

To Our Friends and Supporters

**YOUR PROPERTY RIGHTS AND VALUES ARE IN DANGER!!!**

How many RPV residents are aware of the proposed Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) / Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) area that encompasses the 13.6-square-mile coastal City of Rancho Palos Verdes in Los Angeles County, California?

The NCCP includes **ALL** properties (city and private) within the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.

Why should RPV residents care? Because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally impacts your RIGHTS as an RPV resident.

The RPV Council with Susan Brooks as Mayor voted on March 29, 2018 to approve the NCCP which was then submitted to California / US Wildlife agencies for final approval without having any voter approval. Yes it was on the Council agenda but who scrutinizes RPV agendas (other than PVP Watch and several other interested RPV residents).

If you care that RPV is encumbering your property rights and that action will likely reduce property values, please read on as the next several pages will have overwhelming data.

Briefly, the creation of the NCCP was in the year 2000 / 2004 time frame when some Gnatcatchers (birds) were observed in the land that is now Trump National and the Portuguese Bend slide area as well. Gnatcatchers were then and now remain on the Endangered Species list although increasingly those who become aware are questioning “why”? The last reported Gnatcatcher count was some time ago and then there were some 80 Gnatcatcher birds observed in the RPV area. It is reported that there are very large Gnatcatcher flocks in the Orange and San Diego counties. RPV spends unknown, but certainly vast, sums of public funds needlessly planting native habitat for a few Gnatcatchers that are in plentiful supply a few miles South on PCH.

As we understand the early circumstances, initially those lands where the Gnatcatcher birds were observed, the RPV Council at that time initiated the draft NCCP process with those lands. Subsequently the NCCP was expanded by a previous City Council to include **ALL** land in RPV including private properties. For the past 15

years or so the “Draft” NCCP has been floating around city hall with endless and unknown funds being spent and now in its supposed final format was approved by the RPV Council on May 29, 2018.

The Council approved “final” NCCP plan is now under review by the Wildlife agencies and there is a sixty (60) day opening / expiring December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018 for RPV residents to *express their opposition to having their homes subject to the mandates of the NCCP.*

PVP Watch **URGES** RPV residents to make their objections known. A brief message stating that you object to the NCCP as currently proposed *because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers your PROPERTY RIGHTS as an RPV resident.*

**To submit comments to the Wildlife Agencies:**

- 1- Email: fw8cfwocomments@fws.gov.      Include “City of RPV NCCP/HCP” in the subject line.
- 2- Copy RPV Council at cc@rpvca.gov.
- 3 – Copy PVP Watch at info@pvpwatch.com.

**Clarification:** There is ongoing legal action concerning the NCCP and the merits of the Nature Preserve, our immediate concern is making notice to the Wildlife agencies to limit the boundaries of the NCCP to the Nature Preserve excluding the ~14,000 homes in RPV from inclusion in the NCCP.

**Save Your Property Rights.**

**RPV Council - NCCP Action Plan – 3/29/2018**

<http://documents.rpvca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=61266&searchid=5e0dfa88-12c6-48b3-9693-4b696e70728f&dbid=0> (copy into your browser) This is a 106 page document but the first 6 or 7 pages provide pertinent data.

**The Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) favors plants over humans**

The RPV City Council has approved drafts, twice. They either don’t recognize that an NCCP has a huge impact on public use of private property, local control of land use and private property development opportunities.

[rpvca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/12762](http://rpvca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/12762) - (copy into your browser)

This is the NCCP document

If you are interested in the demise of public use of anything, check out page 101.

If you are interested in the demise of access from private property/private communities into any of the Nature Reserves, check out page 113.

If you are interested in back yard or boarding horses check out page 113.

If you are interested in having RPV remove coastal view blocking foliage, check out page 153.

If you are interested in the demise of the RPV Trails Network Plan, check out page 91.

A majority of our City Council is all that stands between the City of RPV as planned in 1973 and as described in the NCCP. Get on the record to the Wildlife Agencies and then pursue your special interests with the individual City Council Members.

Please share this with your friends and neighbors.

### **Nature Preserve Issues**

At its August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the RPV Council accepted the Feasibility Study Update report dated July 26, 2018 concerning the "Portuguese Bend Landslide". The report was presented by Daniel B. Stephens & Associate. The matter is very complex and for those interested the entire report is posted on the RPV website. Go to the Council meetings archives for the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. See Regular Business item 2.

Most RPV residents are undoubtedly aware of the landslide and the potential problems the landslide presents to our community. The issue with the landslide is that it is continuously sliding (watch the cracks in PVP Dr. South) and it is not whether or not it MIGHT slide but WHEN? The RPV Council has been giving this matter serious consideration and the July 26<sup>th</sup> report lays out a roadmap.

Unfortunately there remains a major obstacle, the PVPLC (Palos Verdes Peninsula Conservancy) who are more concerned with their sacred habitat than the safety of our community. We have posted the Agreement between RPV and the PVPLC dated 11/1/2011 at [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) / Current Issues page. The agreement was approved for **50 Years** by two attorneys Tom Long and Doug Stern then at their final meetings as RPV Councilmen and both now Judges in the Los Angeles Superior Court system. In the opinion of many RPV residents, the Nature Preserve has become a public nuisance (think Del Cerro and Ladera Linda area residents) and the management competency of the Nature Preserve by the PVPLC should be reassessed by the RPV Council to protect the best interests of RPV taxpayers.

### **PVE – New Bond/Taxes to pay for Pensions?**

Early in 2018, during Measure E campaigning, the Council told residents that the proposed \$5 million annual tax would fully pay for the police for 9 years. It fell far short of the \$10 million annual cost of the Police Dept. Residents attempted to engage the Council in an open dialog to address financial concerns. The Council did not respond to resident questions about the missing \$5 million in annual funding, did not engage in open dialog with residents and did not attend the PVrrg Community Town hall a week before the election. However, the Council was concerned about public discourse, so, Councilman Davidson hired a videographer to tape the Community Townhall.

Residents knowledgeable with the financials, openly predicted further taxes or borrowing (bonds) would be required.

In March 2018, the Measure E tax passed and with it the obligation to fund a \$10 million annual police department cost with only a \$5 million tax.

Three months later the Council passed a deficit budget - spending 10% over income (\$2.1 M); and depleting taxpayer savings to pay for it. \$30 million in PVE savings was depleted to \$15 million.

On November 1st, at the Financial Advisory Committee meeting; the Committee engaged Councilmembers Kao and Vandever in a discussion about a proposed new \$20 million Bond.

It was recognized that the City did not have enough to pay for pensions; 77% of which are for the police department. This has caused the pension debt to almost double in 2 years from \$8 million to \$14 million.

The purposed solution was to repurpose Infrastructure funds for pensions, then raise a bond to pay for Infrastructure.

There were no discussions about how to reduce growth of spending or utilization of efficiencies. The sole focus of the discussion was on how to get more money to facilitate spending growth.

PVE has no means to pay for a \$20 M bond without raising taxes.

Why does the PVE Council hide the cost of the PVE police?

## **PVP Watch Welcomes Subscriber Comments**

PVP Watch welcomes subscriber Comments. Please send comments to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com).

A current email issue is overactive “spam” detectors and we urge everyone to enter [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com) and pvpwatch into their computer address books. This signals your ISP (Internet Service Provider) that you wish to receive PVP Watch newsletters.

Those who have topics of community interest are encouraged to bring those issues to [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com) as well.

**Subscribers should check out [www.pvpwatch.com](http://www.pvpwatch.com) as well.**

**PVP Watch Welcomes Contributions**

PVP Watch appreciates the financial contributions of the many subscribers who have sent checks to PVP Watch as we remain on the financial support of our many subscribers. Those wishing to make a modest contribution, please send checks to PVP Watch / PO Box 2041 / Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

**PVP Watch – Newsletter List**

A reminder to ALL PVP Watch subscribers, should you change your email address, don't forget to advise PVP Watch. For those who wished to be removed from the PVP Watch newsletter data base, please notify [info@pvpwatch.com](mailto:info@pvpwatch.com).