

## **PVP Watch Newsletter – February 28, 2010**

To Our Friends & Supporters

### **Peninsula Schools**

Because of the fiscal irresponsibility of the California legislature, funding to Palos Verdes Unified School District is being cut another \$4 million dollars this coming year (2010 / 2011) with the likelihood of another \$3 million dollars the following school year. While Peninsula residents have been extremely generous with local funding support by means of Parcel Taxes, Save Our Teachers Now campaigns, donations to the Peninsula Education Foundation, PTAs, and Booster Clubs donations etc., the bulk of school funding comes from Sacramento.

**A Town Hall meeting was held on February 24th. A second meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 18th, 7:00pm at Ridgecrest Intermediate School MPR. The purpose of these meetings is to keep the public informed on the issues. Everyone is invited to attend.**

A budget overview that was presented at the most recent School Board meeting (February 11, 2010) can be found at the District website - [www.pvpusd.k12.ca.us](http://www.pvpusd.k12.ca.us)

The \$7 million of cuts is over and above the \$10 million in cuts implemented the past two years! Budget cut considerations include:

- Calendar changes to reduce the school year from 180 to 175 instructional days
- Eliminate one non-instructional day for teachers
- Increase class sizes as a result of teacher lay offs
- Freeze built-in pay increases.
- Reduce psychologists, counselors, nurses, librarians, & special education staff
- Cut clerical, office, custodial and other support staff
- Eliminate athletics, music, drama, AVID, and reduce elective courses.

These are dire times for educators responsible for educating our children. All constructive ideas are welcomed and can be sent to [supt@pvpusd.k12.ca.us](mailto:supt@pvpusd.k12.ca.us) and / or [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com).

### **RPV - Marymount College**

The February 25th edition of the Daily Breeze contained an announcement that Marymount had received accreditation approval from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to offer bachelor's degrees in business, liberal arts and media studies. There will be no increase in the approved number of students attending Marymount.

At last week's RPV Council meeting (February 16th) the latest Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Appendix D was presented. The conclusion of the DEIR was that the proposed Bachelor

of Arts program will have minimal if any, impact on any Marymount campus construction matter. The final date for residents to make comments to RPV City Hall regarding current Marymount planning is **March 8th**. ALL Interested residents wishing to comment on the DEIR should respond to RPV Planner Ara Mihranian at [aram@rpv.com](mailto:aram@rpv.com) **no later than 4:30 PM on March 8, 2010**. The other issue in the DEIR is the location of the soccer field & tennis courts. Interesting..... some have commented that Marymount plans would obscure their ocean views when driving on PV Dr. East. Should not these folks have their eyes on the road rather than looking at the ocean views? Marymount is a great cultural asset to the Peninsula and we would hope that RPV City Hall soon approve / accept the EIR report. There has already been excessive expense and wasted time pursuing the latest questionable Environmental Impact Report.

### **RPV - Annenberg Project at Lower Point Vicente**

At it's February 23rd meeting, the RPV Planning Commission initiated the "scoping" for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Annenberg Companion Animal facility. The intent was to gather data to be included in the EIR analysis.

Some 12 / 15 residents appeared before the planning Commission with the preponderance being Ocean Front residents. Many lived on Calle Viento and those properties back up to the PVIC / Lower Point Vicente property. With the placing of the silhouette flags, these folks have awakened to what is being planned.

We have posted several documents concerning the Annenberg project at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com); go to the Current Issues page. As further information becomes available, those documents will be posted as well.

The bottom line is that the main structure is planned at 51K square feet. It is fairly close to the Ocean Front Calle Viento properties and those folks are concerned about the potential negative financial as well as "life style" impacts on their properties.

While there have been a number of presentations to various organizations by Leonard Aube, a Peninsula resident and Annenberg Foundation Managing Director, it seems adjacent neighbors have not been included and "neighborhood compatibility" is a critical issue. Looking at the Annenberg documents (posted at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com)) it appears that Annenberg has spent considerable time and expense creating project building plans only to now become aware that there is significant opposition to the Annenberg plan. Public comments / opinions concerning the Annenberg project should be sent to Ara Mihranian at [aram@rpv.com](mailto:aram@rpv.com) and must be received no later than March 8, 2010.

In fairness to Annenberg, how did this occur? Several years ago Melendrez Associates was retained to develop a *Vision Plan* (posted at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / RPV Coastal Plan - August 2008). Included in the *Vision Plan* which was accepted by the RPV Council was the proposal of a companion animal facility at Lower Point Vicente / PVIC (Point Vicente Interpretive Center). The

portion of Melendrez report that contains resident comments concerning Lower Point Vicente found that overwhelmingly that those responding rejected the proposed companion animal facility at that location. It appears RPV City Hall has ignored resident comments.

That the previous RPV Council (Mayor Larry Clark, Councilmen Tom Long, Doug Stern with Steve Wolowicz opposing) authorized Annenberg to proceed / submit plans for approval is puzzling. Is this not *putting the cart before the horse*? Why is there not some form of a proposed contract being discussed? What are the financial *Terms & Conditions*? How many animals will be housed at the Annenberg Companion Animal facility? Is this appropriate use of public lands? There is mention of *educational classes*, what does this mean? What other uses are contemplated? What will be the potential noise impact on neighbors? Where is the concern by RPV City Hall that Calle Viento residents will likely lose their neighborhood tranquility? Many responded to the *Vision Plan* that Lower Point Vicente is the wrong location for the Annenberg facility yet RPV City Hall apparently plans to move ahead with the project regardless of public input. We wonder, if this is what Ann Shaw and other founders had in mind when RPV was created? By the way, RPV City Hall obtained funds from Annenberg to pay for the Vision Plan project as well as \$4 - \$5 million for the proposed PVIC parking and other amenities project (Planning Commission Feb.9th meeting).

### **RPV - Council Goals 2010**

At the February 16th meeting the RPV Council approved the tactical plan for 2010 which has been posted at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / Current Issues page. We urge all RPV residents to read and judge City Hall objectives for themselves. One of the most pressing issues, in our opinion, is Tarapaca Canyon (stopping / curtailing rain flooding damage) and the Portuguese Bend / PV Dr South slide area. December 31, 2010 is the date for an initial project presentation. Why is there not more aggressive action for these serious issues. However, a questionable project, a new City Hall is being fast tracked with aggressive dates. A recent Newsletter from Councilmen Tom Long & Brian Campbell states " *Building a new city hall will replace the current 1950s army barracks that may fail in an earthquake and does not provide an adequate or safe facility for city staff to conduct their work for the residents or for residents who find themselves at city hall for various reasons.*" We question the veracity of this statement and ask if a registered structural engineer has made an actual structural assessment or is this merely more City Hall whining? Let's see a credible report before spending more staff time or funds on another *feel good want*.

### **RPV – View Ordinance**

GOOD NEWS A legal posting in the February 25th edition of the PV News gave notice that the RPV Planning Commission, will on Tuesday March 23, 2010 conduct a public hearing to – "Consider Amendments to the City's View Restoration and Preservation Guidelines." Many RPV

residents have recognized that the "View Restoration" ordinance was poorly concocted and a badly managed process causing many residents to suffer the onerous decisions of RPV City Hall. PVP Watch will monitor this process and advise residents accordingly. We urge all residents with opinions of the RPV View Ordinance to pay close attention to developing issues and at the appropriate time communicate their respective opinions to the RPV Planning Commission.

### **RPV – Trash Hauling**

Notices of the change from Waste Management to EDCO trash hauling service have been sent to RPV residents. This change of trash haulers will take place on July 1, 2010. We urge all residents to attend one of the scheduled meetings to learn about the changes soon to be implemented. RPV residents have had many years of excellent service with Waste Management and it speaks poorly of us that RPV City Hall did not negotiate with Waste Management in a more ethical manner. However, the "deal is done" and we will have to live with what City Hall has decided.

### **Responses to February 5th Newsletter**

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.

-----

Why don't you rename your newsletter the RPV Dysfunctional Newspaper. Why do the other peninsula cities not have these problems? There must be a reason that no matter who is elected RPV is broken and a train wreck.

-----

Thank you for this publication, I enjoy reading PVP Watch for the real story. Incredible how Councilman Stern would rebuke the mayor for trying to review City employee costs in light of the economy. I drive on PV Drive East every day and, Mr. Long, we do not need more of Officer Knox's speed traps and aggressive enforcement!

PVP Watch, keep up the good work, I will definitely get more involved in the next city council election.

-----

I would like to respond to the deputy Knox issue. The City of Rancho Palos Verdes hired one extra deputy (Knox) to help enforce their traffic-calming scheme. They figured they could generate income from the extra citations to pay his salary and put extra moneys in the city revenue. The city sets the speed limits on the roads in RPV and pays a person to illegally provide a speed survey that does not reflect the actual speed traveled by traffic as it is required to do, if it

is to use radar to enforce its set speeds. The city is responsible for our being harassed by these deputies. Everyone that I know that has appealed these citations has won their case. I am surprised the city is not facing another lawsuit from all the people cited. I guess most people just think its not worth the few hundred dollars. Any attorneys out there? There are hundreds of people with illegally issued (citations?) by this city. You can go back in the records of the city council and see the discussions by the city to do this when they know better. This is no different from thugs holding you up for your time and money. The law is very specific and RPV is not in compliance.

#### Speed Trap Definitions -

Section 40802(b) provides that prima facie speed limits established under Sections 22352(b)(1), 22354, 22357, 22358 and 22358.3 may not be enforced by radar unless the speed limit has been justified by an engineering and traffic survey within the last five years. Under Section 40802(b) an engineering and traffic survey is required where enforcement involves the use of radar or other electronic speed measuring devices. Local streets and roads, as defined in Section 40802(b), primarily serving abutting residential property, are exempt from this requirement.

In a recent ruling ([People v. Goulet](#), 13 Cal.App.4th Supp. 1), the court had held that in order to use radar without creating a speed trap, speed limits must be set in compliance with the CalTrans Traffic Manual, section 8-03.3, subdivision B.2.b. This says that speed limits should normally be set at the 85th percentile speed, with a further five mile per hour reduction only if there are unusual conditions not readily apparent to drivers, and if those conditions do exist, they should be documented on the engineering report. The establishment of a speed limit of more than 5 miles per hour (8 km/h) below the 85 percentile speed should be done with great care as studies have shown that establishing a speed limit at less than the 85th percentile results in an increase in accident rates, and this may make violators of a disproportionate number of the reasonable majority of drivers.

Further information contained in the submission is posted at [www.pvpwatch](http://www.pvpwatch) / Position Papers / Speed Trap Definations.

-----  
Need to clarify a statement which appeared in the "Other Issues" section of the PVP Watch Newsletter of Feb. 6th,2010. It was stated " that a few years ago Mayor Wolowicz had a brilliant idea to provide a pool/'gymnasium facility on the land behind city hall."

*For three years, beginning in 2002 Open Space Planning and Park Recreation Task Force , created by the city council worked on a Project to bring needed recreational facilities to the citizens of Rancho Palos Verdes utilizing the land adjacent to City Hall. Many meetings were held*

*and an excellent plan was worked out. A great deal of interaction took place with executives and site planners from the YMCA. They were most anxious for this project to go forward with little city funding involved for the Pool.*

*Suddenly, our City Council decided, after spending thousands of dollars on consultant fees and totally ignoring the excellent reports put together by the Task Force to cease exploring the use of City Hall property for recreational purposes. Soon after this the Task Force was disbanded..... The work of many talented people and outstanding conceptual plans for this area was lost by this action.*

-----  
Great, as always. I especially enjoyed hearing the comments of fellow readers. You are doing a great community service.

-----  
Please add my email to your distribution (name deleted). Thanks, I just found your list via a friend and I can't thank you enough for existing. The PVP governments are getting out of balance and I'm very thankful that you are bringing transparency.

### **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).

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