-----Original Message-----  
From: Borsos, John <[JBorsos@cta.org](mailto:JBorsos@cta.org)>  
To: [pmanwiller@aol.com](mailto:pmanwiller@aol.com) <[pmanwiller@aol.com](mailto:pmanwiller@aol.com)>; Fisher, David <[dfisher@saccityta.com](mailto:dfisher@saccityta.com)>; [nmilevsky@saccityta.com](mailto:nmilevsky@saccityta.com) <[NMilevsky@saccityta.com](mailto:NMilevsky@saccityta.com)>; [dgrantham@lozanosmith.com](mailto:dgrantham@lozanosmith.com) <[dgrantham@lozanosmith.com](mailto:dgrantham@lozanosmith.com)>; [christine-baeta@scusd.edu](mailto:christine-baeta@scusd.edu) <[christine-baeta@scusd.edu](mailto:christine-baeta@scusd.edu)>; [shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu](mailto:shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu) <[shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu](mailto:shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu)>; [wikerk@scusd.edu](mailto:wikerk@scusd.edu) <[wikerk@scusd.edu](mailto:wikerk@scusd.edu)>; [gabe-estrada@scusd.edu](mailto:gabe-estrada@scusd.edu) <[gabe-estrada@scusd.edu](mailto:gabe-estrada@scusd.edu)>  
Sent: Fri, May 13, 2022 4:51 pm  
Subject: RE: Proposal

Pam:

We continue to have issues with the District’s lack of urgency around this issue.

Your proposal continues to be:

1.      Punitive;

2.      Regressive;

3.      Unlawful.

Additionally, we have repeatedly notified the District that it is problematic for the District to continually attempt to bargain by email with no opportunity to discuss proposals.

Accordingly, we are prepared to meet on Monday, May 16, at 4 p.m. to make yet another attempt to resolve these important issues.

In addition, we will also be prepared to have an initial discussion about the special ed assessments that are both a new proposal and a new addition to the District’s proposal on make-up days.

Please let us know if you are available to meet.

**From:** [pmanwiller@aol.com](mailto:pmanwiller@aol.com) <[pmanwiller@aol.com](mailto:pmanwiller@aol.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2022 9:14 AM  
**To:** Borsos, John <[JBorsos@cta.org](mailto:JBorsos@cta.org)>; Fisher, David <[dfisher@saccityta.com](mailto:dfisher@saccityta.com)>; [nmilevsky@saccityta.com](mailto:nmilevsky@saccityta.com); [dgrantham@lozanosmith.com](mailto:dgrantham@lozanosmith.com); [christine-baeta@scusd.edu](mailto:christine-baeta@scusd.edu); [shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu](mailto:shawn-hadnot@scusd.edu); [wikerk@scusd.edu](mailto:wikerk@scusd.edu); [gabe-estrada@scusd.edu](mailto:gabe-estrada@scusd.edu); [sadie-hedegard@scusd.edu](mailto:sadie-hedegard@scusd.edu)  
**Subject:** Re: Proposal

Good morning John, I am writing to confirm that the District is prepared to meet this afternoon at 4:00pm.

**From:** Borsos, John <JBorsos@cta.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2022 7:39 PM  
**To:** pmanwiller@aol.com; Fisher, David <dfisher@saccityta.com>; nmilevsky@saccityta.com; dgrantham@lozanosmith.com; Christine Baeta <Christine-Baeta@scusd.edu>; Shawn Hadnot <Shawn-Hadnot@scusd.edu>; Karen Wiker <WikerK@scusd.edu>; Gabe Estrada <Gabe-Estrada@scusd.edu>; Dr. Sadie Hedegard <Sadie-Hedegard@scusd.edu>; Jorge Aguilar <JAguilar@scusd.edu>; Cancy McArn <Cancy-McArn@scusd.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: Proposal

Pam:

At the conclusion of negotiations, the District stated it was reiterating its May 12 2022 proposal with no explanation.

As explained in detail, your proposal is punitive, regressive, unlawful  and impractical.

Attached is our response to your proposal, which we explained in full detail, and to which you raised no objections nor raised any concerns.

Accordingly, this is remains our response to the District’s May 12, 2022 proposal.

As we stated when we were together, the District appears to be resistant to working with educators to reach a solution and may actually be more interested in seeing the $47 million penalty levied against the District for some inexplicable political agenda.

We gave the District a proposal that resolved all of its expressed issues, and the District can’t seem to take yes for an answer.