

Message Sent November 2, 2011

From: tomlong@palosverdes.com

Subject: RPV Election 11-8-2011

Message:

Dear RPV Residents,

Sadly, PVP Watch is now distorting the issues to influence the election. I have never contacted a union and have never supported unionization of city employees. Nor has any councilmember or candidate that I know of. The reason we now have a city employees' union for the first time in history is that PVP Watch and its slate of candidates, Brooks, Duhovic and DeLaRosa have spread misinformation describing a pension decrease as an increase and overstating salary increases. By treating city employees as enemies, a council dominated by PVP Watch's slate will make it much harder for the city to deliver good services.

Remember how different things would be if PVP Watch had its way. They opposed every initiative of the city council. We would have no open space preservation. (They complain vaguely that the contract with PVPLC is "poorly written" but provide no suggested changes. Their real concern is that finalizing the contract allows us to record open space easements preserving 15% of the city as open space in perpetuity, something they have consistently opposed.) If PVP Watch had its way we would have no utility user tax to keep streets maintained and no storm drain user fee to protect those facilities. PVP Watch supported Abrams' lawsuit and that of Monks as well. PVP Watch supported the rights of property owners to put commercial antennas on residential property (Abrams) and to build in landslide zones (Monks) and sought to have financial liability imposed on the city that would have bankrupted it. They would have lent \$8 million (more than twice the revenue received from the resort since it opened 2 years ago) to Terranea with inadequate security such that it all likely would have been lost. PVP Watch repeatedly urged the council to spend down reserves in ways that would have left us unable to take advantage of the \$9.4 million grant we now have to repair San Ramon. PVP Watch denies none of these things--none would have been bad decisions in their view. All would have helped fulfill their goal to "drive government toward zero." People with this kind of record have no place making recommendations as to how we should vote.

PVP Watch blithely ignores (or given their past history perhaps supports) Donald Trump's lawsuit against the city for \$100 million and suggests that its candidates' acceptance of \$1000 each from Trump is OK because Trump offered donations to all! Nonsense. Kudos to those who maintained their independence and rejected the donations. As to those who accepted it I hope they will all act immediately to return the donations.

None of the candidates I support owe me anything nor agreed to any conditions to get my support. However, they did respond to my questions and you can see all of the responses. They represent a variety of views and do not agree with me or each other on all issues. In contrast PVP Watch admits it questioned the candidates but has not shared their responses. PVP Watch's candidates did not want to answer questions publicly. Brooks and de la Rosa made it clear they did not want to publicly provide answers to questions on specific issues until they were elected. The slate of Brooks, de la Rosa and Duhovic do not represent a cross section of the community and are likely beholden to PVP Watch based on questions and answers the public does not get to see. I would like to bring the focus back to the issues and where the city is headed. You can go to the Election 2011 tab on my webpage www.palosverdes.com/tomlong to read candidates' answers and get information about the election. I have also provided links to the candidates' web pages. You may also want to read ballot statements and answers to questions by the newspapers. There are real issues in this election that should not be obscured. And a careful consideration of those issues may lead you to conclude, as I have, that we need a council independent of PVP Watch. That warrants votes for Knight, Emenhiser and Alegria.

Tom Long
Mayor, Rancho Palos Verdes