## KRAUSE, KALFAYAN, BENINK, & SLAVENS

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

550 West "C" Street · Suite 530 · San Diego, California 92101 Telephone (619) 232-0331 Facsimile (619) 232-4019 WWW.KKBS-LAW.COM

SPECIAL COUNSEL BENJAMIN T. BENUMOF

RALPH B. KALFAYAN ERIC J. BENINK VINCENT D. SLAVENS VENEETA JASWAL

JAMES C. KRAUSE (1950-2012)

August 28, 2018

Via Overnight Mail
Monique De La Garza, CMC
City Clerk
333 W. Ocean Blvd.
City of Long Beach
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: Proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases

September 4, 2018 City Council Agenda Item re: Recommendation

To Declare Ordinance Approving Resolution No. WD-1392

Dear Ms. De La Garza:

Please be advised that this firm represents Long Beach Water Department customers
Diana Lejins and Angela Kimball and Angela Ki

On September 4, 2018, the City Council will consider whether to declare an ordinance approving Resolution WD-1392. It is our understanding that the Board passed Resolution WD-1392 based on the passage of Measure M on June 5, 2018. According to the City, Measure M authorizes the Water Department to embed a surcharge in its water and sewer rates in order fund transfers from the Water Revenue Fund to the City's General Fund. The City initiated Measure M after it resolved a lawsuit brought by Ms. Lejins to challenge the City's practice of transferring so-called "pipeline permit fees." The goal of Measure M was to replace the loss of revenue that resulted from the settlement the City entered into with Ms. Lejins.

Ms. Lejins and Ms. Kimball believe that the proposed water and sewer rates are illegal to the extent they embed amounts to transfer from the Water Revenue Fund to the City's General Fund based on any purported authority provided by Measure M. It is our understanding that such embedded surcharges comprise approximately 12% of the rates.

Monique De La Garza, CMC City Clerk August 28, 2018 Page 2

The basis for their contention is threefold. First, the City apparently agrees that the water and sewer fees and charges are property-related and accordingly, are subject to Proposition 218. (See California Constitution, article XIII D, § 2, subdivisions (e)(g) and (h).) Yet, California Constitution, article XIII D, section 3, plainly prohibits the imposition of any tax, assessment, fee or charge, upon any parcel or property or upon any person as an incident of property ownership, subject to four exceptions, none of which are applicable here. Second, article XIII D, section 6, subdivisions (b)(1)(2) and (5) prohibit the imposition of a property-related fee if such fee exceeds the funds required to provide the property-related service, is used for purposes other than that for which the fee or charge is imposed, or is used for general governmental services. Embedding surcharges to fund transfers to the General Fund violates all three subdivisions. Finally, to the extent that the City contends that the fees and charges constitute a voter-approved tax (a term not used in Measure M or in the amended Charter provision), the City lacks legal authority to impose taxes on persons and properties outside it territorial limits. Ms. Kimball resides in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. She was unable to vote on Measure M, yet she is subject to the "tax" to the extent the City contends it is such.

Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that City Council decline to declare an ordinance approving Resolution No. WD-1392. Please include this letter in the record of the September 4, 2018 public hearing with respect to the above-referenced agenda item. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Eric J. Benink

En / Km