

Communication from Public

Name: Stanley Nowak & Il Young Susie Kang

Date Submitted: 05/31/2026 09:02 AM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Persons, 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. In our immediate Venice neighborhood where we have resided since 1980 there are several access plates to street lamps that are broken, missing and otherwise vandalized allowing access points for homeless individuals to charge their phones and power their motor homes. 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. The City's classification of street-lighting as a "special benefit" rather than a general public benefit is flawed and contrary to common sense. Mom-and-Pop housing providers like my 82 year old wife and 79 year old me 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. 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. 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. With the reduction in other services such as weekly street cleanings, and conditions such as cracked sidewalks and broken curbs, the appearance and gradual decline in the quality of life in our great City of Los Angeles is distressing at best. Regards, Stanley Nowak & Il Young Susie Kang

Communication from Public

Name: Leslie

Date Submitted: 05/31/2026 08:01 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: For the following reasons, I respectfully oppose the Streetlight Maintenance Assessment. The City should first demonstrate that it can't adequately maintain streetlights with its current funds. At the May 20, 2026 Public Works hearing, many spoke against the proposed assessment with each given only one minute to speak. Then the Public Works Civil Engineer and Project Manager Reuben Flamenco spoke at length to address the public's concerns. He said any property in the full proximity of the light is assessed. However, only a minimal portion of a property which has a pole receives any benefit from these lights. Assessment for one light on a 10,000 sq ft property currently pays 10 times that of a 1,000 sq ft property with one light and the light offers benefit for approx 10 feet on each side of the pole. Minimal benefit for a large charge. These assessments on property tax bills are ONLY where streetlights are in front of a property. Neighbors, cars parking, pedestrians, bike riders DON'T PAY. Only property owners pay at an unfairly calculated rate. All streetlights should have a specific cost. There should be only one uniform charge for each streetlight pole regardless of the property size! The general public benefits from streetlights although Mr. Flamenco stated only the properties benefit. These lights face the street not the properties. Houses are not lit. Commercial storefronts are not lit. NO benefit. Store awnings also block the light. If an owner wants lights for their frontage or parking lot they pay for it through DWP. The assessment is unfair to property owners while the community benefits from the lights. It should be a community burden and not the property owners always paying for all of the City's needs. Mr. Flamenco said to the Public Works panel that absolutely no money from the general fund will be taken for this assessment so that there will be no competition for the general fund money. The property owners will have to pay. Mr. Flamenco acknowledged the amount will be insufficient for the proposed changes to the lights which means the following years will be assessed at ever increasing rates with no end. The public was not given the opportunity for rebuttal after his long speech to any of the issues raised including erroneous ones. So far all we are hearing is that the public will not be paying for this proposal, the future cost will be much higher and the General Fund and all the City's entities competing for that money will never be burdened

because the property owners will be charged. Solar lights are least functional and not efficient in dark times of late nights and cloudy or rainy days. Solar is not the answer but deterring copper theft is. There are many ways to deter this theft. Our streetlight pole was out for over a year and finally fixed. The small opening at the bottom of the light pole is now securely covered. In the recent past it was not secure from copper thieves and now property owners are told they, and only they, must now pay. Why? Recycling centers know that copper pipe and wiring sold to them is stolen. Perhaps recycling centers should share in the burden since they knowingly created a market for stolen goods. Simply spending more money on streetlight maintenance will be meaningless unless the City first enacts an ordinance to combat copper thefts. Metal recyclers should collect information on those selling copper just like is necessary when someone sells gold and jewelry. Wooden light poles in our alleys are managed by DWP and rarely go out. This is mainly due to DWP maintaining these lights and is readily available to answer calls if there is a problem. DWP also manages trashcan charges for the Dept. of Sanitation. Everyone is charged equally and this is how our streetlights should be managed. The whole community should carry the burden of cost because the community benefits as a whole from streetlights, not solely property owners. Mr. Flamenco will insist that the assessment rates have not been changed since 1996. Whereas this may be true, there had been no shortfall until copper thieving had become an epidemic. Changing all the lights and putting the burden on property owners at a cost that cannot be calculated with certainty is not the answer. The clear answer to the problem is to assess all DWP bills with streetlight charges regardless of which entity maintains the lights. The whole community, meaning all DWP customers, being charged is the most fair Answer!! Those of low income are subsidized already anyway so they won't be adversely affected. Spread the charge across the whole Community because the Benefits of Streetlights is for the Community, not just a few property owners who carry the whole burden of which the assessment proposal will make worse. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/31/2026 09:01 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: Hello City council! I am against this proposal to increase our tax base for new street lighting. We as property owners are taxed too much already!!! Here a novel idea, tax all the renters in the city for this new endeavor. Thank You

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/31/2026 09:16 PM

Council File No: 26-0331

Comments for Public Posting: CEASE AND DESIST INCREASING OUR PROPERTY TAXES -- WE ARE NOT THE CITY'S BOTTOMLESS PIGGY BANK!!! MANY OF US ARE ON FIXED INCOMES!!! Consider this: Rather than classifying streetlights as a Special Benefit -- which they clearly are not; re-classify them as the General Benefit they actually are and raise the sales tax to pay for the copper wired streetlight transition to solar. No more repairing / replacing copper wire just to be stolen again.