

***** PUBLIC HEARING *****
WRITTEN TESTIMONY
NON-WORKING CASH BOND SALE

January 11, 2018

Elementary School District Number 58
Administrative Service Center
ATTN: Board of Education
1860 63rd Street
Downers Grove, IL 60516

HEARING
EXHIBIT _____

Via e-mail: dpurcell@dg58.org, esigale@dg58.org, gharris@dg58.org, dhughes@dg58.org,
jmiller@dg58.org, jsamonte@dg58.org, bethtaylor@dg58.org

Cc: Superintendent Cremascoli (kcremascoli@dg58.org)
Recording Secretary Jerves (mjerves@dg58.org)

**RE: PUBLIC HEARING WRITTEN TESTIMONY ON THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF
\$2,810,000 OF BONDS FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN WORKING CASH**

Dear members of the Board of Education:

Please consider the following to be my written Testimony on the proposed issuance of \$2,810,000 of “project” bonds masquerading as a “working cash fund bond” sale allegedly authorized for “working cash fund purposes.” I am providing this written Testimony so that the written record of this Hearing contains my complete statement in its entirety. The Recording Secretary must include this written Testimony, as submitted, within the records of the Hearing, and it must be properly labeled as an Exhibit referenced within the Minutes of the Hearing.

In addition, within my written Testimony, I will provide references to the public records which I believe support my statements and/or position. Those records must also be maintained as attachments to my written Testimony within the records of the Hearing.

I will attempt to address the key points succinctly. Those points are:

- 1) A Board Member’s Oath of Office,
- 2) Methods of financing capital projects,
- 3) Financial costs of both proposed and non-proposed financing options,
- 4) The published “Notice” of both this Hearing and the Notice of Intention to sell bonds,
- 5) Back-door Petition to place proposed bond issuance before the entire community.

I encourage you to ask any question at any time. The purpose of a Hearing, unlike a meeting, is a dialog ... communication ... between the board and those who wish to share their opinions and insight.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this Testimony.

Respectfully, Scott O’Connell

HEARING TESTIMONY OF SCOTT O'CONNELL

January 11, 2018

Members of the Board of Education:

Each Board Member has previously taken an Oath of Office and therein has sworn to: "...respect taxpayer interests by serving as a faithful protector of the School District's assets."

At its December 11, 2017 meeting, the elected members of this public body gave notice to the community that the members of this Board have decided to violate one of the key tenets of their "Oath of Office" by approving the bond "Resolution of Intent" which is the subject of this Hearing without considering other responsible options.

Through my Testimony, along with certain Exhibits attached, I will demonstrate the apparent reckless breach of the contract that exists between District 58's elected school board members and the citizens of the district.

METHODS OF FINANCING PUBLIC CAPITAL PROJECTS

As a former elected member of this public body and as a student of public finance, it is deeply disturbing to witness the recent actions of this Board of Education. The genesis of this bond issue appears to be the size of student enrollment at one of the district's elementary schools.

In my opinion, this Board has *not* fully vetted in front of the community the issue nor has it deliberatively reviewed all available options with input from the community.

Option One: Increased class sizes. An objective review of this issue leads to the conclusion that there is *no* difference in the quality of education offered students within an elementary classroom in this district containing 20 students versus 30 students. Any statements to the contrary are simply self-serving (for the union and/or the administration) and ignore historical facts surrounding the issue.

Simply allowing class sizes to increase until the population bulge reverses is one way to solve the "problem". Apparently, this option was never seriously considered. The community deserves to know: Why not? Was it a lack of resolve? Was it indifference to the seriousness of your Oath of Office? Was incurring debt the only convenient solution? However the Board reached its decision, it demonstrates how little the community should trust your commitment to your oath of office. In short, there truly is *no* real "need" to sell these bonds for the purpose of adding physical space to one of the elementary schools. This proposed bond sale appears to be an act of convenience, not of necessity.

Option Two: An Arbitrary School Boundary. Before adding costly physical space, school attendance areas and/or policies should be fully vetted. In my opinion, the recent public records of this public body fail to show any in-depth commitment on the part of this board to solve any perceived problem via boundary adjustments.

Option Three: Current Financial Reserves. If, and that is a big if, the non-building options listed above are carefully reviewed and determined *not* to be adequate solutions, the first question which

should have been asked by the members of this Board is ... “What financial reserves can the board commit to the list of capital projects?”

In my opinion, this is where your Oath of Office has been unquestionably breached. In my opinion, the elected members of this board have shamefully abandoned the “*faithful protector*” role which is *the* cornerstone of their service to this community.

The public records of this district show no discussion prior to the decision to sell bonds wherein this Board reviewed the option of:

- 1) Utilizing the \$670,000 of currently *idle* funds resting undisturbed for years in the “Sinking Fund” which is a sub-fund of the Operations and Maintenance Fund.
- 2) Utilizing a fraction of the \$9,149,000 currently deposited in the Working Cash Fund.
- 3) Utilizing the nearly \$1,700,000 of currently *idle* funds resting undisturbed for more than a *decade* ... *more than a decade* ... within the Working Cash Fund. Monies that have simply never ... *ever* ... actually been loaned to operating funds in anticipation of property tax receipts.

It is appalling to me ... and I believe the community at-large would be furious if they were to have actually been informed of this Hearing and its stated purpose ... to think that we are here tonight actually discussing this Board’s decision to place an additional financial burden onto the backs of the taxpayers of this community when nearly all of the costs of your “project list” can be paid for with monies previously taken from the collective pockets of all of the property owners of this district.

Each of you has signed an Oath of Office wherein you stated: “I shall respect taxpayer interests by serving as a faithful protector of the School District's assets.” Not spending previously collected monies *first* warrants, in my opinion, all of your resignations.

Option Four: Front-door Ballot Question. Again, I am deeply troubled by this Board’s current attempt to sneak a tax increase onto the already large tax bills of this community. The idea of expanding the physical footprint of the facilities of this public body without directly asking the voters is contemptible. Personally, I find this attempted back-door tax increase to be irreconcilable with both your Oath of Office and common decency.

COSTS OF FINANCING PUBLIC CAPITAL PROJECTS

In my opinion, if an accurate poll could be taken of the entire District 58 community, I would venture to guess that no more than 50 to 100 voters out of the 39,000+ registered voters actually have **any** knowledge regarding this Board’s proposed tax increase and the costs of your proposed bond sale.

Think about that! Less than 100 voters in this community probably have any knowledge of not only this Hearing, but also the tax increase that this Board is contemplating.

In order for a majority of this board to be seated, it only takes approximately 200 signatures on candidate petitions and an uncontested election. However, a multi-million dollar tax increase is quietly being imposed on the unsuspecting community, and less than one-half of the number of

citizens who would be needed to place a majority on this board into a position to vote on a back-door bond referendum actually are aware of this proposed bond sale.

Shame on all of you who voted last December to circumvent a public discussion and direct referendum vote on the issue.

Instead, the elected members of this Board of Education are attempting to grab authority to issue new debt without the consent of the governed.

At this point within my Testimony, I would like to address the so-called “costs” of the proposed bond sale. These are the financial costs ... dollars and cents ... and not the cost to this Board’s reputation and standing within the community. The most valuable resource this Board possesses is the “trust” of the community. I believe a review of the current and future proposed non-voter approved bond sales and their financial costs all but destroys any “trust” this community has in the financial competence of this Board.

Within a PMA presentation dated December 11, 2017 ... and which only became available to the public on Thursday, December 21, 2107 via the Board’s “BoardDocs” interface ... the cost of the two proposed financing options are revealed to the community. Attached as Exhibit #1 to this Testimony is the PMA presentation dated December 11, 2017.

Under the heading of “Transparency”, I feel it is important at this point to express to this Board how outraged I was ... as a former board member as well as a property owner and as a registered voter ... to find out that the December 11, 2017 PMA presentation PDF file and all of its relevant content was withheld from the community for nearly two weeks. One must ask ... was this delay intentional?

From Friday, December 8th to the board meeting on Monday, December 11th to the first day of the Petition Window on Wednesday, December 20th ... this critical record, a record which every parent, taxpayer and voter should not only have access to but fully understand ... was withheld from the community.

At this point I would like to ask the Superintendent a question as part of this Hearing:

- Q: Superintendent Cremascoli, when, if at all, did you become aware of the fact that for more than ten days prior to December 21, 2017, there were no PDF files attached to the BoardDocs agenda for the action items involving the two resolutions?

Let the record reflect that the Superintendent’s answer was:

- Q: Superintendent Cremascoli, what is your explanation as to why no PDF files were attached to the BoardDocs agenda for the action items involving the two resolutions? This would include both the PMA presentation as well as the two proposed resolutions.

Let the record reflect that the Superintendent’s answer was:

- Q: Superintendent Cremascoli, did the administration ever request PMA to produce an analysis of the cost of a voter-approved bond sale for these projects? Did PMA ever voluntarily produce an analysis of the cost of a voter-approved bond sale for these projects? If so, why did PMA's presentation not include that cost analysis?

Let the record reflect that the Superintendent's answer was:

How do the members of this board believe that a Hearing ... this Hearing ... can be held and well-reasoned statements and arguments can be made ... both pro and con ... on the issue of selling bonds when the only supporting record ... the PMA presentation ... is not available to the public until after my visit to the central office during the morning of December 20th?

The PMA presentation can be summarized succinctly: there are two proposed bond issuance choices. Not to belabor the point, but both proposals involve costly financial gymnastics. For example, existing "tax-exempt" bonds will be advance refunded with more expensive "taxable" debt.

The cost of proposal # 1 is: **\$5,123,436**

The cost of proposal # 2 is: **\$5,988,732**

Attached as Exhibit #2 to this Testimony is an alternative cost structure ... the cost of a voter-approved Building Bond with the same duration of 11 years.

The cost of an 11-year bond structure with near equal annual tax levy amounts of \$280,000/tax year is: **\$3,117,728**.

A voter-approved referendum question would actually cost the property owners of this community ... which includes each board member as well as the superintendent ... \$2,000,000 less than the cheapest option available to this Board via a back-door bond sale.

It is shocking to see that there are no records maintained by the Recording Secretary that indicate that this board even considered the cost of a direct ballot initiative.

It is shocking to see that PMA, acting in its capacity as Financial Advisor to this Board of Education, did not include within its presentation the customary single page revealing the cost of a voter-approved bond sale.

Members of this community are left to speculate ... Why did the Superintendent, the Board and PMA fail to simply run "the numbers" for a voter-approved tax increase and include that page in a record that the community could review?

I believe that the answer is simple: **\$2,000,000**. That is the price tag of this Board's back-door tax increase over the price tag of a voter-approved ballot initiative.

Any informed taxpayer would have to wonder if the Board is:

- 1) financially indifferent to an increased debt burden,
- 2) unable to recognize the financial costs imposed by this ill-conceived scheme, and/or
- 3) simply complicit in circumventing any voter input regarding taxes and spending in District 58.

The facts appear to support the conclusion that the community should trust neither the Board's financial competence nor their honesty with their supposed constituents.

PUBLISHED NOTICE OF THE INTENT TO SELL BONDS

At this point within my Testimony, I would like to address the statutory requirement of “Notice”. The purpose of giving “notice” to the community is so that the members of the community can be made aware of the issue *and become engaged*.

On Friday, December 15th, I returned to Downers Grove after a vacation. In looking at the posted Agenda for the board meeting held on December 11th, I became aware of the Resolution placed before the Board regarding a non-referendum bond sale. Due to a lack of any records (PDF files) being attached to the Agenda as maintained on BoardDocs, I was unable to read the actual Resolution.

As the members of this Board know, this Board voted to publish the required Notice of Intent and that the December 20th edition of the newspaper known as “*The Bugle*” carried that Notice.

On Wednesday, December 20th, I went to the Downers Grove Public Library in search of a copy of a newspaper containing the public notice. I saw no notice in the Suburban Life. It's vital that as part of my Testimony at this Hearing that the Board fully comprehend that not only did the public library not have a copy of the December 20th edition of *The Bugle*, the **PUBLIC LIBRARY** serving the majority of the District 58 community did not have *any* edition of *The Bugle* for the entire month of December 2017!

That same day, I arrived at the central office of the district shortly before noon on December 20th, coincidentally, *the first day of the back-door Petition signature window*.

Prior to my arrival, I had assumed that the Notice of Intent had already been published during the week of December 11th. I had assumed that the Petition signature window was already well underway.

I had gone to the central office in order to accomplish two things: 1) to pick up a Petition for the back-door referendum from the Recording Secretary, and 2) to find out which newspaper was contracted by this board to publish the required Notice of Intent.

Upon arrival, the secretary at the front desk was unable to provide me with a copy of the Petition. She had no copies of the Petition available for “walk-in” requestors seeking a Petition.

Subsequently, she left her station and returned with the Recording Secretary (Melissa Jerves). It is important for this Board to know that at the time Ms. Jerves met with me on December 20th, she did **not** provide me with a copy of the requested Petition nor did she instruct me as to which newspaper was handling the Notice. Ms. Jerves simply wrote a note to herself that I had requested a Petition and the Resolution in order to determine which newspaper had been selected by the Board. I left

the central office without a Petition and without knowing which newspaper carried your Notice of Intent.

Attached as Exhibit #3 to this Testimony is an e-mail sent by Ms. Jerves at 2:24 P.M. on Thursday, December 21st wherein she informs me that *The Bugle* is the newspaper and that the December 20th edition carried the Notice of Intent.

After receiving the email from Ms. Jerves on Thursday the 21st, I returned to the Downers Grove Library. There was no copy of the December 20th edition of *The Bugle*. Between 3:30 P.M. and 4:30 P.M. that afternoon, I conducted a comprehensive search of numerous downtown stores, banks, businesses, and restaurants in Downers Grove. I searched the metal box at the train station on the south side of the tracks. I went to the Downers Grove Management office as well as both Village Hall and the police station. In total, I searched at least FIFTEEN different locations listed as locations where *The Bugle* is put into circulation in downtown Downers Grove supposedly every Wednesday.

At not one of those locations did I find a copy of the December 20th edition of The Bugle.

At this point I would like to ask a few questions as part of this Hearing:

- Q: By show of hands, how many board members have actually ever seen **any** copy *The Bugle*?

Let the record reflect that the following board members raised their hands:

-
- Q: By show of hands, how many board members have actually ever seen the December 20, 2017 edition of *The Bugle*?

Let the record reflect that the following board members raised their hands:

-
- Q: Superintendent Cremascoli, have you personally actually seen the December 20, 2017 edition of *The Bugle*?

Let the record reflect that the Superintendent's response was: _____

- Q: Recording Secretary Jerves, have you personally actually seen the December 20, 2017 edition of *The Bugle*?

Let the record reflect that the Recording Secretary's response was: _____

Attached as Exhibit #4 to this Testimony is an e-mail sent by me at 11:43 P.M. on Thursday, December 21st to the management of *The Bugle* as well as their reply. I wrote the management of the paper in order to inform them that not a single copy of their December 20th edition could be found in downtown Downers Grove.

The contents of those two e-mails are compelling and provide reasonable doubt that the Notice of Intent was printed and later circulated on December 20, 2017 as claimed.

Additionally, I made another search on Friday, December 22nd. I went again to Village Hall where Robin at the counter stated that their receipt of The Bugle was “hit or miss”. I went to other stores. I even went to the secretary’s office over at Henry Puffer which is listed by The Bugle on their website as drop site for the weekly paper. Walking into the school after dismissal, I encountered the secretary who also told me delivery at Henry Puffer was “hit or miss”. I went back to the library to confirm that I hadn't missed it. I also searched at the Fairview 7-11, Belmont Metro station, Main St. Metra station south side, Food Market north of SBUX, Peets, SBUX, Ballydoyle, Berto's, Subway on Main St., Anderson's, and the Downtown Development Office. Again, there were no newspapers available nor had the people I asked seen the December 20th edition.

Additionally, I made another search on Tuesday, December 26th. Village Hall still had not received any copies of the December 20th edition. I finally found a copy at the Downers Grove Management office. Apparently, several copies were bound together and found outside their door on the morning of December 26th.

Attached as Exhibit #5 to this Testimony are two written statements. One from Karen Neal, a librarian at the Downers Grove Library. The other from Linda Kunze at the DG Management office. These statements are evidence that reasonable and timely Notice was not provided to the community regarding the back-door Petition and the existence of a 30-day Petition signature window.

Therefore, as part of my Testimony at this Hearing, I wish to enter into the Record of this Hearing that I not only strongly protest the handling of the Notice provided to the public, but I also believe that the statutory notice requirement for the back-door bond sale has not been met.

BACK-DOOR PETITION

At this point within my Testimony, I would like to address the statutory requirement regarding the Petition to place the issuance of the bonds before the voters.

Within Article 20, Section 7 of the School Code, the Recording Officer’s duty with regard to the handling of Petition requests is clear and unambiguous.

“At the time of publication of the notice and for 30 days thereafter, the recording officer of the district shall provide a petition form to any individual requesting one.”

On Wednesday, December 20, 2017, I personally asked Recording Officer Jerves for a copy of the Petition. She denied my request when she failed to immediately provide a copy of the Petition to someone who simply walked into the central office during business hours. Her only response to my visit was to send me an e-mail on December 21st informing me of the name of the newspaper and which edition carried the Notice of Intent. I have attached that e-mail as Exhibit #2.

It is important to note for the Record of this Hearing that the Board had approved the Resolution of Intent nine days before my visit to see Recording Officer Jerves for a Petition and that she, acting as

Recording Officer, had been in attendance at the meeting on December 11th. Furthermore, Ms. Jerves actually signed the Notice of Intent as required by law before it was placed within the newspaper.

Additionally, on Wednesday, January 3, 2018, at approximately 3:00 P.M., I once again travelled to the central office on 63rd street to request a Petition. At that time, Mr. Buzz Whowell joined me. We entered together and both requested a copy of the Petition from the secretary stationed at the front door. No Petitions were provided to either of us. In fact, the secretary had stated another individual had been in the office earlier that day and that person was also not able to pick-up a Petition.

When an inquiry was made regarding the availability of the Recoding Officer, Recording Officer Jerves was reported as absent for that day and we were instructed that she was expected to be in the office of Thursday, January 4, 2018. The audio tape of this encounter clearly records the fact that two requests were made at 3:00 P.M., and at least one request earlier that day, and that those three requests went unfulfilled.

Therefore, as part of my Testimony at this Hearing, I wish to enter into the Record of this Hearing the fact that not only did the Recording Officer fail to personally provide a copy of the Petition on December 20th, but she apparently failed to provide other employees of the central office staff with a stack of copies in the event of her absence.

Denying my request on December 20, 2017 is a violation of Article 20 of the School Code.

Denying my request on January 3, 2018 is a violation of Article 20 of the School Code.

At this point I would like to ask Recording Officer Jerves a question:

- Q: Recording Officer Jerves, what reason, if any, can you provide to this Board of Education as to why you failed to provide me with a Petition on Wednesday, December 20, 2017?

Let the record reflect that the following was Recording Officer Jerves' response:

- Q: Recording Officer Jerves, what reason, if any, can you provide to this Board of Education as to why you failed to provide copies of the Petition to other administrators and/or employees who work at the central office for those requests made during your absence? Was that your decision to not make a stack of copies available at the front desk, or were you directed to not make them readily available either at your desk, the secretary's desk, outside the front door or the district's website.

Let the record reflect that the following was Recording Officer Jerves' response:

- Q: Recording Officer Jerves, do you have a copy of the Petition with you tonight and, if so, may I have one?

Let the record reflect that the following was Recording Officer Jerves' response:

In conclusion, I strongly state for the record at this Hearing that in my opinion the explicit statutory requirements surrounding the Petition window for this back-door bond sale have not been met.

PETITION

While pondering how to overcome all the barriers to getting this bond sale to at least be subject to the approval of the voters by a referendum, it occurred to me that instead of standing in the cold over the holidays or scrambling for two weeks to secure over 4,000 signatures that would certainly be challenged, I didn't actually need over 4,000 signatures.

I only need four!

If four Board Members believe that a bond sale for a building addition should be subject to approval by a referendum ... they should sign a Petition.

If four Board Members believe that all other solutions and funding options were not considered ... they should sign a Petition.

If four Board Members recognize that the cost of proceeding with the back-door referendum will cost taxpayers *at least \$2,000,000 more than* a non-voter approved back-door referendum bond would ... they have a duty to sign a Petition.

If at least four Board Members believe that the voters have a right to approve the Board's actions that would increase taxes and expenses ... they should sign a Petition.

If four Board Members recognize that honoring their Oath of Office dictates that they need to be more respectful of taxpayer interests ... they need to vote against this bond proposal and demand that other options be seriously considered and or put the measure to a vote of the community.

Four votes is a majority of the Board. If you recognize that even one of the criticisms contained here is valid, at a minimum, four of you should act to reverse this action for the sake of the taxpayers, your reputations and District 58's reputation concerning competence and honesty.

Finally, I have one last question to ask each member of the Board of Education.

At this point I would like to ask Board President Purcell a question:

- Q: President Purcell, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that the following was President Purcell's response:

- Q: Board member Miller, as you undoubtedly recall, I once voted to approve your appointment to fill a vacancy on this very board, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Miller's response was: _____

- Q: Board member Harris, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Harris' response was: _____

- Q: Board member Hughes, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Hughes' response was: _____

- Q: Board member Samonte, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Samonte's response was: _____

- Q: Board member Sigale, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Sigale's response was: _____

- Q: Board member Taylor, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that member Taylor's response was: _____

And, finally, I have a question for a neighbor who lives on my street.

- Q: Superintendent Cremascoli, I have here a copy of a Petition, do you wish to sign my Petition?

Let the record reflect that the Superintendent's response was: _____

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is apparent that the Board of Education has failed to seriously consider all of the options available to resolve the issues herein addressed. The unpopularity of the options in the eyes of the parents of a particular school ... or the staff of that school ... or the administration seem to have directed members of this public body to reach the conclusion that this financially ill-advised refunding plan is the most palatable solution.

A back-door referendum is not the same as a direct question placed on the ballot.

By using this sneaky method, this Board will not have to directly ask the voters for permission to raise taxes. Additionally, without the members of the Downers Grove Watch overseeing the

behavior of this Board, it is very unlikely that the taxpayers would have ever known how reckless you have been in the drafting of this plan.

\$2,000,000 dollars!

This plan ... this back-door referendum ... will cost at least **\$2,000,000** more than if you had 1) properly reviewed all of the options in public, 2) there was a determination, with community input, that the issuance of debt was the only viable option, and 3) the voters had approved the sale of \$2,810,000 of building bonds.

This community faces **\$2,000,000** dollars in increased debt burden over-and-above a voter-approved ballot initiative because members of this Board are too afraid of the likely response from the community!

It is difficult to determine if you are simply incompetent when money and finances are involved or merely indifferent to reckless spending to avoid making unpopular political decisions.

Either way, it is impossible to believe that any informed taxpayer in the district would be able to confidently trust your financial competence or your honesty if they knew how irresponsible the bond proposal is and how concerted an effort was made to keep the details confidential.

It also appears that your reluctance to put this bond measure to the voters is an act of virtual voter suppression.

Disenfranchisement!

I am quite confident that all of your legal advisors will assert that everything is procedurally legal. I, of course, disagree and the facts presented within my Testimony support my conclusion.

Nonetheless, what is "legal" isn't always right or honest. Disenfranchising the taxpayers is wrong whether it's legal or not.

This Board approved the placement of the statutory Notice in a "newspaper" that I suggest very few taxpayers have ever even heard of ... let alone know where to find a copy. According to the management of that free "newspaper", they try to get it "distributed" (into circulation) on Wednesday, but ... well, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

And, based on my personal experience ... good luck finding a copy!

It is *impossible* to trust the competence and the motives of people who voluntarily assumed public office as a result of elections when they turn around and deny their constituents a chance to vote for or against another tax increase. In addition, trust is destroyed when tax increases are shrouded within a process that absolutely no one within the community understands.

This abuse is only now in the public domain due to the efforts of an industrious former Board member who was elected in April 2007 on platform to end the culture of wasteful spending and indifference to the taxpayers of this community.

Once again, this former Board member points out the absolute absurdity of having a so-called “Financial Advisory Committee” when apparently they have both given their blessing to this profligate debt refunding and kept the details from the community.

Just because every December you capture every dollar the law allows you take in your annual tax levy without asking the voters doesn't mean that it is right.

I fear that getting elected inures you to the responsibility that accrues to those who have taxing authority.

It is necessary when assuming that responsibility that you are vigilant, competent, and trustworthy.

If you compliantly agree to this bond sale, you will demonstrate to this community that you don't deserve to be trusted.

Once again, I implore you to reconsider and vote to at least put this measure on a ballot and not to disenfranchise the voters of the district.

Thank you.

/s/ Scott O’Connell

Scott O’Connell
5140 Grand Avenue