

## **PVP Watch Newsletter – April 22, 2009**

**To Our Friends & Supporters:**

### **PVP Schools – Parcel Tax**

Undoubtedly, all / most Peninsula residents are now aware that the PVP School District (PVPUSD) is planning a June ballot for increasing the Parcel Tax approximately \$165 per year. The reasoning for this is the budget shortfall caused by the mismanagement of taxpayer funds by our State Government in Sacramento.

While the financial situation for PVP schools is dire, why is it that residents / taxpayers are the only ones targeted? It seems to some of us that PVP teachers can make a contribution, perhaps waiving 2009 / 2010 salary increases. Our understanding is the PVP teachers union has rebuffed all efforts to contribute. Peninsula residents are not an endless source of \$\$\$\$. While the teachers union laments that teachers are underpaid, we have posted a salary chart at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / PV Schools. One of our concerns about the teachers union is that they favor the older rather than the newer teachers. The State / National teachers unions are one of the causes of the local schools financial problems. With their cronies in Sacramento, too many programs are mandated and local districts have little room to maneuver. PVP Watch believes it is past time for performance based teacher compensation.

The Following Voter Guide was obtained from Citizens for California Reform, an organization committed to advancing a more limited and transparent government, which reduces the tax burden on California. PVP Watch has posted voter information on these Propositions with greater detail at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / Current Issues.

### **MAY 19<sup>TH</sup> SPECIAL ELECTION: VOTER GUIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS 1A-1F**

#### **Proposition 1-A: THE "RAINY DAY" BUDGET STABILIZATION FUND**

**VOTE NO** on this fraud. If politicians could be prosecuted for deceptive advertising this little item would land a bunch of Sacramento legislators in jail. According to the Secretary of State's Ballot Label for this proposition, the measure would "limit future deficits by increasing the State's 'rainy day' fund," but it would also enact "higher state tax revenues of roughly \$16 billion."

The State "Rainy Day" reserve is nothing more than another pot of money to feed the big government monster. (See *"Fox Guarding the Henhouse"* @

<http://www.pvpwatch.com/documents/CCR-FoxGuardingtheHenHouse.pdf> for a more detailed explanation of Prop 1-A).

### **Proposition 1-B: EDUCATION FUNDING - PAYMENT PLAN**

**VOTE NO** on this "save now - pay later" scheme. The Secretary of State says, "Potential state savings of up to several billion dollars in 2009-10 and 2010-11. Potential state costs of billions of dollars annually thereafter." It alleges that temporary cuts to education made now will be added back to the education budget later. Actually, taxpayers will receive the bill for the "repayment." Remember, increased income, sales and car taxes have already begun. Prop 1-A proposes to push those tax increases out another 2 years for an ADDITIONAL tax increase of \$16 billion. The increased tax package passed by the Legislature in February for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are in play right now, so the "potential state savings" are current "actual enacted tax increases." No savings, just higher taxes.

The California Teachers Association (CTA), the state's powerful teachers union wrote Proposition 1-B which guarantees teachers salaries and benefits by securing their lion's share of Prop 1-A funds.

### **Proposition 1-C: LOTTERY MODERNIZATION ACT**

**VOTE NO** on this shell-game gamble. If "modernizing" means increasing the public debt by writing IOU's in the name of California taxpayers to the California State Lottery, then this could rightfully be considered gambling at its best. The State is having problems selling its unsustainable debt instruments to investors and unable to pay for current voter approved debt, it hasn't even released, due to a shortfall in cash flow. Next step? Strong arm some more credit from one of its own public-private partnerships, further indebt our children and gamble with their future.

### **Proposition 1-D: CHILDREN'S SERVICES FUNDING**

**VOTE NO** on this bait and switch sham. California voters approved a tax on cigarettes a few years back with the Legislature's promise that the new tax would yield money for early childhood programs. Now, here is that same Legislature telling voters that it wants them to approve changing the use of that tax money so the Legislature can spend it in whatever way it sees fit. Make a promise. Find an excuse. Break the promise. Spend the money anywhere but where it was promised.

### **Proposition 1-E: MENTAL HEALTH FUNDING –**

**"TEMPORARY REALLOCATION" - OXYMORON**

**VOTE NO** on this hand-is-quicker-than-the-eye scam. Californians voted in 2004 to provide funds for specific mental health services. It was called Proposition 63 or “The Millionaire’s Tax.” Income over \$1 million pays an additional 1% tax for these mental health services. Now comes the Legislature to undo the work of the supporters of Proposition 63 by tricking voters to take money from that purpose and give it over to another purpose. So much for public earmarks!

**Proposition 1-F: ELECTED OFFICIALS' SALARIES. PREVENTS PAY INCREASES DURING BUDGET DEFICIT YEARS**

**VOTE YES** even though this measure only empowers the Director of Finance to prevent the Citizens Compensation Commission from recommending an increase when a deficit year is declared. Although this is only “lip service” sent to our elected representatives, it sends a loud message from the electorate that they are NOT happy with the Legislature’s mismanagement of public funds and demand accountability when those representatives fail in getting the job done. The Legislature is banking on a confused, apathetic, and uninformed electorate to be asleep at the switch realized through a low voter turnout for passage of these absurd smoke and mirror propositions. Exercise your most fundamental right and VOTE on May 19. Let’s all remind our elected representatives that it is they who work for us and that we, the taxpayers, do NOT work for them.

**Solicitors:**

PVP Watch received the following from a Newsletter subscriber concerning those misrepresenting themselves as Peninsula High School students while soliciting funds.

"We in the South Gunter Road area, RPV, experienced young men soliciting donations in our block . . . Sheriff was called . . . Sheriff asked if we had the 'DO NOT DISTURB' sign posted. . . Yes, we all do . . . Sheriff acknowledged they had received reports of the activity... however, there was absolutely no response other than that. . . no Sheriff showed up. . . .

In response to the receipt of these comments, PVP Watch contacted Captain Anda, commander of the Lomita Sheriff’s office.

Following is the response from Captain Anda:

"Thanks, yes, that was an anomaly, dispatch is directed to send a car and I have directed the field units to make sure they contact the informant so that there is no miscommunication."

Hopefully, the problem has left our area. However, should anyone resident encounter a Sheriff’s response that they find unsatisfactory, Captain Anda would like to know about it.

**RPV – Affordable Housing**

Following is another response from a PVP Watch Newsletter subscriber.

*"I recently attended a meeting in Burbank re: "The California Budget" and what we think would end our crisis. One of the things that was pointed out, was the "inside rot" of the government employees and representatives lack of consideration to the taxpayer. This affordable housing in an area where hard working people have paid millions for their homes only to go across the street to the "freeloaders" who need "affordable" housing is an insult to those who have shed sweat, tears and hard work to buy in that area. Not only is it going to negatively affect the prices of that area, but is an example of the "inside rot" by uncaring political representatives who have been elected to fight for us, NOT doing their job! This is a disgusting development and the ruination of the peace and quiet that we paid for is about to go up in smoke! The Peninsula is in peril of losing its position of "desirable" real estate, not to speak of the tranquility we have enjoyed. We paid for that, what have the "affordable" housing prospects done to enjoy OUR achievements? The City Managers "increase" is ANOTHER example of "inside rot." Hello, is ANYONE awake up there? Or this is a case where "the lights are on, but nobody's home?"*

What is pathetic is the RPV Council's lack of interest in residents concerns about the Affordable Housing location. There are better locations on Western Avenue. That the Council / Staff apparently did no investigations of alternative sites again demonstrates that the Council / Staff considers resident's desires and concerns irrelevant. PVP Watch has concerns about the financial viability of this project and potential taxpayer liabilities.

### **RPV Salaries**

As is typically the case, Councilman Tom Long was quick to respond that PVP Watch was in error by reporting City Manager Lehr's had been increased to \$193,000 annually. Our figures were from the Staff report posted on the web site. Long did not provide the correct figure, whatever the amount may be. Apparently another back room deal without transparency. Wherever her salary may be, it is approximately \$190,000.

One subscriber provided the following comparison. The complete copy including the sources is posted at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / Current Issues / RPV City Manager Salary Comparison.

Let's Compare:

#### I. U.S. Government

- A. Salary for Member of Congress or U.S. Senate = \$174,000.00
- B. Population of Average Congressional District: 646,952

#### II. Governors

- A. Salary of California Governor (not accepted and donated to charity) = \$206,500
- B. Salary of New York Governor = \$179,000
- C. Population of California = 36,553,215

D. Population of New York = 19,297,729

III. City of Rancho Palos Verdes

A. Salary of Carolyn Lehr = ~\$190,000.

B. Population of Rancho Palos Verdes = 41,145

IV. Comparisons

RPV's City Manager gets paid approximately 9 percent more than Members of Congress and she is responsible for approximately 6 percent of the population.

RPV's City Manager is paid approximately 6 percent more than the Governor of New York and she is responsible for 0.2 percent of the population.

RPV's City Manager is paid 8 percent less than the Governor of California and she is responsible for 0.1 percent of the population. Not computed are the difference in budget and staff responsibilities.

And Councilman Tom Long states that RPV MUST pay complete salaries to attract good people. Haven't we heard the same words from Wall Street?

**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 welcomes modest contributions. Those desiring to contribute, please send checks to PVP Watch PO Box 7000-22 Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274. We thank those who have contributed for helping to promote PVP Watch.

**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