

To Our Friends & Supporters:

### **RPV Storm Drains**

Los Angeles County Tax bills were recently delivered. Included was RPV Storm Drain Fee / Tax for the 2006 / 2007 budget period.

The October 3rd Council meeting had an extended discussion concerning the proposed repeal of RPV Storm Drain Fee / Tax. It began about midnight and lasted for an hour or so. For those who may have missed this discussion, a video replay is available on the RPV Web Site. Go to [http://www.palosverdes.com/rpv/citycouncil/agendas/2006\\_Agendas/MeetingDate-2006-10-03/](http://www.palosverdes.com/rpv/citycouncil/agendas/2006_Agendas/MeetingDate-2006-10-03/). Scroll down to topic (#22). Click on the video link. Please observe the RPV Council's rhetoric towards residents that collected signatures / signed petitions. That the Council uses the Council dais to viscously attack those that disagree with them is outrageous. Everyone should view / listen for themselves.

Next is a letter that was published in the PV News on October 13th.

Dear Sirs

The last RPV City Council meeting included a discussion of the Storm Drain User Fee. At that meeting the council allocated \$15,000 for legal support to their ad hoc committee to devise an alternative ballot measure intended to thwart our Repeal Initiative. The council has now admitted that they sold the public the proverbial pig in a poke. They spent 3-1/2 years and \$300,000 selling this plan but now say "we failed to explain it well" and we need to "shape public opinion". A special election plus "public education" could cost another \$300,000, the equivalent of lining 6 storm drains.

MYTH: "There is no contingency for emergency" (Long)

FACT: The adopted plan included 40% in contingency and administrative moneys thus increasing the construction costs from about \$18 Million to \$25 Million. The final cost (\$39 Million) includes \$14 Million for maintenance, a traditional annual (non-construction) budget item.

MYTH: "We are a poor city" (Long) and "Not enough money in the till" (Gardiner, et al)

FACT: The City's cash balance as of 6/30/06 was about \$36 Million. General Fund revenues have **exceeded** expenditures by about \$19 Million over the last 5 years and the projection for 2006-2007 is over \$3 Million. Reserves will again increase pending transfers into various restricted funds including storm drain upgrades.

MYTH: "The proponents of the Repeal Initiative are irresponsible for not providing an alternative" (Stern, et al)

FACT: On several occasions we have provided the council with our analysis including budget priorities, other revenue sources and acceptable reserve levels (\$7 Million). The last detailed analysis was also posted at PVPWatch.com. The alternative is to stop talking about priorities

and actually make public safety/infrastructure #1 before, not after, funding special interest "wants".

The council wants a new tax alternative while we want fiscal responsibility. When you look at the FACTS you will see that the latter is the better plan.

Don Reeves / Barry Hildebrand

Committee to Repeal RPV Storm Drain User Fee

----

Thursday, Oct 19th, the PV News published a letter written by RPV Councilman Tom Long responding to the Hildebrand and Reeves letter. Long's comments were a repeat of the same tired words, no meaningful sales tax base, poor city, etc. The article went on that "Hildebrand and Reeves claimed the city could fund infrastructure repair by eliminating things such as the Interpretive Center and open-space acquisitions". More nonsense, no such comments have been offered. What has been said is that the Interpretive Center went from an initial budget of approximately \$3,000,000 to a current cost exceeding \$6,000,000. Long has repeatedly stated that funds used for the Interpretive Center could not have been used for Storm Drains. The truth is that some \$2 plus million of the added funds came from unrestricted funds available to the Council for a number of purposes including Storm Drains. Is it too much to expect that Councilmen be accurate when making public comments? The Interpretive Center now has an annual budget of \$300,000. Why do RPV taxpayers have to carry this burden?

### **PVP Watch Blog**

Visits to the PVP Watch "Blog" are increasing. We encourage all to post their opinions.

To find the PVP Watch Blog go to [pvpwatch.com](http://pvpwatch.com), There is a "Link" button in the lower left corner. Can also go direct to "[www.pvpwatchblog.blogspot.com](http://www.pvpwatchblog.blogspot.com)".

### **Subscribers**

The PVP Watch e-mail list continues to grow. Friends & Supporters forward e-mail addresses of friends and neighbors. For those who wish their addresses removed. please send notice to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com).

PVP Watch strives to bring current issues to [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com). Those who have topics of community interest are encouraged to bring those issues to PVP Watch.

The Editorial Committee