

7-11 Committee Correspondence

Entered into the public record
by the 7-11 Committee
on September 1, 2010

Julie Boucher

From: <gbstoneman@aol.com>
To: <cnorgaard@regentbc.com>; <gwoods@smusd.us>; <jboucher626@smusd.us>; <mbaha@att.net>; <kdomier@gmail.com>; <forgatch@aol.com>; <ihung1026@aol.com>; <vkoo@pacbell.net>; <kevinmcdonnell@earthlink.net>; <snowmiss@aol.com>; <stalllaw@aol.com>; <wangjerry@yahoo.com>; <cnorgaard@regentbc.com>; <jeng@mems.caltech.edu>; <chihchang@aol.com>; <karenpreston@socal.rr.com>; <namjack4@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 21, 2010 11:02 AM
Subject: Stoneman School

Dear members of the 7-11 Committee and the School Board:

I am in favor of keeping Stoneman School in the ownership of the residents of San Marino. Please consider going forward with the long-term lease, and eventually turning over the ownership of Stoneman School to the City of San Marino. There are so many future options for the school that the City of San Marino could take advantage of.

Thank you for your consideration.

George B. Stoneman, M.D.
Great-grandson of Governor G Stoneman

From: "Bruce & Helen McGregor" <bhmcg@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Stoneman School

Date: August 30, 2010 12:15:16 PM PDT

To: cnorgaard@regentbc.com, gwoods@smusd.us, jboucher626@smusd.us, mbaha@att.net, kdomier@gmail.com, forgatch@aol.com, ihung1026@aol.com, vkoo@pacbell.net, kevinmcdonnell@earthlink.net, snowmiss@aol.com, staltlaw@aol.com, wangjerry@yahoo.com

Cc: jeng@mems.caltech.edu, chihchang@aol.com, karenpreston@socal.rr.com, namjack4@yahoo.com, MBallantyne@SanMarinoCA.gov, moimos@cityofsanmarino.org

Sirs and Mesdames:

We read with interest the current status of the question of what to do with the Stoneman School property in the recent issue of the San Marino Tribune.

We hope that the recommendation will be made to the School Board that they proceed with the long term lease, and eventually turn over the ownership of Stoneman School to the City of San Marino.

Once you sell or convert real property into cash or its equivalent, you will find that it will disappear rapidly, like water into the ground.

We have lived in San Marino for 43 years and raised five children here. We love this community and pray that it will continue to prosper and serve its residents well. We commend each of you for your service to the community.

Sincerely,

Helen McGregor

Bruce and

Julie Boucher

From: <fsohl@sohlfamilyadvisors.com>
To: <gwoods@smusd.us>; <jboucher626@smusd.us>; <mbaha@att.net>; <kdomier@gmail.com>; <forgatch@aol.com>; <ihung1026@aol.com>; <vkoo@pacbell.net>; <kevinmcdonnell@earthlink.net>; <snowmiss@aol.com>; <stalllaw@aol.com>; <wangjerry@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 5:43 PM
Subject: Feedback for Tonight's 7-11 Cttee Mtg

Hello 7-11 Committee Members -

Thanks again for stepping into this delicate role as representatives of the views of your friends, neighbors & fellow San Marinans with regard to Stoneman School. I wanted to share some feedback with you as you go into tonight's committee meeting.

When I read the Tribune's report of what transpired at your meeting two weeks ago, I was startled as it was very different from what I heard you come to consensus on. I don't know if you had the same reaction. When I reviewed the minutes from the meeting posted on the district website, I saw that everything you agreed to was indeed recorded there, but that one had to piece it together by reading the minutes carefully and also would benefit greatly from having attended the meeting as I did. I bet this is what happened with the Tribune story.

Based on the meeting minutes and on my recollection of the meeting, what I understood you to have agreed to is the following.

First, Stoneman School is surplus property for educational purposes.
 Second, the acceptable community uses of the Stoneman property in order of priority are: 1.) Long term lease or Sale of Stoneman to the City of San Marino, 2.) A long term lease or sale of the property to a philanthropic or educational institution, and 3.) Sale of the property to a residential developer / for residential development (don't remember which you agreed on, "developer" or "development").

Putting myself in your shoes (thankfully I am not) I'd keep in mind that the community will ultimately look back at you and our recommendations when the Stoneman issue is finally settled. With this in mind, I would be sure to review the minutes from last meeting carefully to ensure they accurately state who said what and what was agreed to in the meeting. (In my reading of the minutes, I am not certain that this is the case - but you'll know best.)

Secondly, in deciding what, specifically, you all agreed to at the last meeting, I'd write it out word for word and review it so that you all can see it in its finished form. Reading through the minutes and cobbling it together from that could come up with several different versions and the community will do this as the Tribune story appears to bear out.

Finally, when you leave tonight, agree, again, word for word, what you've come up with, especially if it changes in light of tonight's community input. This will prevent against misunderstanding and misinterpretation at a later time.

I wish you the best in your deliberations and again thank you for your service to your neighbors in this contentious matter.

Personally, I hope this all ends up being a non-issue because the city & schools agree to the proposed deal. Unfortunately, no one has reassured me that this will be the case. My real concern is for what might happen if the current proposal from the city somehow does not go through.

9/1/2010

The way your committee's recommendations stand now, the green light is being given to the school district to preferentially accept offers from these other groups if things do not proceed with the city. Perhaps some phrasing that denotes a strong preference for option 1 and that options 2 & 3 are considerably less desirable or avoided if possible would better reflect the sentiment of those who care about this matter. Completely removing option # 3 would be my choice. I have to say I have not spoken to anyone who feels strongly about the second & third options absolutely being included in your recommendations.

What I have found is, that among those who have strong feelings about this issue or who will be most directly impacted by what transpires at Stoneman, there is a strong desire for the first option to be the exclusive option recommended to the city.

Again, I feel fortunate to not be making the final recommendations and be on the point for them and to rather be someone who can try to influence the discussion from outside.

God be with you as you deliberate & thanks for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Fred Sohl

I would like, for the record, to state my view about Stoneman School.
before I start, I want to let you know that, I respect the
Stoneman School issue has been there since my first son started school
and he is now a senior in college. *effort of task force and what the committee
has accomplished,*

Over the years, we are able to get by holding this additional property,
either it is surplus or not. If our budget crisis has not been such a
pressing matter, we probably could get by and hold on to this piece of
property for many more years until the next cycle of booming economy
time. Who knows, optimistically, we might be able to do something in
major scale in those future years.

The problem seems, we are in a situation that our school needs to
consider every possible venues to fund the school and eliminate waste.
The budget is under scrutiny, and the school board is forced to take
action. For the benefit of the entire city, either school children or senior
citizens, the City should step in and lease or purchase with a reasonable
price. The real estate and business of California had been hitting very
hard but San Marino City is doing relatively good. Our City Government,
of course, is sustaining revenue and prestige majorly due to our
distinguished school district. It makes perfect sense to me that we
should focus more on recommending school board to negotiate a price
base on at least Market Value. If it is a long term lease, say 99 years, it
is the same as selling the property for all of us since we will not live to
see the day the property return to the district any way. In that case, we
should negotiate a lease agreement base on the Present Value equals
to the fair market assessment value.

Vanessa Koo

9-1-10

7-11 Committee member