

Gregory E Breen
1905 Monterey Boulevard – Hermosa Beach, California 90254

October 27, 2006

Mr Gordon Evans
1769 Valley Park Avenue
Hermosa Beach, California 90254

Dear Gordon:

Thanks for your letters to the Beach Reporter and Easy Reader. Once again, I think you've misstated facts and I need to correct you on a few points.

First, the CRSE has not stated its preference for classrooms over a gym, as you claim. CRSE has objected to any construction on the school site, including classrooms. The president of the CRSE, Jerry Compton, certainly did not support classroom construction since he is on record as opposing any expansion of the school site, and at Facilities Committee meetings voiced his opposition to increasing the enrollment at Valley. This was before the School District sought bond financing. Once Measure I passed, Mr Compton did not oppose the gym; he only opposed its location near his house, and urged that the gym be placed at the front of the school property on Valley Drive. You may also recall that, when placement of the gym at the front of the school was rejected, Mr Compton presented his so-called alternative C that built the gym on the mobile home park, far from his house.

The point is that I think it's incorrect for CRSE to claim that they favored classrooms; if CRSE had any preference concerning enrollment, it was for moving kids somewhere else. In fact the original lawsuit filed by CRSE was as opposed to the construction of classrooms as it was to the construction of a gymnasium and if successful, would have prevented the construction of the classrooms you claim to want. CRSE's appeal similarly seeks to stop the construction of the classrooms being constructed, using a deft linguistic trick and calling the entire project - including the classrooms and library - "the gymnasium project" and seeking to have it stopped. To my mind the statement that CRSE wanted classrooms and only objected to the gym rings a bit hollow.

Second, the primary objection voiced by neighbors of the school, most of whom I presume to be the membership of CRSE, concerns neighborhood parking and traffic. Parking and traffic are, in fact, the only consistent objections to the project. Interestingly, the concern seems to be that members of the public will park on public streets, which is something over which the School District has no jurisdiction. Notwithstanding that parking and traffic are city responsibilities, and that the School District's responsibility is to deliver the education the state constitution guarantees, and that the School District had already limited gym operating hours to lessen the

impact on the surrounding area, the District did ask the City about vacating the portion of Valley Park Avenue nearest the school and dedicating it to residents (the state Streets and Highways code allows a locality to "give" a street, along with all the attendant maintenance obligations, to a group of residents). The District's records show that you, your wife, the Superintendent, and City Manager Steve Burrell were all at this meeting. Before this conversation got very far, Mr Compton, speaking for the CRSE, said that he was not interested in having to pay for a private street, and that the school district should pay for residents' parking permits. Since the school is not permitted to disburse public funds to private individuals, the talks went no further. The notion that the lawsuit is about building classrooms instead of a gym is of very recent vintage and serves to mask the true intent of the some of the members of CRSE (I hope not including you), which is to have a private street at public cost.

Third, I am no health expert but I do not know how indoor exercise is more or less healthy than outdoor exercise. It seems to me that a kid with asthma or allergies is better off inside, and I am not sure how a kid playing baseball outside will be healthier than a kid playing volleyball or basketball indoors. It seems to me your rationale extends to include any school activity, including, for example, math or humanities classes – that is, under your rationale, outdoor classrooms would presumably be healthier than indoor classrooms, leading to the preposterous conclusion that we should not have any school buildings.

My real frustration in this whole exercise is the seeming lack of knowledge of this whole matter on the part of the members of CRSE, and the blind repetition by them of the CRSE mantra. This may be a tactical ploy on the part of the animators of the CRSE, hoping that if they holler long enough, hard enough, and loud enough, people begin to believe what they're saying. The surprising thing is that the correct information – the information that you seem not to be aware of – is publicly available, but the members of CRSE seem to have no interest in reviewing facts themselves, relying instead on CRSE representatives to inform them. You may be culpable in this; I recall that you wrote a letter to the effect that you felt you were fully informed since you got all your information from CRSE.

While it is disappointing that you rely on information filtered through the biases of others -- I think you would have to agree that this has become very personal for Mr Compton and Ms Tagliaferro, and that their judgment may be compromised -- I suppose I should not be surprised that you are not aware of facts outside the scope of what CRSE management has directed your way. It seems to me that Jerry Compton keeps fairly tight control of the information he disseminates, and that most of the CRSE folks rely on his version of events. I would guess, for example, that from the get-go he's told the members of CRSE that the School's Environmental Impact Report is flawed and legally inadequate, and that CRSE's victory is certain and that the school is wrong. And he might have indicated after the first hearing that CRSE's loss was only a temporary setback, and he might have told you that the school has been intractable and is not worthy of trust and that the lawsuit would have been unnecessary had the school agreed to settlement terms promulgated by CRSE. He might even have told you that he was willing to spend substantial sums of his own money to stop the transgressions by the School District.

Mr Compton has free rein in promoting any fictions he cares to promote. The school, as a public entity, is restricted in its legal ability to counter Mr Compton's versions of events, though the

results of the court cases so far should give you some idea of the comparative weight to be accorded Mr Compton's and the School District's versions of events. And, by the same token, you are free to go on the Mr Toad's Wild Ride that is the CRSE lawsuit, although I find it deplorable that you drag the schools along with you. It does frustrate me that Mr Compton continues to push the CRSE lawsuit, with the cost to the District standing at a couple million dollars (which could have been used to build the classrooms you pretend you want), notwithstanding that he has moved out of the area. I'm surprised that the membership of CRSE seems voluntarily to be in rank order behind him, although this may be Mr Compton's doing. I think he has a vested interest in making sure that CRSE stays in line and that nobody breaks ranks, since CRSE's ability to fund its legal fees is, I think, dependent on its winning its case and its consequent ability to receive legal fees under California's private attorney general statute. Having lost five times, Mr Compton is, like a drunken gambler, going back to the table for another roll of the dice.

I do wonder, though, what is going to happen if the California Supreme Court refuses to hear the case and your attorneys turn to you for payment of the substantial fees they've run up. To date the school has run up about \$140,000 in legal fees, and I have to think the fees that CRSE has incurred are higher since CRSE has been using very well regarded (and presumably pricy) lawyers. CRSE is an unincorporated group such that its members likely do not have the protection that a corporate entity would provide. My fear, were I in your shoes, would be having to write a check for the legal fees Mr Compton incurs with the apparent approval of the CRSE. I trust you've sought legal advice from someone other than Mr Compton on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Greg Breen", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Gordon B. Evans 1769 Valley Park ave. HB, CA 90254
November 3rd 06 overcast - fog

Thank you Greg for your long formal letter.

If I'm too old to misstate the facts, then you're
too young to state them.

I find fault with your directing the blame on
CRSE for past & current School Board decisions.

Your defending your position as a School Board member.

I am protesting the misuse of J Bond monies,
adding class rooms was paramount, the
Gym was a phantom.

are you a Lawyer?

I appreciate your concern

Sincerely

Gordon B. Evans

thought you would
enjoy this!