sell to large corporate developers. Los Angeles is already facing a severe housing affordability crisis. Property owners should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. Thank you. Susan Broussalian

Communication from Public

Name: Allen Arzoumanian

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 02:24 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Allen Arzoumanian and I oppose the proposed streetlight assessment. The City's attempt to classify streetlighting as a "special benefit" to nearby property owners rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Streetlights exist for the safety and benefit of everyone who uses our streets — residents, visitors, businesses, pedestrians, and emergency services alike. Property owners already contribute significant tax dollars and deserve transparency regarding how existing revenues are being spent before the City imposes additional long-term assessments that may continue increasing over time. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly through the City's existing budget. The City should first exhaust all other options, including stronger anti-theft protections, improved maintenance practices, and alternative technologies, before asking residents to absorb another financial burden. At a time when housing providers and working families are already under enormous economic pressure, this proposal moves the City in the wrong direction. Allen

Communication from Public

Name: Michele Stetz

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 03:48 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Hello Council Representative, Please OPPOSE the street light assessment. As rental housing provider, who is already struggling with rising insurance costs, inflation, regulations, city ordinances, maintenance expenses and existing property taxes. This should not be funded primarily by targeting property owners!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 06:31 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: I am a small rental owner, 72year old, retired, still manage my rentals that I rely on along with my social security to live life and pay my bills. So much financial pressure have been laid on the backs of Landlord in the City of Los Angeles, with the burden of regulations favoring tenants to the detriment of owners, costs of owning and managing rentals have substantially increased and there is no room for additional funds to pay for street lighting which is a core government responsibility that benefits entire community:public, businesses, pedestrians, drivers, visitors, homeowners and renters. It is unfair to target property owners to be responsible for funding this infrastructure that benefits everyone. The City should prioritize catching and prosecuting the vandals, maintain properly paved roads and repair the jacked up sidewalks of the City. We pay enough property taxes and it would be a rewarding gesture from the City to do their part. The City should consider affordable alternatives like solar powered lighting upgrades. Lastly, please consider that landlords and owners are not all equal. There are still small property owners that need to survive the pressures of the financial burdens we have and most of us are just hanging on. Please do not add to the burden. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication from Public

Name: Yvonne M

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 06:41 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: As a home owner, who is currently unable to work due to low back injury, I am very concerned with rising costs of everything - raising property taxes - again - for lighting - something that everyone uses - is unfair. If the prices keep going up, I will have to sell up and move out of California- and I love it here - it has been my home for almost 40 years...and could not imagine living anywhere else; it would break my heart. These are some other points that have been made regarding this issue, which I agree with with: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly. Los Angeles is already facing a severe housing affordability crisis. Adding another property tax assessment will only increase financial pressure on housing providers and ultimately harm renters and working families as

well. Thank you, Yvonne M

Communication from Public

Name: Bert

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 08:29 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. It is unfair to have property owners foot the bill for everyone. Street lighting is a general public benefit for everyone. The rules and regulations and associated cost of all the cumulative measures that landlords have to face is devastating to landlords, particularly small landlords. Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 08:32 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: * The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. * Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. * Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. * The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. * Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. * Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. * Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. * The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. * Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. * Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. * This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/29/2026 08:33 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: The City must prioritize catching and prosecuting copper thieves and vandals responsible for damaging public infrastructure instead of shifting the financial burden onto property owners. Streetlights are a core government responsibility and benefit the entire public, not just adjacent property owners. Property owners already pay substantial property taxes and deserve transparency regarding how existing tax revenues are being spent. The City's classification of streetlighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Many Mom-and-Pop housing providers cannot absorb additional taxes and assessments, especially one designed to increase annually over time. Rising operating costs continue to place enormous pressure on housing providers and threaten long-term housing affordability. Additional taxes and assessments may force smaller owners to sell properties to large corporate developers, accelerating redevelopment and higher rents. The City should first improve maintenance oversight, secure utility access points, strengthen anti-theft protections, and explore more cost-effective repair solutions before imposing new taxes. Affordable alternatives such as solar-powered lighting upgrades and private contracting options should be explored prior to creating a permanent assessment district. Residents should not be pressured into approving new taxes simply to maintain basic public safety services that are fundamental responsibilities of city government. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent by shifting traditional public infrastructure costs onto a limited group of taxpayers instead of funding them broadly and fairly.