

Monument Academy, a District 38 school of choice. I appreciate that the district supports the freedom to choose the school best suited for my children. However, I find it an unacceptable use of their power to say, "Parents can send their child to the best school for his/her situation. But if you send your child to Monument Academy, the district has chosen to withhold MLO funds (which were designated for every student in D38) from your children and that school."

No, Monument Academy students deserve to receive from the 1999 MLO as every other student in District 38 receives. I am not asking that the board repay us for the years we weren't compensated on the MLO. But I am asking them to make things right starting now. It's time for the board to step up and give Monument Academy the money from the MLO that they legally deserve.

Elissa Brooks

Board disregards public comments, hides executive session topic

In the 1999 MLO, ballot language clearly stated to tax-paying voters that all students district-wide would benefit. Monument Academy, having been told they weren't included, never received from those MLO funds. Just because they were lied to for 17 years does not make it truth. It's very gracious of MA to forgive what was owed them from the past. Now the district needs to do what's right and begin sharing the 1999 MLO funds equitably with MA from this point forward.

Public comments at the April 21 board meeting were handled wrongly by the board. Monument Academy and Prairie Winds parents were discriminated against and had their voices stifled.

Not only has President Pfoff attempted to place a gag order on the board through the BAA-R policy discussed at a previous board meeting, but now he's trying to put a gag order on the public by manipulating public comments. The board placed public comments for agenda items after agenda items were to be discussed and voted upon. That clearly implies that the concerns and opinions of citizens who elected the board are not welcome.

Director Matt Clawson tried to give MA parents a chance to speak before entering executive session, but Pfoff prevented it. Pfoff asserted that the MLO was not on the agenda, so no one could talk about it. Later it was discovered the very purpose of their executive session was to discuss the 1999 MLO issue. This is a violation of transparency laws.

The board seems to be following direction of the administration and union but not considering concerns of their taxpaying constituents who elected them. Why else would they welcome public comments after the agenda items are voted upon? It may also explain the past four failed MLOs.

Cheryl Darnell

School board acts on hearsay instead of facts

I am a parent and my children attend Monument Academy. I was not permitted to provide comment at the District 38 school board meeting on April 23, 2016 because of Mark Pfoff, board president. He independently and without a vote from the rest of the board chose to prohibit remarks from the public, even when their names were entered on the appropriate public comment form. Mark Pfoff may have suppressed my remarks within the confines of the board room but he can't censor my question and comments from the public at large.

Can Mark Pfoff testify that he has seen or can provide the public with a written copy of question 3A on the Nov. 2, 1999 ballot that states "Monument Academy is to be excluded from the 1999 mill levy override"? He can't because it doesn't exist. An exact copy of ballot question 3A is provided at the right. The purpose of the funds acquired is to provide to the educational needs "district-wide." There is no debate that Monument Academy is in the district. What is debatable is Mark Pfoff's recall of conversations that he states he clearly remembers that took place in 1999. Even if Mark Pfoff has the ability to remember from nearly two decades ago, it doesn't matter. What matters is the "record" of the voters.

Mark Pfoff and all of the school board members are

responsible for acting on facts and written policies and not on unfounded information and the recollection of one individual. If the board members choose only to rely on Mark Pfoff's memory on this issue, then the people of District 38 will know the board chose to "take the easy route and not the right one."

Cynthia Fong

Monument Academy students treated unfairly

The MLO funding is an issue that is dividing the community and is ultimately affecting the entire district. I have heard every member of the board make statements that they individually care about all the students foremost above all the rest. However, actions speak louder than words. The actions of making public comments and stances that do not support all the students of the district hurt these students that they state they care about.

Monument Academy currently teaches 15 percent of the district's students and is at full capacity for the next school year and it has a waiting list for almost every grade. D-38 statistics show that MA has the highest amount of students transferring from other D-38 schools and students opting into D-38. Both of these statistics show that what MA is doing is having a positive effect on the community that more families want to be there!

The question and concern really boil down to the choice that the board is taking to treat the students of Monument Academy as less than the rest of the schools in the district. The MLO of 1999 clearly stated that the MLO was for the district and reaffirms this in the verbiage when it states it as to benefit all students district-wide. Nowhere in the verbiage does it state that any schools are included or excluded. I have heard from previous board members and the previous superintendent that they never planned to include MA in the funds. If that is true then why was it not in the verbiage in 1999, so that voters knew they would be excluding students and families' property taxes would not be distributed to all D-38 schools?

Lance Goraczowski

What's fair for Monument Academy?

Monument Academy (MA) is threatening to sue Lewis-Palmer D-38 to get some of the 1999 MLO. They claim MA should receive the same funding as other D-38 schools. Is it fair to compare MA, a charter school, to the traditional public schools in D-38?

MA has almost 40 exemptions from the regulations that govern D-38 schools. The claim was these waivers would make MA cheaper to operate. Is it fair to ask the taxpayers to provide identical funding given the special rules in place for MA?

MA does not commit to educate all the students in the district. For example, MA does not provide bus service and is inaccessible to families with limited transportation. Is it fair to ask the taxpayers to provide identical funding when MA provides less service and less commitment to the community?

Then there's the question of accountability. All voters in D-38 elect the school board officers that run the district. MA, on the other hand, grants voting privileges only to voters with students in the school. Is it fair to ask taxpayers to fund a school that is carefully designed not to be accountable to them?

Finally, the state already appropriates supplemental funds for charter schools only. Officially called Charter School and Institute Charter Capital Construction funds, these dollars go only to charter schools, and MA has collected hundreds of thousands of dollars of these funds, which of course it does not share with the other schools in D-38.

All in all, MA is much more like a private school that gets taxpayer dollars than a traditional public school. If MA would like to work together with the district on a joint MLO request that voters would support, that would be a fair resolution of this issue.

James Howald

Amendment 69—please vote no for Coloradans

The letter to the editor in April 2 issue supporting Amendment 69 left out a few key details. First, all healthcare providers in Colorado would be forced to participate. This would result in less overall health care available in Colorado as providers who don't wish to participate simply (gasp!) move away or quit. Next, the deduction amounts mentioned for non-payroll income would only apply to those 65 and older. Yes, for payroll income employers would pay 6.7 percent, but any competent payroll manager will advise you that you should consider any amount an employer pays on your behalf to be part of your overall compensation.

Beyond that, at least 15 percent of Colorado households are already healthcare covered by the federal government (Medicare recipients, military retirees, etc.). They're not going to stick around and pay this extra 10 percent income tax. Same, at least, for six-figure income households who collectively already pay a large percentage of overall Colorado individual income taxes—they're not going to stick around and pay five figures annually for ColoradoCare. And many would also take their businesses/jobs elsewhere, including for many, their healthcare practices—resulting in even less health care available in Colorado.

Particularly unjust would be Colorado resident active-duty military households stationed here, although fully covered by the federal government, still being forced to pay into this but can't move away for several more years. And there would be no way to force providers in other states to accept ColoradoCare if you were to ever need emergency care when traveling outside of Colorado.

Colorado taxpayers are already forced to pay \$9 billion/year for health care via their existing overall Colorado state taxes as it is. And what incentive would most people have to watch out for their own health if everyone else was forced to pay for their care? So please vote no—thank you.

Paul McSpadden

Coloradoans were denied their rights on April 9

I have been a Republican all my life. I have always been a conservative who upholds the United States Constitution and affirms the Bill of Rights. I am for freedom and small government.

I became a resident of Colorado in June 2015. Being a new resident, I was unfamiliar with the caucus system but discovered that the party officials in the Colorado Republican Party decided in late August to deny the registered Republicans in this state from voting and selecting the presidential candidates in a traditional state primary, but instead requiring only state delegates to vote at the state convention.

It appears that the Colorado Republican elite feel they are better qualified to select the nominee than the faithful Republican electorate. Just like the national Republican Party feels they should be the ones to select the party's nominee. Isn't this why the vast majority of Republicans are fed up with the Republican Establishment and the Rhinos and have turned to Donald J. Trump?

This is a corrupt system. It is saying only the party is qualified to nominate and select the candidate for the people. Coloradoans, you have been screwed by your own party. I believe that the national Republican Party leadership put pressure on the Colorado Republican Party to stop Donald J. Trump. Sounds like what occurs in communist countries where the party chooses a slate of candidates and these are the only candidates that can be on the official ballot.

IR COORDINATED ELECTION 'Y, COLORADO
EMBER 2, 1999

LEWIS-PALMER SCHOOL DISTRICT 38

3A

SHALL LEWIS-PALMER CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 38 TAXES BE INCREASED \$4,000,000 ANNUALLY (THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT WHICH MAY BE COLLECTED IN ANY YEAR ABOVE 1999 TAX COLLECTIONS) FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROVIDING:

- ENHANCEMENT OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING PROGRAMS;
- STAFFING TO REDUCE CLASS SIZE DISTRICT-WIDE;
- STAFFING FOR NEW SCHOOLS;
- EXPANSION OF GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION DISTRICT-WIDE;
- TEXTBOOKS AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS TO SUPPORT CURRICULUM DELIVERY FOR ALL STUDENTS DISTRICT-WIDE;
- RESOURCES TO MAINTAIN, ENHANCE AND INITIATE OTHER PROGRAMS DISTRICT-WIDE;

AND SHALL THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY FUNDING FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH REVENUES BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 30 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

YES

NO

LEWIS-PALMER

Hometown Heroes

Would you like to honor a member of your family who served honorably in our United States military? Join American Legion Post 9-11 in honoring your family hero by having an 18" by 36" banner flown in the Tri-Lakes area featuring his/her photo in uniform with area and dates served on active duty. The banner will be attached to town posts by Palmer Lake Legionnaires and flown from Memorial Day through Veterans Day. The cost for the family is \$125. To order or for more information, call Post Headquarters at the Depot Restaurant, (719) 481-8668.

Palmer Lake Art Group

51st Annual Fine Art Exhibit

Opening Reception:
Friday June 3, 6 - 8pm

Live Music at
Tri Lakes Center for the Arts
304 Hwy 105, Palmer Lake

Art Scholarship Awards

not's of colorado

Show is on display from May 31 - June 25, 2016

Show Judge: **Chuck Mardosz**
www.MardoszFineArt.com

Proceeds from this show will benefit art scholarships for District 38 high school seniors. Palmer Lake Art Group is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization and donations are tax deductible.
www.palmerlakeartgroup.com