

CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Clifton B. Cates III – Chair
Quincy Hocutt – Vice Chair
Steven Cole
Geoffrey Commons
Glenn DeVeer
Joelle Morisseau-Phillips
Willie Ordonez
Mikala Rahn
Gretchen Vance
Diana Verdugo
Jenifer Wang



Pasadena, California

May 20, 2017

Kimberly Kenne – Board Liaison

Dr. Brian McDonald
Superintendent, Pasadena Unified School District
351 S. Hudson Avenue
Pasadena, California 91109

Dear Dr. McDonald:

As you requested in your email to me of May 15, 2017, on behalf of the Citizens' Oversight Committee I am directing the following questions and requests for information to you.

1. New items

For the current fiscal year ending June 30, 2017, would you please furnish to the Committee copies of all Board Reports that do *not* end with the suffix “-F” and that request Proposition TT funding. The Committee regularly receives from the Facilities Department Board Reports that end in “-F;” we do not need those. What we seek are reports like Board Report No. 114-B, which seeks the expenditure of Proposition TT funds on District legal expenses. So far that is the only such non-F Board Report that the Committee has seen.

We would also like you to furnish the Board Report(s) that requested prior funding for Contract RC690:16:17, the legal services contract between the District and the law firm Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo. If any of the appropriation sought was to be paid from Proposition TT funds, the Committee would like to know the amount and the basis on which charges to Proposition TT funds was made.

The total cost of all projects shown on the “Spend-out Plan” released by the Facilities Department last month is approximately \$126 million, which equals the amount of remaining Proposition TT bond proceeds. Those projects include \$2.3 million for the rehabilitation or upgrade of three running tracks. However, not included in the Spend-out Plan are the associated architectural fees. The Spend-out Plan also makes no provision for the roughly \$4 million total cost of the compensation of Facilities Department personnel that is being charged to Proposition TT. Discrepancies like this call into question the validity of the other numbers on the Plan and make it difficult for the Committee to monitor effectively the expenditure of Proposition TT funds.

2. Pending Requests for Information or Assistance

The Committee is still awaiting the ten key pieces of information described in my letter of March 23 to the Chief of Facilities and in my letter of May 11 to you. Having *all* of this information is essential in order for the Committee to be able to produce the budget and project status report for the District, the Board, and the public. I think that we may be making some progress on this score, but the progress is glacial, and we still have no firm commitment when all the information requested will be provided—or even that it will be provided.

The Committee is still awaiting a substantive response to its request that that the Committee be listed on the main directory of the PUSD’s website (the red task bar at the top) rather than under “About PUSD.” It should be as easy as possible for anyone searching for information about the Committee to find that information. At present the Citizens’ Oversight Committee is one of the many entries under the heading “About PUSD,” which is not an accurate description of who we are and is certainly not an obvious place to search.¹ Surely, adding another heading to the main task bar cannot be a major operation.

Finally, the Committee is still awaiting an answer to the fundamental question about the April Spend-out Plan: how were all these numbers derived? Many differ significantly from the last approved budget.² However, the Committee realizes that this critical issue is currently being addressed by the Facilities Committee and will shortly be addressed by the entire Board. The Committee will therefore take and analyze the

¹ In their letter to me of May 17, three members of the Board of Education acknowledged that issue: “We have requested your requests for changes in the PUSD website but are still looking for the best ways to address those concerns.”

² Example: The Spend-out Plan proposes spending approximately \$6.9 million on Norma Coombs. The existing budget provides only \$4.6 million. What explains the difference?

information that emerges from the Board's investigations and will ask for additional information only as necessary to explain any remaining significant discrepancies.

On behalf of the Committee, I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Clifton B. Cates
Chair, Citizens' Oversight Committee