



October 8, 2012

Molly Munger
1910 W. Sunset Blvd., Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Dear Ms. Munger,

We are disappointed by your mischaracterization of the Prop. 30 television ads and reports that you are planning to launch an attack comparison against Proposition 30, a measure supported by a very broad coalition of educators, business leaders, public safety and healthcare workers community groups, newspapers and those concerned about the future of our public schools and colleges. We urge you to re-think this destructive course of action.

Our goal is to improve educational opportunities for students in California. That's why we have run a positive campaign for Proposition 30 and not engaged in negative campaigning on Proposition 38. A positive campaign from both the Prop. 30 and 38 campaigns will create the highest likelihood that students in California will benefit from the November election.

We understand you prefer your competing measure--Proposition 38. However, any actions to destroy Prop. 30 – the one measure which would prevent \$6 billion in cuts to schools and colleges and universities this year and which has a viable path to passage -- fly in the face of stated goals to improve educational opportunities for our children.

Most papers in the state have researched and considered the arguments both for and against Propositions 30 and 38. You have appeared personally before the editorial boards to make the case for your proposition. And, as you know, every single major paper has agreed that Prop. 30 is the better solution for our children at this time. The Los Angeles Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, The San Jose Mercury News, the Sacramento Bee, the Oakland Tribune—each and every one of them have endorsed Prop. 30. And, every one of them has urged a no vote on Prop. 38. The Los Angeles Times even noted in their support of 30: “The measure requires that eighty-nine percent of the money raised goes to k-12 schools and eleven percent to community colleges...” as that provision is written into the constitution. So for you to call the Yes on 30 ad deceptive is certainly disingenuous.

There is also a very long list of individuals and community and state organizations in education, public safety, business, labor and politics who endorse Prop. 30. Many of them have devoted

their lives to public education and children – and some have worked alongside you to strengthen schools. All know well that it is our students who will pay the price if you insist on risking billions of dollars in cuts to our schools and universities just to pass your initiative.

If you launch these Prop. 30 comparison attack ads you will be the second Munger spending millions against our students and schools. In the end, the Munger family could be known as the millionaires who destroyed California's schools and universities.

We urge you to pause and re-think this course of action which could cause irreparable harm to our students and schools.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL KIRST
President
California State Board of Education
Professor of Education (Emeritus)
Stanford University

PATRICIA WILLIAMS
Vice President
California State Board of Education

DIANA RODRIGUEZ
President
Sacramento City Unified School District

ALLAN CLARK
President
California School Employees Association

DAVID KIEFFER
Executive Director
Service Employees International Union --
California

DEAN E. VOGEL
President
California Teachers Association

WILLIE L. PELOTE, SR
Assistant Director, Political Action
Department
AFSCME International

ANTHONY THIGPENN
President
California Calls

JOSHUA PECHTHALT
President
California Federation of Teachers

DARRELL STEINBERG
President pro Tempore
California State Senate