

From: Kim Follien

Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 10:35 AM

To: Padilla, Ingrid; Conway, Clarke; Davis, Madison; Cunningham, Karen; Lentz, Cliff; O'Connell, Terry

Subject: July 19 2018 CC meeting, Agenda Item X. A. Educational Study

Dear City Council,

I do not support the educational study. Doing a study in advance of the general plan amendment vote makes no sense, and is a distraction from this very important Baylands development decision. We already know how the Baylands development will impact primary and secondary education based on the current school district boundaries. The CC has no decision making authority for this, and it's way too premature to assume any school will be built in the Baylands. Please go back to your October 2015 Community Survey Results, and look at what the community strongly prioritized for Baylands Development (not a new school).

Merger of Bayshore's and Brisbane's ESD was shot down by the BES school board, 4 current city council members, and Brisbane parents, even with the knowledge that merger would've meant Baylands revenue would benefit Brisbane's elementary school children. Last year the Bayshore Superintendent made it very clear they aren't interested in merger, and was very angry regarding the first attempt at this study. A Brisbane Unified School district isn't feasible either.

The former Brisbane High School Parent's group already explored this back in 2011. One reason it failed was that it violated at least 2 state education codes, one of which is that you can't cause financial harm to the current district and its students. The Bayshore ESD will never allow this, and the State won't make them, as they are considered by the State to be an under-served district.

Last, please be mindful about angering entities that do have decision making authority. We've already angered Sacramento. Let's not make it worse.

Sincerely,

Kim Follien (Brisbane Resident)