

Communication from Public

Name: Ohh Douglas

Date Submitted: 05/28/2026 02:49 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: This is yet another unaffordable cost and as a property owner I feel that you keep charging for such items that at the end of the day you keep every last penny and I will end up on the streets! I realize that the streetlights are important. I drive in the dark on the freeways and in my neighborhood on the winding street from Don Lorenzo to Coliseum in Los Angeles. We report that they are stealing the copper wires and the police does not even show up! As a mom-and-pop housing provider, I cannot continue to abdoorb all these additional taxes and assessments, especialy the cost for the streetlights which will increase annually over time. There is no end in sight and I hope that you all will reconsider alternatives such as solar-powered lights and imposing this cost to the multi millionaires because they are probaly the only ones who will afford it. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/30/2026 04:42 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: Melvarene Hayes

Date Submitted: 05/30/2026 06:51 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: 1- Use the money you have without new .5% tax only on property owners stop trying to get around prop 50 2- Money going into the general fund where other projects seem to come first and new committee of people to follow the money which is more money paid to this new committee not street lights 3- Taxes the millionaire groups they live here too that .5% for the next few year 4- Start in the neighborhoods that need them the most

Communication from Public

Name: Christine Mills O'Brien

Date Submitted: 05/30/2026 11:20 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: To: Los Angeles City Councilmembers FROM: C. M. O'Brien
RE: NO VOTE Proposed BSL streetlight Assessment CF 2026-0257 Please vote NO vote on the proposed street light assessment. It is remarkable that an action could be developed and executed within days of introduction at City Council. Below are my concerns. The City has failed to secure/protect the copper in the street lights. I am not aware of any arrests for copper thief. If there were, what were the recovery costs. What were the penalties for the thief? What preventative measures did the department implement to secure the functionality of the street lights? What were those costs? The quasi-city entity underwriting, lobbying the street light brochures/ mailing is directly associated with a city agency (DWP) that will benefit from the new solar street lights and their administration. This is telling. I also understand, there is no specific research/ plan for the historic street light standards. The proposal is not comprehensive. Why not? The assessment process sets a prescient for any future assessments/taxes in the city. The process for creating this ballot assessment/ solicitation is not identified in the City Charter. Below is a chart from the BSL report. Fifty-one percent goes to maintenance/operation and 48% goes to administration. Is this breakdown similar to current operations for existing street lights? Please explain. Respectfully, Christine Mills O'Brien
Hollywoodland Tract 6450