

## PVP Watch Newsletter – February 28, 2011

### To Our Friends & Supporters

In this Newsletter:

- \* RPV Voter Alert
- \* San Ramon Stabilization Project
- \* PVPUSD

## RPV Voter Alert Vote No RPV Measure C – March 8<sup>th</sup>

PVP Watch is strongly opposed to RPV Measure C. The proposed charter is poorly crafted, overly broad, lacks checks and balances to protect RPV residents.

PVP Watch urges a **NO vote on RPV Measure C** to prevent potential abuse of excessive new powers that would be given to Council if Measure C is approved. Please help spread the word in these last few days before the election.

Measure C was first touted by RPV City Hall as a cure-all for saving millions of dollars in *prevailing wage* costs as well as *saving* Terranea TOT funds from Sacramento's grasp's. Those proclamations were soon shown to be highly speculative and anything but guaranteed. Now they simply say, "**TRUST US**" - we will protect RPV residents from Sacramento, "*we listen to our constituents and we are always available to address their concerns*" Unfortunately, we know that is not so.

Why was there no input from the community? Why is this on a March ballot, at an additional cost of approx. \$90,000 instead of on the November ballot? Why is the City spending so much of our taxpayer dollars on costly ads and materials to get this passed? Why was there NO mention of the charter in the two City Newsletters that went out last year when charter was on the agenda? Why are some people on the East side of the Hill (Yes signs on PV Drive East at Ganado) supporting it so strongly? Why was a resident told his voice was a CANCER in the community when he questioned the contents (or lack thereof) of the charter on August 3, 2010?

February 13, 2011 Mayor Tom Long distributed an email message stating "*the No Campaign has just sent out a mailer funded by unions which is packed with false information.*"

The entire letter was subsequently forwarded by Councilman Brian Campbell to his mail list which included No on RPV Measure C chair Sharon Yarber. Ms. Yarber informed Mayor Long

that the No campaign was not involved in any way with the union flyer and asked Long for proof of the assertion. Long acknowledged he did not have any at this time. Trust him, why?

Using public funds to pay for the City's very slanted "informational" material and advertisements to promote their power grab charter is just plain wrong. Are we to trust our current Councilmen with tremendous NEW power?

We believe there are hidden agendas behind the push for Measure C. What are they hiding? Why the rush? Why, why, why?

## **PVP Watch Strongly Urges RPV Residents to Vote NO on Measure C on March 8th.**

We wish to congratulate the Peninsula Democratic Club for conducting an open forum on Measure C on Sunday February 20th. In comparison, the local Republican 46 District Central Committee endorsed Yes on RPV Measure C without hearing opposing views from opponents. Measure C is a non-partisan issue. Those who may receive misguided Republican endorsement material in support of RPV Measure C, don't be fooled by this charade.

### **San Ramon Stabilization Project**

March 1st the RPV Council will have a Public Hearing on the San Ramon Stabilization Project and we urge everyone to "tune in" on this as this is a very important matter. Hopefully a report from City Manager Lehr will be included regarding the costs associated with a trip by RPV City Hall staff to Washington DC several weeks ago to solicit funds. Taxpayers should be informed about who went on the excursion, which government officials were contacted, total trip costs and anticipated outcome of the trip.

In view of the seriousness of a critical matter like the San Ramon Stabilization Project, we wonder why RPV City Hall continues to hire consultants and spend money on projects not desired by taxpayers. Some examples are the proposed improvements for Lower Hesse & Grandview Parks for which we see little resident support and which are each estimated to cost \$2,000,000 or more, and a new City Hall which we cannot afford and do not need. Meanwhile we sit with crossed fingers that that a severe storm does not wipe out the PV Drive East switchbacks, destroy 25<sup>th</sup> street, and risk injury or death to residents living below 25<sup>th</sup> street.

## **PVPUSD Schools**

Peninsula High currently has two swimming pools that are over 50 years old and have serious health, safety and structural issues. The school district has approved expenditure of \$1.3 million dollars. That amount will enable the larger pool to be repaired to meet swim/water polo team requirements, but not community needs, but the second, smaller one would not be repaired. HOWEVER, one alternative is to replace BOTH pools with a brand new, larger pool that would meet the needs of the teams AND the community; but the new pool will cost \$2.1 million. WE NEED TO RAISE \$800,000 from the community by June 1, 2011 to make this a reality. Presently the pools are used in the summer for community swimming programs. If the community fails to raise the \$800,000 a pool with a shallow end for community "learning to swim" programs will be lost.

Before some criticize PVPUSD, please remember not only does the school district face a shortage of funds; they are limited by law as to how they spend funds. The school district is doing a community service by making school facilities available to the public.

If the community does not raise \$800,000 by the June 1, 2011 deadline the opportunity for a new pool will be lost and the district's approved funds will be used to repair the existing undersized pool.

Please help this fundraising effort so that a new pool can be built to accommodate the highly competitive high school water polo and swim teams and the aquatic programs used by the entire community.

Tax-deductible contributions should be made to:

**ABC Peninsula Pool Project Capital Campaign  
c/o Nancy Scott  
19 Aurora Drive  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274**

Please indicate how you want your name to appear for acknowledgment on the memo line of your check.

For more information visit the website [www.newpeninsulapool.org](http://www.newpeninsulapool.org) or contact:

Mary DiMatteo, [salandmar@cox.net](mailto:salandmar@cox.net), 310-936-4904

Jennifer Ryan, [reejen@cox.net](mailto:reejen@cox.net), 310-429-6716

### Seniors Parcel Tax Exemption

Time to renew for 2011 / 2012 Senior Parcel Tax Exemptions. If you need renewal form, go to [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / PVPUSD page. Can download from there.

### Newsletter Responses

Reader comments are welcomed and should be sent to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com). Newsletter responses are posted with names removed and no editing other than obvious grammatical changes. These are subscriber thoughts and opinions and PVP Watch does not vouch for those opinions. That so many have sent their comments has made the Newsletter more interesting and we appreciate the input. We have been reminded that not ALL subscribers are aware of the PVP Watch website: [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com). Lots of good info posted there.

### Subscriber Comments:

- All that has to be said about Measure C is the following quote from the Ralph M. Brown Act:  
*"The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created."*

It would be difficult to find a more appropriate passage as relates to the RPV City Council. They have tried to hide the consequences of Measure C from the beginning. To this day they still will not give facts about the supposed millions to be saved by eliminating prevailing wages. I challenge them to pick a project, any project, and give the details as to how much could be saved.

-----

Let's be clear. Overshadowing the value in any city charter, there is a fatal flaw in THIS proposed RPV city charter: It does not contain checks and balances.

The old rule says, "Sooner or later, if they CAN, they WILL."

Our electorate is mostly unaware that this proposes a skeleton two-page charter for RPV. Its proponents base its value on our trust in all future city councils and in possible cost savings, yet every description says it "may," "could" or "might" save us money. In fact, as our City Attorney and our Finance Chair admit, their estimates depend on unsettled law as the Vista case exemplifies.

No checks and balances, too much risk, too little debate, too weak a factual foundation. Maybe a well-conceived charter could be good. For now, we are obliged to vote NO on C.

### PVP Watch – Newsletter List

A reminder to ALL PVP Watch supporters, should you change your e-mail address don't forget to advise PVP Watch of your new address. We suggest that pvpwatch.com be added to your computer address book to assure delivery of PVP Watch Newsletters.

### PVP Watch – Contributions

PVP Watch thanks the many subscribers who have contributed to PVP Watch. Those desiring to make a modest contribution, please send checks to PVP Watch PO Box 7000-22 Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

### Subscribers

The PVP Watch e-mail list continues to grow. For those who wish their addresses removed, please send notice to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com). Those who have topics of community interest are encouraged to bring those issues to PVP Watch.

The Editorial Committee