FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE





South Poway Residents Association member survey concludes NO endorsement of PROP C

POWAY, CA / JANUARY 17, 2008 ---- South Poway Residents Association (SPRA) announced today the conclusion of its member opinion survey regarding SPRA endorsement of the PROP C SCHOOL BOND on the primary election ballot in February. Following the tally of member votes for and against endorsement of this controversial school bond, SPRA officers state that members overwhelmingly voted against PROP C endorsement.

The vote totals break down as follows: 5.3% "YES" votes; 5.3% "MAYBE" votes; 89.4% "NO" votes. Note that not all 180 SPRA members opted to participate in this recent survey.

The opinion survey request was sent out via E-mail in early January to SPRA members with a dead-line of January 16th. SPRA's survey included a YES ON PROP C STATEMENT submitted by PUSD School Board Member, Todd Gutschow, and a NO ON PROP C STATEMENT submitted by John Ramirez, a former PUSD School Board candidate. In addition, the survey added links to the YES ON PROP C website and a variety of recent articles and editorials on PROP C from local newspapers so that members could research additional background information before submitting their vote.

Along with their vote, members had the option to submit written comments. Attached are excerpts from a few of the SPRA member comments submitted (names and E-mail addresses deleted).

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

SOUTH POWAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION was formed from an idea of Connie Messina's that came together after the 2004 election. Connie ran for Poway City Council in 2004 due to the ongoing lack of South Poway representation on the Poway City Council. Many South Poway residents have long felt that their needs and concerns have largely been ignored by their City Council. Although Connie did not win a seat on the City Council (she also ran in 2006), many supporters urged her to continue to "represent" them in any way she could. This was the germination of SPRA as a grassroots group in early 2005. SPRA brings together residents from all South Poway neighborhoods to work in support of common issues and goals. SPRA also has several members residing outside of South Poway who support SPRA issues.

Joe St. Lucas is currently SPRA's Chairperson. As of the end of 2007, SPRA has 180 members.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Karen Knecht Secretary

Phone: 858-679-0636 • E-mail: spra.poway@hotmail.com

SOUTH POWAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

JOE ST. LUCAS - CHAIRPERSON ● CONNIE MESSINA - VICE CHAIRPERSON ELDA PARMLEY - TREASURER ● KAREN KNECHT - SECRETARY ADDRESS: 13033 EARLGATE COURT, POWAY, CA 92064 ● PHONE: 858-679-8386

 $\textbf{E-MAIL: spra.poway@hotmail.com} \quad \bullet \quad \textbf{WEBSITE: www.SouthPowayResidents.com}$

SOUTH POWAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION MEMBER COMMENTS SUBMITTED REGARDING PROP C

I vote "NO" on endorsement. The PROP C campaign literature states that this is an "extension of Proposition U" and "extends the payment period by 11 years" while "not increasing rates!!!". However, the official ballot states that PROP C is a "new" bond with a 25 (or 40) year payoff period. This is deceptive at best and a lie at worst. Our total school bond property tax obligation could DOUBLE from what we are currently paying because the bonds are independently financed. Why doesn't the "YES ON PROP C" group mention this instead of "rates"? Is it because they want people to think that we'll be paying the same dollar amount as we currently are paying, but just for an additional 11 years? Why don't they say "You might be paying the full RATE of \$55/\$100,000 assessed value for PROP U, AND another \$55/\$100,000 for PROP C, totaling \$110/\$100,000 assessed value"?

At a time when the country is heading towards a recession, when bankruptcies are being declared all over the city, when the cost of living increases for Social Security are around 2.5%, how many people can afford to have their school bond tax DOUBLE?

~~~

I vote against SPRA supporting PROP C. I think this whole process is grossly mismanaged. How can their cost estimate be off by almost 100%?? I used to be responsible for construction project estimating and accounting. If someone was off by 100%, they'd be back digging ditches.

~~~~

Passing prop C rewards the PUSD School Board for irresponsible behavior. Cost overruns are understandable --- but 170 million dollars???? Where was the OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE on PROP U and why should I think that the next OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE will do any better???

~~~~

Are we still carrying all the homes with mello-roos with the bond extension? What if their mello-roos expires before the bond? I would have an easier time voting "YES" if all who benefit were sharing the burden.

~~~~

Prop C is tugging at our heartstrings saying a lot of money will go to Valley School. PUSD has not cared about Valley School until it flunked the "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND" parameters last year.

~~~

I am voting NO on endorsing Prop C for the following reasons: I don't want higher taxes because PUSD school board can't manage their budget. We don't have a revenue problem -- we have a spending problem. It is time for the bureaucrats to better utilize the money that we already spend on education.

~~~~

I say "NO" on the school bond. I think they should have built in the cost controls during the first bond. It is not my problem that PUSD cannot do basic accounting and basic planning.

~~~~

I vote "NO" regarding endorsement of PROP C. I believe in supporting education and generally support maintaining a high standard in educational facilities for our students. However, in this case, perhaps we would be teaching our PUSD students the wrong lessons if we vote "YES" on supporting PROP C. A "YES" vote would teach our kids that it's okay to overspend, it's okay to not stick to a budget, it's okay to

ignore priorities, it's okay to live well beyond your means and, --- most importantly --- if you do all these irresponsible things, you will still be rewarded with more funds if you ask for them.