

6/23/15 AGENDA, ITEM 5c: PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED SEWER SERVICE CHARGE
SUPPLEMENTAL LETTER SUBMITTED TO THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE BY RON FELSING
ON 6/18/15 AT 11:49AM

From: r f [<mailto:rf90254@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 11:49 AM

To: City Clerk

Subject: PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed Sewer Service Charge

The last time I received something in the mail from the City that needed a vote (I believe maybe one for the school funding) it came in a ballot form. This sewer charge mailing was not consistent as the prior one sent by the City - as was not a ballot but "mail back written protest" with a, "If less than a majority of properties submit a protest, then the Council can approve the charge".

I am asking the Council not to approve the charge - go a different way as to collect the needed funds.

As someone who is retired and on a very fixed income - the proposed charge of \$115 will mean that I will have \$115 less groceries per year. Could there be some exemption for hardship retirees? Just this year I applied for and was accepted for some of the utility assistance programs. I was hoping to spend the rest of my years here in Hermosa Beach, which I have considered and enjoyed as my hometown.

If the sewer fee was done on the Utility Tax (the city has the proven record of the data when the Green Belt was purchased using the tax) the tax would include a higher rate on utilities that are consumed in the bootleg units.

I believe there are 10 bootleg units from Morningside Drive to Ozone Court on the north side of 26th Street and the south side of 27th Street, then from Morningside Drive to Manhattan Avenue on the north side of 27th Street and the south side of 28th Street. Those are 10 bootleg units that contributed to the sewer usage - $10 \times \$115 = \1150 not paying their fair share per year. I think fairer if the sewer funding was on the Utility Tax.

What's the yearly Utility Tax presently collected and what is that tax used for?

I also saw that the fees were less for multi units. A two bathroom apartment is adding more to the sewer system than my one bathroom. A three bathroom apartment even more. Apartments are run as a business, not just an individual or family. Again, the Utility Tax would be fairer to use to fund the

new sewers. Or if so going the letter's route, should be across-the-board same fee for all residential units.

I saw NOTHING on the City's letter regarding commercial properties. Hopefully they a considerable more share to the new sewer tax (couple months ago saw that Yucca Valley was adding a sewer treatment system - commercial properties had a much higher rate)

This new \$115 fee on the property taxes will probably never get a new school bond passed.

Ron Felsing
rf90254@yahoo.com

June 18, 2015