

PROTEST

12244 Darby Ave.
Northridge, Ca. 91326
November 21, 2011

City Clerk
200 N. Spring St.
Room 395
Los Angeles Ca. 90012

Re: Proposed Sewer Service Charge
Assessor's Parcel Number 2870002015

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2011 NOV 28 PM 4:21
BY ⁵⁴ (7) CITY CLERK
DEPUTY

C.F. 10-1947

Sirs:

I read with trepidation your proposal for a series of SSC base rate "adjustments" for the next ten years. It amounts to roughly 8% per year. This exceeds expected inflation, and appears unwarranted, especially due to the fact that water usage in Los Angeles is down approximately 20% due to conservation measures. Your pamphlet offers a poor excuse to note that our rates are lower than some cities and that you use this to justify the increase. Comparison is rationalization.

DWP siphons off a significant amount of our fees on a yearly basis and pays that into the city's general fund. So in reality, this means that what I have been paying in the past and what I will be paying in the future pays for things that have nothing to do with my water rates. **THIS IS THE FIRST OFFENSE PERPETRATED ON THE CONSUMER- THE FACT THAT A FEE FOR ONE SERVICE IS USED FOR SOMETHING ELSE**, and you blatantly have no issue with it.

Your pamphlet states that the money is required for repayment of bonds used to fund capital projects as well as additional capital project costs. When the bonds were approved initially, no mention of rate increase was made. Thus, the customer population was led to believe that DWP was solvent and well managed, and could handle this debt within its current means. Additional capital project costs can be of two types- one being more cost on top of expectation for current projects, the other being additional projects. Both of these represent the poorest of planning and management control which has placed you in the position of requesting more funding.

It seems that the Bureau of Sanitation is now in a bind, with no choice but to turn again to its customers and stick out its hand. I would think that if a bond measure was placed on the next ballot there would be concern on your part that it would be rejected, based on your obvious poor planning and management. Well, sometimes we all have to eat crow, and I think in this case it is the customer once again. **BUT, I BELIEVE YOU NEED TO GENERATE AND STICK WITH A VIABLE PLAN FOR WHAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR, NO DIFFERENT THAN WHEN ANYONE TRIES TO TAP A FINANCIAL SOURCE.**

BE ACCOUNTABLE, THAT IS TRULY A THING FOR WHICH YOU MUST BE CHARGED AND OF WHICH YOU MUST TAKE RESPONSIBILITY, then at least your