



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
WATER & SEWER DEPARTMENT
MAYOR Jake Wilson

Date: June 4, 2026
To: City Council
From: Michael Richards, Director of Finance and Administration
RE: FY27 Water & Sewer Rates – Public Hearing Comments & Questions

Honorable Members of the City Council,

The Water & Sewer Department advertised and hosted a public hearing held on Thursday, May 28th 2026 at 6:00PM in the Highlander Forum and online to present the proposed rate increases as part of the Department’s proposed FY27 water and sewer rate recommendation.

There were two (2) participants who attended the hearing in person and three (3) public comments were received during the hearing, including one (1) from an online participant. Two (2) written comments, both in opposition, were received by the Water and Sewer Department prior to the hearing. One was submitted by Maninder Singh and the other was submitted by Sisia Daglian.

In response to the advertisement and hearing, a summary of the questions, comments, and answers the Department received and provided in included below:

Constituent Questions and Remarks from the Public Hearing - 5/28/2026

- Why are Somerville and Cambridge the only communities affected by or responsible for the EPA-related aging infrastructure/outflow combined sewer overflow (CSO) project?
 - When the Clean Water Act was passed in 1970, EPA had to give out permits for pipes that went to the rivers. EPA identified every pipe that went into a river and assigned the permits to that community. Somerville was assigned an outfall to the Alewife and the Mystic. Cambridge was assigned four outfalls to the Alewife and two to the Charles. None of the remaining outfalls on the Charles were assigned to Boston; they were assigned to the MWRA. Because of these permits, those are the parties that have been assigned to eliminate that pollution.

These are shared pipes that go up through Arlington, Belmont, Medford, Stoneham, and others. They all contribute to the overflows but because the outfall are assigned to us, we are responsible for it. We are making the argument to the state level that those assignments are unfair. To the extent that we can get the state to take the burden off of Cambridge, Somerville, and MWRA, we are pursuing that. Are representatives running for Senate or receptive to it but it is early in the process.



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
WATER & SEWER DEPARTMENT
MAYOR Jake Wilson

- Are the rates that we pay to the MWRA different compared to neighboring cities and towns?
 - Yes, the MWRA meters all of our consumption and bills for the whole city or town. It's mostly based on the metered use but rates are also influenced by factors such as total population and population density, using Arlington as an example of a community with lower rates than the more densely populated City of Somerville. Cambridge's sewer bills are higher than ours because their population and metered use is higher than ours. However, Cambridge has its own water reservoir so they are not fully served by the MWRA. Most of their water comes from their reservoir and only a small fraction is provided by the MWRA, so as a result their water bill is significantly lower than ours.
- Will the rates go down again?
 - The rates will not go down, but we expect that these large increases will level out and future increases will be like annual inflation with 4%.
- What do the base charges mean if I have a vacant property with no consumption and still have a bill?
 - The concept is that even if you aren't currently using water, by virtue of having a connection to the water main and could have someone move into tomorrow, we need to be ready to serve and water can be delivered the second the water is turned on. There is required maintenance to our system to provide this readiness to serve.
- Has the City considered a resident discount or owner occupancy exemption for residents living at and using water at the property?
 - The residential exemption had been explored by the Board of Aldermen and submitted as a home rule petition previously. This policy was motivated by affordability for lower income households. The analysis determined that homeowners derived more of a benefit and would have resulted in raising the rates for renters as these discounted costs would need to be offset elsewhere. It was determined that the lower-income households and renters would have been negatively impacted by the residential exemption and so it was not further pursued.
- What has happened with stormwater charges?



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
WATER & SEWER DEPARTMENT
MAYOR Jake Wilson

- We are still working toward a stormwater fee implementation, but at this point our primary focus on getting the bill right and reconciling billing accounts. We're concentrated on assuring that the water and sewer accounts are 100% accurate and infallible before we implement a stormwater fee on top of these charges. It is a labor-intensive correction to our databases; we're pursuing the stormwater fee but will be delaying implementation until we have the billing database 100%.
- When will these fees be assessed and included on bills?
 - We're targeting no sooner than January 1st, 2027.
- Will property owners will have an opportunity to review and "refute" the analysis used to calculate the charges before they are billed?
 - We may pursue a mock bill before this implemented. The intention is that the cycle before the fee goes into effect, you will receive a mock bill demonstrating your charges and will give you an opportunity to see what you may owe and request a review.

A general theme expressed by our two in-person attendees was concern that water and sewer rates are becoming increasingly unaffordable for residents. Both attendees were long-time residents and commented that they feel fortunate to have made financial decisions that have allowed them to remain living in the city despite the rising cost of living.

A link to the recording is included here: [Public Hearing on Water & Sewer Fiscal Year 2027 Rate Proposal - May 28, 2026 - YouTube](#)

The public notice and written comments are attached for your reference. Thank you.

From: Maninder Singh [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2026 9:22 PM
To: Water
Cc: Jesse Clingan; All City Council; Public Comments
Subject: RATE HEARING

This email is from an external source. Use caution responding to it, opening attachments or clicking links.

To the Somerville Water & Sewer Department, Mayor Wilson, and Members of the City Council.

As a resident and homeowner of the City of Somerville, Ward 4, I am writing to formally object to the proposed FY2027 water and sewer increase.

Another 15% increase in water volumetric revenue and another 15% increase in sewer volumetric revenue is not a routine adjustment. It is a second consecutive major hit on residents after FY2026 already raised water volumetric charges by 18%, sewer volumetric charges by 12%, changed residential tiers, and moved households from triannual billing to quarterly billing. Your own hearing notice even says these FY27 increases are "higher than is typical," yet the notice does not publish the actual FY27 residential rate table or household-by-household bill examples.

It is also important to note that the proposed FY27 sewer increase of 15% is higher than the 12% the City itself projected for FY27 in its FY26 long-range model. So by Somerville's own forecasting, the picture is getting worse, not stabilizing. Residents deserve to know why.

The lack of transparency in the hearing notice is unacceptable. Do not ask residents to reverse-engineer what "15% more in volumetric revenue" means for their home. Publish the exact proposed FY27 residential rates by tier, the meter-size base charges, and clear examples for single-family, two-family, and three-family homes before any vote. As it stands now, the public is being asked to comment on percentages without being shown the real bill impact.

This burden falls hardest on ordinary homeowners, especially older one-meter properties. Under current FY26 quarterly residential rates, everything above 18 CCF per quarter is billed at the highest residential tier. For a standard 5/8-inch

meter, the current base charges are already \$15 per quarter for water and \$30 for sewer. That means normal family usage moves into the highest tier quickly, and another 15% volumetric increase would land on top of a rate structure that is already steep for occupied homes.

Your own FY26 materials acknowledged that 1-, 2-, and 3-family users had been paying more than their fair share under the prior structure, and the City's own appendix showed that three dwelling units on one meter could pay 10.5% more than the same three units on three meters. So before asking for another major increase, please explain clearly how this FY27 proposal affects one-meter two-families and three-families, which are a huge part of Somerville's housing stock.

Massachusetts law makes this even more serious. Owners of older one-meter homes cannot simply pass the City's bill through to tenants. Under M.G.L. c. 186, § 22, a landlord can only charge tenants separately if each unit is lawfully submetered, common-area water is separately measured, conservation devices are installed, the tenancy qualifies, and the lease complies with the statute. The landlord also remains the customer of record and remains responsible for the bill. In real life, that means many owner-occupied two-families and three-families absorb these costs directly and then face pressure to raise rent or cut elsewhere just to keep up.

Using the City's own published average residential use examples — 18 CCF for a single-family, 30 CCF for a two-family, and 42 CCF for a three-family per triannual cycle, as used as recently as the FY26 rate presentation — and converting them to quarterly use because Somerville changed residential billing from four months to three months, another 15% volumetric increase would raise an illustrative quarterly 5/8-inch-meter bill from about \$335 to \$378 for a single-family, from about \$580 to \$660 for a two-family, and from about \$847 to \$968 for a three-family, before any separate stormwater charges. Those are not small changes for working households. They are significant recurring increases on top of everything else residents already pay.

In my own case, my current water/sewer bill was \$2,258.44 for 79 units of use. I reviewed the FY26 rates and understand how the bill was calculated. That is exactly the problem: the math may be technically correct, but the burden is outrageous. If this FY27 proposal translates into a straight 15% increase on volumetric charges with base charges unchanged, that same bill would jump to roughly \$2,590 for the same use — about \$332 more for one quarter and more

than \$1,300 more over four quarterly bills.

I also want to know why residents are being asked to bear this increase without a full breakdown of what is driving it. The hearing notice cites essential infrastructure, the federally mandated CSO plan, and flood-mitigation work. A separate City update says the draft updated CSO control plan is a \$1.29 billion legal requirement and that its costs will drive rate increases for customers here and across the MWRA system. The Financial Capability Assessment prepared for that plan projects a typical Somerville single-family sewer bill (54 CCF annual usage) rising from \$852 today to between \$2,094 and \$2,367 by FY 2055 — a 146% to 178% increase. So the City already knows this is a multi-decade affordability crisis, not a one-time adjustment. At the same time, your FY26 presentation showed that the water and sewer budgets are dominated by MWRA assessments, debt service, and capital outlay, and that fixed costs account for between 66% and 84% of the annual budget. If those are the true drivers, then show the public the FY27 numbers plainly and honestly.

Your own FY26 presentation also said the failed FY25 increase created "dire" FY26 financial circumstances, and last year's model already projected another major FY27 increase. Residents should not be forced to absorb the consequences of prior rate-setting failures, deferred decisions, or financing choices through repeated double-digit utility hikes. If the City has a sound mathematical case for this proposal, it should publish that case in plain English before taking another dollar from households.

The City also told the public in FY26 that affordability efforts were limited by legal constraints and that it was still evaluating ratepayer assistance. The official City discount page shows a 25% discount for certain income-eligible seniors, surviving spouses, and minors — but Massachusetts law (Chapter 298 of the Acts of 2018) actually allows Somerville to offer up to a 30% discount. The City chose 25%. There is also still no broad relief for working-age households that are also struggling. Please explain what affordability relief exists right now for non-senior homeowners, tenants, and small landlords facing these bills, and why the City has not exercised the full 30% authority the state has already granted it.

Please also explain how much revenue is being collected from developers and other non-residential sources before asking residents for another 15%. Your FY26 presentation said the I/I fee (Item ID 25-1069) would increase revenue collected from developers. How much has that fee generated to date, how much

is budgeted for FY27, and how much state, federal, or MWRA funding is being used to reduce the burden on residential ratepayers? Those numbers should be public before any vote.

Residents are also being told that parking permit and meter fees are going up on July 1, 2026. Whether those charges sit in a different part of the budget or not, the reality for households is the same: the City keeps coming back to residents for more money. Property taxes, water, sewer, parking, permits, inspections, and other city-related costs do not hit people in isolation. They stack. And for many residents, that stack is becoming unsustainable.

I also want to point out a glaring contradiction in how the City approaches residents. During election season, candidates and their teams go door-to-door, make phone calls, send mailers, and personally ask for our votes with detailed promises of change and better service. The outreach is constant, organized, and well-funded. But when the City makes a decision that will increase every household's water and sewer bill by hundreds or even thousands of dollars a year, the entire public process is one hearing on one evening, with a noon written-comment deadline on a workday, and the rates are then approved by a small group of officials. If door-to-door outreach is possible to win an election, it is more than possible to explain a major rate increase before it is voted on. And a change of this magnitude — one that affects every single household and small property owner in Somerville — should arguably be put to the voters directly, the same way other major financial decisions are. Transparency cannot be a campaign promise that disappears the moment the votes are counted. It has to be how the City actually operates when residents' money is on the line.

I am asking the City to answer the following questions before approving any FY27 increase:

1. What are the exact proposed FY27 quarterly residential water and sewer rates by tier and by meter size?
2. What is the modeled impact on an average single-family, two-family, and three-family bill, both quarterly and annually?
3. How much of the new revenue will come from 1-, 2-, and 3-family residential properties versus large apartment, commercial, institutional, and other high-volume accounts?
4. What portion of this FY27 increase is attributable to MWRA assessments, local debt service, capital outlay, staffing, flood mitigation, and CSO-related

obligations?

5. How much outside funding is being used to offset resident bills, including MWRA assistance, state/federal infrastructure money, and any development-related fees?
6. How much revenue has the I/I fee (Item ID 25-1069) generated to date, what is budgeted for FY27, and why is that not being shown alongside this proposal?
7. Why has the City chosen a 25% senior/surviving-spouse/minor discount when state law allows up to 30%, and what relief exists right now for non-senior households, tenants, and small landlords?
8. Has the City modeled the effect of this proposal on one-meter owner-occupied two-families and three-families that cannot simply bill tenants separately under Massachusetts law?
9. Why does the FY27 hearing notice provide percentages but not actual bill examples for households, when the FY26 presentation included household impact tables?
10. Will the City postpone approval until this information is published clearly, in plain language, and in the major languages spoken in Somerville?
11. Given the level of door-to-door outreach the City and its candidates conduct during election season, why is comparable outreach not being done to inform residents about a rate increase that will affect every household in the city, and would the City consider putting a change of this magnitude to a direct vote of the residents?

I also want to formally note the inadequacy of the public notice itself. The City published this hearing notice on Friday, May 22, 2026 — going into a Memorial Day holiday weekend. That leaves residents roughly three business days to read the notice, understand what a 15% volumetric increase actually means for their household, compose written testimony, and submit it before the noon deadline on Thursday, May 28 — the same day as the hearing. For a proposal that will raise costs on every household in Somerville for years to come, a three-business-day window opened over a federal holiday weekend is not meaningful public notice. It is procedural compliance dressed up as public engagement. The City should not be permitted to push through a decision of this magnitude on this kind of timeline, and I am asking the Council and Department to acknowledge that the notice period itself is a reason to postpone the vote.

Somerville is home to a significant multinational population, with residents who speak many different languages. A decision of this scale deserves the same standard of public communication that the City already applies to elections —

proper notice, well in advance, translated into every major language spoken in the city, and delivered directly to residents rather than relying on a website or social media post.

At minimum, a proposal of this magnitude should be noticed at least a month in advance, with the full proposed FY27 rate tables, household impact examples, and hearing details translated into every major language spoken in Somerville and mailed directly to ratepayers. Residents have a right to know what their City is doing before it is decided, not after. Transparency must come above all else.

One 6 p.m. hearing — even at the Highlander Forum at Somerville High School and even with a virtual option — combined with a noon written-comment deadline on a workday, is not enough outreach for a proposal of this size. Many residents are working, caregiving, commuting, or managing multiple jobs. If the City is serious about public input, then it should not rely on a single hearing window and a social media post. It should mail clear examples to ratepayers, publish translated summaries, and make the actual household impacts impossible to miss.

I respectfully ask the City to withdraw or postpone this proposal unless and until a full residential impact analysis is published. Another 15% is too much. Residents should not be the automatic shock absorber for every financing gap, deferred decision, or infrastructure plan. If Somerville wants to call itself fair, then it needs to prove with actual numbers that this proposal is fair to the people who live here and pay the bills.

Please include this email in the official hearing record.

--

Maninder Singh

████████████████████
████████████████████

From: Sisia Daglian [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2026 7:52 AM
To: Water
Subject: RATE HEARING

This email is from an external source. Use caution responding to it, opening attachments or clicking links.

Questions:

1. Can you please explain what "volumetric charges" are, and how this is different from "base charges".
2. How do these changes affect the average 2-family house, what kind of increases can we expect to see.

Is the hearing going to be recorded and made available later?

Thank you,
Sisia Daglian

From: Maninder Singh <singhmb92@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2026 9:22 PM
To: Water
Cc: Jesse Clingan; All City Council; Public Comments
Subject: RATE HEARING

This email is from an external source. Use caution responding to it, opening attachments or clicking links.

To the Somerville Water & Sewer Department, Mayor Wilson, and Members of the City Council.

As a resident and homeowner of the City of Somerville, Ward 4, I am writing to formally object to the proposed FY2027 water and sewer increase.

Another 15% increase in water volumetric revenue and another 15% increase in sewer volumetric revenue is not a routine adjustment. It is a second consecutive major hit on residents after FY2026 already raised water volumetric charges by 18%, sewer volumetric charges by 12%, changed residential tiers, and moved households from triannual billing to quarterly billing. Your own hearing notice even says these FY27 increases are "higher than is typical," yet the notice does not publish the actual FY27 residential rate table or household-by-household bill examples.

It is also important to note that the proposed FY27 sewer increase of 15% is higher than the 12% the City itself projected for FY27 in its FY26 long-range model. So by Somerville's own forecasting, the picture is getting worse, not stabilizing. Residents deserve to know why.

The lack of transparency in the hearing notice is unacceptable. Do not ask residents to reverse-engineer what "15% more in volumetric revenue" means for their home. Publish the exact proposed FY27 residential rates by tier, the meter-size base charges, and clear examples for single-family, two-family, and three-family homes before any vote. As it stands now, the public is being asked to comment on percentages without being shown the real bill impact.

This burden falls hardest on ordinary homeowners, especially older one-meter properties. Under current FY26 quarterly residential rates, everything above 18 CCF per quarter is billed at the highest residential tier. For a standard 5/8-inch

meter, the current base charges are already \$15 per quarter for water and \$30 for sewer. That means normal family usage moves into the highest tier quickly, and another 15% volumetric increase would land on top of a rate structure that is already steep for occupied homes.

Your own FY26 materials acknowledged that 1-, 2-, and 3-family users had been paying more than their fair share under the prior structure, and the City's own appendix showed that three dwelling units on one meter could pay 10.5% more than the same three units on three meters. So before asking for another major increase, please explain clearly how this FY27 proposal affects one-meter two-families and three-families, which are a huge part of Somerville's housing stock.

Massachusetts law makes this even more serious. Owners of older one-meter homes cannot simply pass the City's bill through to tenants. Under M.G.L. c. 186, § 22, a landlord can only charge tenants separately if each unit is lawfully submetered, common-area water is separately measured, conservation devices are installed, the tenancy qualifies, and the lease complies with the statute. The landlord also remains the customer of record and remains responsible for the bill. In real life, that means many owner-occupied two-families and three-families absorb these costs directly and then face pressure to raise rent or cut elsewhere just to keep up.

Using the City's own published average residential use examples — 18 CCF for a single-family, 30 CCF for a two-family, and 42 CCF for a three-family per triannual cycle, as used as recently as the FY26 rate presentation — and converting them to quarterly use because Somerville changed residential billing from four months to three months, another 15% volumetric increase would raise an illustrative quarterly 5/8-inch-meter bill from about \$335 to \$378 for a single-family, from about \$580 to \$660 for a two-family, and from about \$847 to \$968 for a three-family, before any separate stormwater charges. Those are not small changes for working households. They are significant recurring increases on top of everything else residents already pay.

In my own case, my current water/sewer bill was \$2,258.44 for 79 units of use. I reviewed the FY26 rates and understand how the bill was calculated. That is exactly the problem: the math may be technically correct, but the burden is outrageous. If this FY27 proposal translates into a straight 15% increase on volumetric charges with base charges unchanged, that same bill would jump to roughly \$2,590 for the same use — about \$332 more for one quarter and more

than \$1,300 more over four quarterly bills.

I also want to know why residents are being asked to bear this increase without a full breakdown of what is driving it. The hearing notice cites essential infrastructure, the federally mandated CSO plan, and flood-mitigation work. A separate City update says the draft updated CSO control plan is a \$1.29 billion legal requirement and that its costs will drive rate increases for customers here and across the MWRA system. The Financial Capability Assessment prepared for that plan projects a typical Somerville single-family sewer bill (54 CCF annual usage) rising from \$852 today to between \$2,094 and \$2,367 by FY 2055 — a 146% to 178% increase. So the City already knows this is a multi-decade affordability crisis, not a one-time adjustment. At the same time, your FY26 presentation showed that the water and sewer budgets are dominated by MWRA assessments, debt service, and capital outlay, and that fixed costs account for between 66% and 84% of the annual budget. If those are the true drivers, then show the public the FY27 numbers plainly and honestly.

Your own FY26 presentation also said the failed FY25 increase created "dire" FY26 financial circumstances, and last year's model already projected another major FY27 increase. Residents should not be forced to absorb the consequences of prior rate-setting failures, deferred decisions, or financing choices through repeated double-digit utility hikes. If the City has a sound mathematical case for this proposal, it should publish that case in plain English before taking another dollar from households.

The City also told the public in FY26 that affordability efforts were limited by legal constraints and that it was still evaluating ratepayer assistance. The official City discount page shows a 25% discount for certain income-eligible seniors, surviving spouses, and minors — but Massachusetts law (Chapter 298 of the Acts of 2018) actually allows Somerville to offer up to a 30% discount. The City chose 25%. There is also still no broad relief for working-age households that are also struggling. Please explain what affordability relief exists right now for non-senior homeowners, tenants, and small landlords facing these bills, and why the City has not exercised the full 30% authority the state has already granted it.

Please also explain how much revenue is being collected from developers and other non-residential sources before asking residents for another 15%. Your FY26 presentation said the I/I fee (Item ID 25-1069) would increase revenue collected from developers. How much has that fee generated to date, how much

is budgeted for FY27, and how much state, federal, or MWRA funding is being used to reduce the burden on residential ratepayers? Those numbers should be public before any vote.

Residents are also being told that parking permit and meter fees are going up on July 1, 2026. Whether those charges sit in a different part of the budget or not, the reality for households is the same: the City keeps coming back to residents for more money. Property taxes, water, sewer, parking, permits, inspections, and other city-related costs do not hit people in isolation. They stack. And for many residents, that stack is becoming unsustainable.

I also want to point out a glaring contradiction in how the City approaches residents. During election season, candidates and their teams go door-to-door, make phone calls, send mailers, and personally ask for our votes with detailed promises of change and better service. The outreach is constant, organized, and well-funded. But when the City makes a decision that will increase every household's water and sewer bill by hundreds or even thousands of dollars a year, the entire public process is one hearing on one evening, with a noon written-comment deadline on a workday, and the rates are then approved by a small group of officials. If door-to-door outreach is possible to win an election, it is more than possible to explain a major rate increase before it is voted on. And a change of this magnitude — one that affects every single household and small property owner in Somerville — should arguably be put to the voters directly, the same way other major financial decisions are. Transparency cannot be a campaign promise that disappears the moment the votes are counted. It has to be how the City actually operates when residents' money is on the line.

I am asking the City to answer the following questions before approving any FY27 increase:

1. What are the exact proposed FY27 quarterly residential water and sewer rates by tier and by meter size?
2. What is the modeled impact on an average single-family, two-family, and three-family bill, both quarterly and annually?
3. How much of the new revenue will come from 1-, 2-, and 3-family residential properties versus large apartment, commercial, institutional, and other high-volume accounts?
4. What portion of this FY27 increase is attributable to MWRA assessments, local debt service, capital outlay, staffing, flood mitigation, and CSO-related

obligations?

5. How much outside funding is being used to offset resident bills, including MWRA assistance, state/federal infrastructure money, and any development-related fees?
6. How much revenue has the I/I fee (Item ID 25-1069) generated to date, what is budgeted for FY27, and why is that not being shown alongside this proposal?
7. Why has the City chosen a 25% senior/surviving-spouse/minor discount when state law allows up to 30%, and what relief exists right now for non-senior households, tenants, and small landlords?
8. Has the City modeled the effect of this proposal on one-meter owner-occupied two-families and three-families that cannot simply bill tenants separately under Massachusetts law?
9. Why does the FY27 hearing notice provide percentages but not actual bill examples for households, when the FY26 presentation included household impact tables?
10. Will the City postpone approval until this information is published clearly, in plain language, and in the major languages spoken in Somerville?
11. Given the level of door-to-door outreach the City and its candidates conduct during election season, why is comparable outreach not being done to inform residents about a rate increase that will affect every household in the city, and would the City consider putting a change of this magnitude to a direct vote of the residents?

I also want to formally note the inadequacy of the public notice itself. The City published this hearing notice on Friday, May 22, 2026 — going into a Memorial Day holiday weekend. That leaves residents roughly three business days to read the notice, understand what a 15% volumetric increase actually means for their household, compose written testimony, and submit it before the noon deadline on Thursday, May 28 — the same day as the hearing. For a proposal that will raise costs on every household in Somerville for years to come, a three-business-day window opened over a federal holiday weekend is not meaningful public notice. It is procedural compliance dressed up as public engagement. The City should not be permitted to push through a decision of this magnitude on this kind of timeline, and I am asking the Council and Department to acknowledge that the notice period itself is a reason to postpone the vote.

Somerville is home to a significant multinational population, with residents who speak many different languages. A decision of this scale deserves the same standard of public communication that the City already applies to elections —

proper notice, well in advance, translated into every major language spoken in the city, and delivered directly to residents rather than relying on a website or social media post.

At minimum, a proposal of this magnitude should be noticed at least a month in advance, with the full proposed FY27 rate tables, household impact examples, and hearing details translated into every major language spoken in Somerville and mailed directly to ratepayers. Residents have a right to know what their City is doing before it is decided, not after. Transparency must come above all else.

One 6 p.m. hearing — even at the Highlander Forum at Somerville High School and even with a virtual option — combined with a noon written-comment deadline on a workday, is not enough outreach for a proposal of this size. Many residents are working, caregiving, commuting, or managing multiple jobs. If the City is serious about public input, then it should not rely on a single hearing window and a social media post. It should mail clear examples to ratepayers, publish translated summaries, and make the actual household impacts impossible to miss.

I respectfully ask the City to withdraw or postpone this proposal unless and until a full residential impact analysis is published. Another 15% is too much. Residents should not be the automatic shock absorber for every financing gap, deferred decision, or infrastructure plan. If Somerville wants to call itself fair, then it needs to prove with actual numbers that this proposal is fair to the people who live here and pay the bills.

Please include this email in the official hearing record.

--

Maninder Singh
Cell +1(857)-204-2759
Fax +1(339)-999-0103

From: Sisia Daglian <cardamom_99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 25, 2026 7:52 AM
To: Water
Subject: RATE HEARING

This email is from an external source. Use caution responding to it, opening attachments or clicking links.

Questions:

1. Can you please explain what "volumetric charges" are, and how this is different from "base charges".

2. How do these changes affect the average 2-family house, what kind of increases can we expect to see.

Is the hearing going to be recorded and made available later?

Thank you,
Sisia Daglian



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
WATER & SEWER DEPARTMENT
JAKE WILSON
MAYOR

WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUNDS
FISCAL YEAR 2027 RATE PROPOSAL

PUBLIC HEARING

There will be a Public Hearing, regarding the Fiscal Year 2027 Water and Sewer rates, on **Thursday, May 28th, 2026, at 6:00PM**, on the proposed changes:

1. Up to a 20% increase in revenues from water volumetric charges;
2. Up to a 20% increase in revenues from sewer volumetric charges;
3. No changes to existing base charges for both water and sewer.

Pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2023, this meeting may be held by remote participation. You have three ways to be heard at this meeting:

1. In person at the Water & Sewer Building, 1st Floor Conference Room at **15 Franey Road, Somerville, MA 02145**.
2. Virtually through the Zoom platform.
Enter this link into your internet browser any time before the meeting:
Webinar ID: 870 9214 3821
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87092143821>
3. If you are unable to attend but wish to be heard, you may email your comments to water@somervillema.gov with RATE HEARING as the subject title or send them by US mail to the Water and Sewer Department, 17 Franey Road, Somerville, MA, 02145. Your comments must arrive **no later than 12 Noon on the day of the Hearing** to be sure they are conveyed to the Department of Water and Sewer.

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND AND BE HEARD.

Persons with disabilities who need ADA accommodations to access this program, please contact 311 (617-666-3311) in advance.

The City of Somerville can provide you with an interpreter in your language for free. To request an interpreter, please contact us at somervillema.gov/ContactSomerviva or call 311 (617-666-3311) at least 7 days in advance of this event.