

Date: January 30, 2014 5:54:27 PM PST

To: Janis Mork <morkjanis@gmail.com>

Cc: Miriam Raftery <editor@eastcountymagazine.org>

Hi Janis,

As to your question regarding my immediate thoughts about the CBOCs discussion on the Alpine/Grand Jury matter, and my recollection. This is my takeaway:

The Chair asked that staff bring copies of the Grand Jury report and the Board Majority's Response, approximately 47 pages, to the next CBOC meeting.

The Chair asked that staff bring the report that the Superintendent presented to the Board in January showing further decline in enrollment (which excluded both Charters).

Seriously, requesting only documents that support, what could be perceived, as an anti-Alpine agenda does not serve the CBOC or the taxpayer's they are there to represent.

First of all, why wouldn't the Chair just direct the committee to review both reports on the District's website to save time and printing costs instead of asking Scott to bring copies to the next meeting? Then they'd be prepared and ready to have a discussion at the next meeting?

I see this as a tact to further delay the discussion. Sadly, I am use to that tact, as I have had to ask my same questions of the the Chair, continually, when all they require is an agendized discussion among the full committee to get to a very simple answer. I.e) How does the full CBOC define or comprehend the use of Plus Ups .vs Variance. Still, the Chair is evading the question by putting it over in a subcommittee, which is NOT what I asked?

Second, the Chair asked Scott to bring the enrollment presentation that the Superintendent gave the Board in January. It would be nice if reviewing the report actually generated discussion as to how this affects all building across the entire district and not be applied only to Alpine? Again, a very dangerous bias towards only one project/community. But that's not the reason for asking for it, the Chair wants to use it to support Mr. Kelly's trigger language to make building the Alpine school about district-wide enrollment. Again, this is a biased and uninformed position.. This body doesn't even know that building the Alpine school was NEVER predicated on a district-wide enrollment until Mr. Kelly's antics the night of the Bond vote. Building the school was to fulfill a joint resolution between the two districts, meet the needs of our Easterly community, and relieve the overcrowding at Granite Hills.

Also, the enrollment trigger is not based on the district-wide enrollment and the Grand Jury is very much aware of this fact. The enrollment trigger, per Mr. Kelly's 11th hour amendment to the Bond resolution, excluded alternative educational programs such as Chaparral. The Grand Jury found that highly suspect and more evidence as to the political bias that Mr. Kelly has towards the community of Alpine. So now, this Board is building out Chaparral to recapture drop outs and increase the student body that will not be counted towards the enrollment trigger. The Grand Jury was not fooled by this fake altruistic last minute deal to kill the school either.

The CBOC doesn't realize that Mr. Kelly's amendment, was by design, to put Alpine on the back burner in order to front-load things that were not even in Prop H and front-load all other building ahead of Alpine. Again, why wouldn't he include ALL ADA representative of a true district-wide enrollment?

Third, why wouldn't the CBOC review the Boundary Committee's report (on the District's website) and the Alpine High School Committee's rebuttal to the Board Majority's response (which they may not have been aware of) so they have a comprehensive and historical account. This anti Alpine bias has permeated the CBOC from the very beginning?

It has been quite apparent, to me, that the Chair of the CBOC has a bias towards directing or leading the committee into any discussion regarding Alpine in an objective manner. It is within their oversight responsibilities to understand any ramifications from a potential unification as it relates to the Bond program. I think at some point, some members of the CBOC may start to realize that there could be some fall-out and public scrutiny that could be directed towards the CBOC during the Unification hearings, for their unwillingness, to review the matter without prejudice or bias.

I have watched this body completely ignore Board Resolutions that gave direction to staff to submit building plans to DSA and continue the grading efforts for that project. Instead, as an arm of the District staff, Superintendent and Board Majority, even after my warnings, the Chair lead the CBOC in adopting the Superintendent's recommendations, including the validation of pulling the Alpine building plans from DSA, unbeknownst to the Board, and to ignore the last Board Resolution directive to grade the land. The Board/Superintendent/Staff/CBOC chose to spread those earmarked monies for grading Alpine to other projects. The Board did not even hold themselves accountable to their own Resolution, whereby stating specifically the Board's intentions toward Alpine. As well, the CBOC was complicit in supporting the Board in violating their own Resolution on two counts. This did not go unnoticed by the Community of Alpine or the Grand Jury.

The Grand Jury report was published on May 21st, the Board Majority's response was published July 25th, 2013 and the final press release surrounding the Grand Jury's final recommendation to the Board was published in Dec. 2013. Which even that final move by the Board did not answer the Grand Jury's recommendation to make a final decision about Alpine. The Board just regurgitated their response from July. That's not what the Grand Jury asked.

It is by design that the conversation about the Grand Jury report was not discussed before those members most familiar with the issue retired. Now, there are very few left, but fortunately, there are those on the committee that will not fall victim to the argument, that they weren't here. How lame an excuse is that coming from the Bond Oversight Committee? It still happened on the Chair's watch. Most of the longer serving members have no real knowledge of the Alpine issue because it has been kicked under the table. They are only told what the Chair and staff want them to know. If any of them would just take the time to watch the Board meeting videos they might, at least, get more perspective into the matter?

How deaf can this CBOC be without being complicit and compliant with the Board Majority's political bias towards Alpine, as cited by the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury recommendations were

clearly in support of Alpine for the Board to do right by that community. Unfortunately, the Board was not moved to do anything to salvage the relationship with Alpine.

I've watched when the current chair assigned projects to the committee members and no member was assigned the Alpine project. That was over 2 years ago.

I've watched the CBOC ignore the Board Resolutions to move Alpine forward accordingly, which makes them complicit with the Board Majority in their bias towards Alpine, as cited in the Grand Jury report.

I've watched the CBOC make a recommendation, to the Board, not to build the school due to operating costs(which was not in their purview) and which this philosophy has not been applied across the district, nor did the Board vote to accept their recommendation but it is used loosely and liberally, when needed, against Alpine.

I've watched the CBOC never have a discussion about Alpine when the enrollment trigger was met for 3+ years following the passage of Prop U. Why did they not support moving that project forward even then?

I've watched the CBOC manipulate the Bylaws to keep their little group cohesive and controlled by not having an open and transparent application process for (2) Community At Large members. Again, this is nothing personal, it is about the CBOC faithfully executing and upholding the bylaws. Instead, the manipulation of these (2) very coveted seats, as witnessed by the number of Community At Large applicants last month, has now tied up (2) of the (4) Community At Large seats for 4 years. At the last Board meeting, the Board had the opportunity to appoint the only Alpine resident to the CBOC for the 4th open Community At Large seat. That seat can be occupied for 6 years now and this Board refused to appoint the only Alpine applicant ever to apply for the CBOC. Not something the CBOC could control, but mentioned so that the CBOC is made aware of the political bias against Alpine.

Currently, there is a CBOC member who just missed his 3rd consecutive meeting, whereby, the Bylaws call for a member's resignation if a member misses 2 consecutive meetings. How is this happening that it was not agendized for this last meeting? The sub-committees are already so small that they need everyone to participate on a consistent basis. Again, the Chair continues to ignore the Bylaws.

I've watched the former chair of the CBOC simultaneously serve on the Boundary Commission and never report to the CBOC anything about the Commission's report. I.e) That building the school was encouraged by the Chair of the Boundary Committee as an opportunity to recapture ADA.

I've watched the CBOC completely ignore their charge to seek joint use opportunities whenever possible and to eliminate deferred maintenance from the backlog, I.e) Helix PAC not in the Bond language and exceeded the scope and cost of the voter approved MPF, no joint-use discussion.

The new Events Center at Grossmont High (not voter approved/not on the ballot) exceeding the cost and scope of the voter approved MPF's and ignoring the voter approved conversion of the old gym and cafeteria, which would have eliminated deferred maintenance of over \$2.5M along with the cafeteria. No discussion about that ever took place before they voted for the Events Center and no joint-use discussion took place. Again, under the leadership of the Chair and her dependence on staff, lead the CBOC to give cover to the Superintendent who was warned of my concerns in building the Helix PAC as other campuses would want theirs. Convening a 15-

member community panel to overturn what the voters approved and for the CBOC to be compliant in this action was not an independent action by this body in representing the taxpayers and ensuring that bond dollars are spent in accordance with the bond language?

Hopefully, what I have stated in this email will give food for thought to examine against all else that has been said, that it will show that the Grand Jury report was absolutely correct, in their findings by their strong recommendations to the Board. Recommendations that have been ignored by this Board in order to spend down every last dime so there is nothing left for Alpine. This is what they did in Prop H and is why the Bond Advisory Commission recommended setting aside money to construct the school. The CBOC has been used and will continue to be used until they become the independent body they are appointed to be by law.

Unlike others, I'm not so sure that the Grand Jury went through this as a mere exercise, especially, when the Judge received the kind of nonsensical response from the Board Majority, the extremely professional Alpine HSCC rebuttal and my independent opinion, including the outline of the financial picture developed in Mr. Loarie's document? My independent opinion is not attached because it details closed session concerns around the Board Majority's handling of the Response.

Time will tell whether anything comes directly from the Grand Jury's presiding judge or not? But, this CBOC better get ready for the Unification hearings that are sure to expose the CBOC's complacent and compliant bias towards Alpine.

Further questions to ponder:

How are you going to report to the taxpayers that you built things that were not voter approved in order not to build the school that was voter approved TWICE?

How can you justify building, building, building when the District is in "desperate" times of declining enrollment OR that this argument is only used against Alpine? The CBOC needs to know that the Board was fully aware of the forecasted declining enrollment, in the out years, as we had many demographic reports; so please don't think that this is something new to this Board. Quite the contrary, it is the bases for Mr. Kelly 11th hour amendment to kill the school. How could this Board seek eminent domain under a "Resolution of Necessity" and kick people out of their homes after Mr. Kelly's imposed amendment to the Bond. For this Board member, I have been pushing and pushing to build that school before the imposed conditions were upon us. Can anyone else say that? Don't forget, land can be flipped, the purchase of the land was NOT good faith. The submittal of the building plans to DSA and grading would have been good faith for the community of Alpine.

How will they explain that the only project, that didn't get built, would have recaptured ADA dollars, would have finally benefitted the Alpine Community for growth and increased property values, while benefitting the District?

Should Alpine be successful in their Unification efforts, will the settlement money become an issue that could potentially impact our general fund because all the bond monies will have been spent?

Will they set bond dollars aside for that in order to keep teachers and programs from being cut; and when will the CBOC pick up their charge and start working for the taxpayers and not the District? I have faith that this group can.