



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 23-0600-S9 - Agenda Item Number: 3

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

Tue, Sep 10, 2024 at 1:09 AM

Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

To: commission@ladwp.com, Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, commission@empowerla.org

Cc: J.goodie@mincla.org

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or Resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Mid City

Name: Jennifer Goodie

Email: J.goodie@mincla.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(9) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 09/09/2024

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 09/10/2024

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: Board of Water and Power Commissioners, Board of Neighborhood Commissioners, City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 23-0600-S9

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 09/10/2024

Item Number: 3

Summary: The Mid-City Neighborhood Council opposes the proposed Sewer Services rate hike. The proposed new rate would be an increase of \$700 million over the next four years, doubling current customer rates beginning with a 22% increase in October 2024. This would put an inordinate burden on the strained budgets of Angelenos that are already

struggling under unprecedented housing costs and high inflation. Increasing required costs on the most vulnerable of us will lead to an expansion in our already nearly insurmountable homelessness rate. The lack of transparency is conspicuous and shocking. In fact, an intentional “setup” to bypass the required fairness and due process has occurred. Under the guise of routine customer relations notices an unjust and virtually unopposed preliminary approval of the increase has happened. The Office of Public Accountability and Ratepayer Advocate was not permitted to review the proposed Sanitation rate increase. The only “analysis” Angelenos received is a whitewashed, public relations version, promoted by the revenue beneficiaries themselves. It is also noticeable that the office of LADWP Inspector General has been left vacant during this process, robbing Angelenos of yet another vital oversight mechanism. These actions and lack of transparency do nothing to regain the trust of ratepayers given the recent history of fraud and corruption at LADWP and LA City Hall. There are too many FBI investigations, raids, and indictments for misuse of public funds for ratepayers to blindly open our wallets for an increase. Before LADWP can ask us for more money, they need to prove it will be spent responsibly and not on fraudulent invoices from Accenture for luxury food, beverage, and gift packages or contracts that benefit LADWP executives. The City’s sewer infrastructure needs to be updated, but there needs to be more input from the public, more transparency, and more trust in LADWP and City Hall’s fiduciary responsibility.

Ref:MSG11066349

 **CIS 23-0600-S9.pdf**
122K

**MID-CITY
NEIGHBORHOOD
COUNCIL® OFFICERS**

PRESIDENT
Birgitta Croil-Snell

VICE-PRESIDENT
Roxie McClenton

SECRETARY
Jennifer Goodie

TREASURER
Luis Lopez

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Kirsten Albrecht

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS
Sarge Hall

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



MINC®
P.O. Box 78642
Los Angeles, CA 90016
(323) 732-5085
info@mincla.org
mincla.org

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
Honorable Members of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners
Honorable Members of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners

**RE: Los Angeles City Budget for Fiscal Year 2022-2023
CF 23-0600-S9**

The Mid-City Neighborhood Council opposes the proposed Sewer Services rate hike. The proposed new rate would be an increase of \$700 million over the next four years, doubling current customer rates beginning with a 22% increase in October 2024. This would put an inordinate burden on the strained budgets of Angelenos that are already struggling under unprecedented housing costs and high inflation. Increasing required costs on the most vulnerable of us will lead to an expansion in our already nearly insurmountable homelessness rate.

The lack of transparency is conspicuous and shocking. In fact, an intentional “setup” to bypass the required fairness and due process has occurred. Under the guise of routine customer relations notices an unjust and virtually unopposed preliminary approval of the increase has happened.

In fact, the Office of Public Accountability and Ratepayer Advocate was not permitted to review the proposed Sanitation rate increase. What’s the point of a public Ratepayer Advocate who is not permitted to evaluate proposals which may negatively affect Angelenos? The only “analysis” Angelenos received is a whitewashed, public relations version, promoted by the revenue beneficiaries themselves. Our public tax dollars are ironically paying other Los Angeles City staff who are promoting the increase to work against the interests of residents, voters and taxpayers. It is also noticeable that the office of LADWP Inspector General has been left vacant during this process, robbing Angelenos of yet another vital oversight mechanism.

This stacks the deck against ratepayers and intentionally skews this process, disabling the public from even having the tools to understand the proposal's defects and make cogent arguments against it.

These actions and lack of transparency do nothing to regain the trust of ratepayers given the recent history of fraud and corruption at [LADWP](#) and [LA City Hall](#). There are too many FBI investigations, raids, and indictments for misuse of public funds for ratepayers to blindly open our wallets for an increase. Before LADWP can ask us for more money, they need to prove it will be spent responsibly and not on [fraudulent invoices from Accenture for luxury food, beverage, and gift packages](#) or [contracts that benefit LADWP executives](#).

Ratepayers have been misled and denied access to relevant financial information, and a level playing field in which to review, analyze and rebut the proposed rate increase. Indeed, the City is the beneficiary of the increase.

The way this has been presented virtually guarantees the adoption of this controversial rate increase by this government monopoly utility. The need has not been substantiated or adequately quantified by the City of Los Angeles.

The City's sewer infrastructure needs to be updated, but there needs to be more input from the public, more transparency, and more trust in LADWP and City Hall's fiduciary responsibility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards,
Mid City Neighborhood Council