



# MISSION VIEJO BUZZ

Keeping the California Promise

Week of June 3, 2006

## *The Patriot Post Founders' Quote Daily*

"I will venture to assert that no combination of designing men under heaven will be capable of making a government unpopular which is in its principles a wise and good one, and vigorous in its operations."

-- Alexander Hamilton (speech to the New York Ratifying Convention, June 1788)

Reference: The Works of Alexander Hamilton, Henry Cabot Lodge, ed., II, 29.

Founders' Quote Daily is a service of The Patriot Post, the most widely read conservative journal on the Internet. If you would like to receive Founders Quote Daily, and this highly acclaimed Digest of news, policy and opinion delivered FREE by e-mail to your inbox, link to: <http://PatriotPost.US/subscribe/>

CARL SCHULTHESS, EDITOR IN CHIEF [carl.s@cox.net](mailto:carl.s@cox.net)

DALE TYLER, PUBLISHER [edt@missionviejoca.org](mailto:edt@missionviejoca.org)

KATHY MIRAMONTES, CONTENT/DESIGN MANAGER [katmiris@cox.net](mailto:katmiris@cox.net)

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR



### WHO IS TENDING THE STORE?

Recall if you will that the current mayor stated, "Things will be different. There will be no more closed-door meetings or agreements." What exactly does he call the ad-hoc committee he chose to find a cell-tower consultant for **\$200,000**? The ad hoc committee appeared to create the terms of the city contract to award a potential of **\$2 million** in commissions to the consultant to determine where cell towers should be permitted.

The contract is not for just one cell tower, but up to **70** of them!

How and why did the city council agree on this? Do council members receive **\$\$** in any way? How is it that a city-hired consultant can propose to bring in a cell tower provider with a commission for himself for 10 years? Were communities surrounding Mission Viejo surveyed to find out if they were enthusiastically accepting cell towers to be planted all over private properties and city-owned properties?

Is it true Councilmen Lance MacLean and Frank Ury

were promoting the contract? Does anyone recall the demands by Ury to put all power lines underground? I can so assume that he is demanding all the towers for the wireless shall go the same way!

Anyone wanting to know more about this should call City Hall. (949-470-3050) I am still wondering how the cell-tower master plan and contract came about.

William Cruse  
Mission Viejo

## RESIDENTS OPPOSE MORE CELL TOWERS

The Mission Viejo Planning and Transportation Commission on May 22 evaluated Permit PDP 2005-153 for Cingular and T Mobile wireless to establish a cell tower near O'Neill School and Park in Mission Viejo. A good turnout of local residents opposed the project, and the commissioners denied the application. It is satisfying to see the city respond in a positive way to the concerns of residents.



Cell towers are an intrusion into the skyline and present visual blight in our city. Unless there is an over-

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

riding consideration, Mission Viejo has enough cell towers, combined with those in other cities, to meet needs into the foreseeable future. Such towers should be in areas away from housing and definitely not near schools.

Whatever monetary consideration the city receives is small compared to the visual blight and nuisance imposed on nearby residents. To provide a couple of companies access is not the primary consideration. The consideration is the welfare of our residents.

James Edward Woodin  
Mission Viejo

## COUNCIL NEEDS RESPONSIBLE ADULTS



I hope residents are keeping an eye on the city council.

When council members aren't fighting with each other, they're in agreement to sell out the city. The cell tower master plan rewards a consultant for bringing approximately 70 more cell towers into town. Which neighborhoods will get cell towers?

As another example of irresponsible politicking, the city has been sued for not having an affordable housing plan. The current council majority first threw away the progress on a plan required by the state and then rolled out the red carpet for developers. The lawsuit was entirely avoidable.

The city council needs responsible adults instead of politicians who couldn't care less about residents. Some of those up for reelection are out shaking hands and kissing babies while selling our city down the river. Let's call a halt to council decisions until after the November election when responsible adults can take over.

Milt Jacobson  
Mission Viejo

"hear, hear!"

## NEWS BRIEFS

**MOXIE JAVA – CAN SMALL BUSINESS SURVIVE?**



Will another Mission Viejo shop lose business to a national chain? Moxie Java, located at 28815 Los Alisos Blvd. in the Von's center, has managed to build its business against the odds. The location on Los Alisos is east of Marguerite, adjacent to the former Kmart site.

<http://www.moxiejava.com/>

The retail center is home to numerous small businesses that have won customers through friendship and quality service. Loyal customers have also kept the Von's supermarket afloat, but they're disturbed by Von's plan to bring in Starbucks. A letter-writing campaign to Von's (Safeway) corporate office is apparently not dissuading its decision-makers from contracting with Starbucks.

Such national chains as Starbucks should locate where they can fulfill an unmet need -- not diminish growth opportunities for existing shops with local owners. Small business is the backbone of local economy, and it deserves community support. Readers can respond by, first, supporting Moxie Java and also by writing to Von's decision makers, [business.ethics@Safeway.com](mailto:business.ethics@Safeway.com). Readers can call Safeway's toll-free number, 1-877-723-3929.

## CUSD RALLY EDITORIAL STAFF

Kevin Murphy, the San Juan Capistrano dad who started the recall of seven Capistrano Unified School District trustees, is ready to rally. He said, "It's time for parents in CUSD to take back what is rightfully ours. These are our tax dollars that have built this 'Taj Mahal.' Spend some time, go walk your son or daughter's school – and then take a look at the 'Taj Mahal.' After that experience, I'll see you June 6 at 4:00."

Murphy is referring to the rally being organized by CUSD parents to protest CUSD's \$52-million education center in San Juan Capistrano. Parents say the controversial administration building is out of place in a district where a high percentage of children attend class in rundown portables.

Parents say funds that were once earmarked



(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

to renovate such facilities as Newhart Middle School were diverted into the administration building.

The rally will take place on Tues., June 6, 4 p.m., at the new CUSD education center, 33122 Valle Road, San Juan Capistrano. Participants will convene at the entrance to the parking lot of the education center. Go to the end of Valle Road, past the Volkswagen and Jaguar dealerships in San Juan Capistrano.

<http://talk.ocregister.com/showthread.php?p=356811>

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR CUSD SPIN CYCLE



CUSD's administration is moving into its new building, and we're in mourning. Patti and her colleagues in accounts payable will now have clutter-free desks and ample parking.

But what about second grader, Josh, who wants to check out a library book and there's no librarian? Amber, a sixth-grader, carries a 30-pound backpack around all day because there aren't enough lockers. Mark, a high-school senior, has to have his mommy pick him up at school because the student parking lot is filled with portable classrooms?



CUSD Superintendent James Fleming is "sticking with his story," telling us in his latest column that "the \$35-million cost [of the new "education center"] is paid with funds restricted to brick-and-mortar projects within the city of San Juan Capistrano." Why does this infuriate me and, more importantly, why should

it infuriate you? Because, simply put, it is not true.

On March 18, 2002, a Certificate of Participation (COP) was approved by the CUSD trustees to finance the new administration building in San Juan Capistrano, pledging Las Flores and Capistrano Valley High School as assets to secure the COP. A COP is a type of loan, a bond that does not require voter approval. This \$35-million loan was also supposed to fund a 50-meter pool at Capistrano Valley High School and a reconstruction project for Newhart Middle School.

The proceeds from the COP have all been spent. In fact, as of November 2005, the cost of the building had reached \$34,356,635 without landscaping, furniture and other associated costs. Work has yet to even begin at Newhart.

The San Juan redevelopment fund, which is contributing \$1 million per year to the cost of financing the new building, clearly states in Section 5.3 that the fund can be used for "the lease or purchase of land or facilities for use only as schools, District administrative offices and operations facilities." Since when are lease payments considered "bricks-and-mortar"?

If CUSD's school board truly believes the kids come first, why did they construct a fancy new building when they could have remained in the



district-owned, Calle Perfecto office and paid the leases on the ancillary facilities with the San Juan redevelopment fund? This would have generated an additional \$550,000 every year, for the next 20 years, for a total increase to CUSD's General Fund of more than \$11,000,000! There still would have been a \$9-million surplus from the San Juan redevelopment fund to help finance improvements at San Juan schools. This would have saved precious Measure A funds for use throughout CUSD. If our school board was going to borrow money without voter approval, they should have spent the money on schools rather than a controver-

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

sial administration building!



Poor Patti would have had to deal with a cluttered desk, but she receives compensation for her woes. Unfortunately, CUSD residents are paying to send Amber, Josh,

Mark and more than 48,000 other students to schools with substandard facilities and inadequate staffing. A school designated as "Distinguished" or "Blue Ribbon" by the state doesn't mean much, when the facilities are dilapidated and not adequately staffed. Why do you think so many parents have opted to send their children to private schools?

The most amazing aspect of this situation is the complete denial of our school board that they didn't do their homework. Why does it take a group of parents to point out the obvious? The PTA and every taxpayer in CUSD should view the evidence for themselves at [www.CUSDWatchdog.com](http://www.CUSDWatchdog.com)

This 128,000 sq. ft. building is a monument to the arrogance and incompetence of the CUSD administration. It demonstrates an utter lack of respect for the teachers, students and residents of this district. Please join me and many more taxpayers just like me on **Tues., June 6, at 4:00 at the end of Valle Road (by the new "education center") in San Juan Capistrano** to let this school board know that we don't appreciate their putting the "administrators first"!

Rebecca Bauer  
CUSD parent



## MEASURE M EXTENSION – OCTA SPEAKS OUT BY DALE TYLER

I wrote a recent article opposing the extension of Measure M and criticizing the Mission Viejo council for voting to impose this new tax on Mission Viejo citizens.

Well, it seems that Monty Ward, who works for OCTA, was quite upset about my article and decided to claim what I said were "lies." Now, most people recognize that calling your opponent a liar is often an admission that you are losing or have lost the argument on its merits. Nonetheless, Monty decided to brand four of the arguments against the new tax, known by OCTA as the "liea," as lies. Unfortunately for Monty and OCTA, his arguments show just how out of touch OCTA is with the people of Mission Viejo and Orange County.

In this article, I'll take on Monty's claims and show how ludicrous they really are. For each point, I will list my original point as he listed it, show parts of his response, then respond to his argument.

**DALE TYLER:** "M renewal will 'raise funds for OCTA operations.'"

**MONTY WARD (OCTA):** "Lie number one. Measure M renewal funds will go to specific projects or programs detailed in a voter-approved plan. By law, no more than one percent of revenues can be used for administration of the program and by law one and one half percent is allocated to the Board of Equalization to collect and distribute the revenues. Can we find another public or private program with lower administrative costs? In 1991 when Measure M started, OCTA had 10 percent MORE administrative employees than it does today, 15 years later. Measure M goes for projects, not bureaucracy."

**THE TRUTH:** First, all of the Measure M tax today goes to the OCTA. They spend it on various things, including freeways, roads, transit, engineering, public outreach (propaganda), bond interest, staff salaries and so on. Anyone who knows accounting realizes that one can

(Continued on page 5)



(Continued from page 4)

classify expenses in many ways. Would you consider interest on borrowed money an administrative expense or a project expense? What about PR? The bottom line is that even if you buy the argument about only a small percentage being spent on "administration," it is still true that the more money you give them in taxes, the more money they have to spend on bureaucracy. Also, even though their so-called administrative employee count may or may not have decreased, they have more than 1,900 employees doing something. As to specific plans being approved by voters in the new tax, what about the more than \$1.3 billion in Projects S and V? These are really just big "slush" funds for OCTA to spend on light rail (like Centerline). There are almost no limits on what the money can be spent on as far as transit goes.

**DALE TYLER:** "Yet, four supposedly fiscally conservative council members voted to impose a new tax on Mission Viejo residents without even having a final document specifying how the tax was to be spent."

**MONTY WARD (OCTA):** "Lie number two. The Mission Viejo council members voted to approve a 30-year transportation investment plan that details how the proceeds from extending a half-cent sales tax will be spent (available on the web at [www.octa.net](http://www.octa.net)). The plan the council approved is exactly what will be presented to the voters in the voter pamphlet. It is the "final document." Moreover, the council did not vote to impose a tax, only the voters (by a two-thirds majority) can do that. The council endorsed the spending plan that will accompany the Measure M renewal on the ballot."

**THE TRUTH:** Let's be clear. The council's approval (4-1, Ledesma opposing), means the new tax (not an extension) is one step closer to the ballot. Our council, if they were really fiscal conservatives, would have said "No new taxes!" To claim that it is simply a formality is disingenuous. If it were so unimportant, why have the council vote at all? As to the notion that this is the final document, the last version I saw and what was approved by the OCTA board on April 24, is still labeled a "Draft." If this were the final document, why not label it "Final Ordinance XX"? The reason OCTA does not do this is that some last-minute changes may be needed to get cities' approval or pacify some other group. Of course, this may be the

final document, after all. We'll only really know when the new tax comes up for a vote.

**DALE TYLER:** "OCTA had different ideas than most Orange County residents about what they should do to relieve congestion. They built carpool lanes and tried to build a light-rail system called 'Centerline.'"

**MONTY WARD (OCTA):** "Lie number three. OCTA has delivered the Measure M Plan exactly as presented to and approved by the voters in 1990 (yes, it included carpool lanes, carpool lane connectors and light rail). OCTA's fidelity to the Plan has been well documented, audited and certified every year for 15 years by a fully independent Citizen's Oversight Committee charged with overseeing Measure M's implementation. More recently these findings were reinforced by yet another independent assessment done by the Orange County Business Council and which led to their endorsement of the Measure M renewal Plan. ... (listing of proposed new tax benefits deleted)"

**THE TRUTH:** In this case the devil is in the details. Sure, OCTA can claim the voters approved something, but there was not a lot of specificity on the ratio of car pool lanes to general use lanes, for example. When people voted in 1990, car pool lanes and light rail were not really pressing issues and so people voted for the tax as a whole, even though they might have preferred no light rail or car pool lanes. Remember, in 1990 very few freeways had carpool lanes. Yet, OCTA spent much of our freeway money on adding carpool lanes and extremely expensive, almost unused flyover ramps for carpool lanes. They also spent more than \$30 million on Centerline, despite a scathing Orange County Grand Jury report on the waste at OCTA. The audits they speak so highly of are done by a group of well-meaning citizens who have little real power and who are manipulated by OCTA into "going along to get along." If this Citizen's Oversight Committee had any real teeth, it would have stopped Centerline in its tracks, long before a vast public uprising put a halt to the "trolley to nowhere." Even OCTA's own reports on Centerline showed it would make traffic worse, yet the COC did nothing. I believe that the Oversight Committee is just window dressing for OCTA's bureaucracy. On the OC Business Council's so-call independent report, remember that the

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

head of the OC Business Council is a former OCTA staffer and that this "independent report" was done at no charge to the OCTA.

**DALE TYLER:** "OCTA continues to plan for too much transit and, despite the overwhelming rejection of the Centerline boondoggle, they include almost \$1.3 billion for new "high-tech transit," which are code words for light rail in their new proposal."

**MONTY WARD (OCTA):** "Lie number four (and pure invention). The Measure M renewal contains no references at all and no funding allocation to "high-tech transit" or light rail. ... (listing of proposed new tax benefits deleted)"

**THE TRUTH:** Look carefully at Projects S and V in the proposed new tax. Compare those sections to earlier drafts, and you will find that they are largely the same as the current "Final Draft," with the exception of the words "high tech transit" being removed. Just because you do not call it a duck, if it walks like a duck and talks like a duck, it's a duck. OCTA has a transit mentality. During the last Measure M, they spent more that \$30 million, with many mailings, public meetings and other so-called "outreach" to try and convince the public that they (the public) really wanted light rail, even though it made no sense, according to OCTA's own studies. Yet they kept coming back and coming back until they were finally shut down by massive public pressure. If OCTA were really a good steward of our tax money, they would have heard what the people of Orange County were saying, instead of putting their fingers in their collective ears and singing loudly whenever someone opposed Centerline. OCTA wasted a lot of staff time on a project that never made sense, except in the minds of the OCTA execs who love rail and want us all to live in high-density projects around rail stations. Perhaps they grew up in Chicago or New York, where that might work, but this is Orange County and light rail will never be cost-effective here. A recent study shows that OCTA's plans for the new tax will spend about \$8.62 per person mile/year for transit and only about \$0.25 per person-mile/year for streets and roads. That's OCTA spending about 35 times as much to move a person by rail or bus than for the folks in their own cars and trucks. Talk about waste!



I encourage everyone to look at the facts and make up your own mind. It is clear to me that OCTA has wasted much of our money on programs that are not cost effective, like Centerline, and wasted more of our money on things like carpool lanes, which actually hurt total traffic flow. There are more and more studies that prove having a carpool lane is less effective for moving the most people per hour on an entire freeway past a given point than a regular (general purpose) lane would be. Put another way, carpool lanes move more people per hour in that lane only while hurting the people per hour for the rest of the freeway. Even the studies of the first carpool lanes built in 1985 on SR-55 showed that. Yet, OCTA continues to press their social agenda on the people of Orange County and tries to force us into using buses, trains and carpool lanes, even though they do not fit the lifestyles most of us choose.



Stay tuned for more facts on the new tax and OCTA.



**NANCY'S PERSONAL PICKS  
BY NANCY SANDOVAL**

Information in this form is the personal opinion of Nancy Sandoval alone and produced at her expense  
Election of June 6, 2006  
Email: [nancyspicks@yahoo.com](mailto:nancyspicks@yahoo.com)  
Web: [www.nancyspicks.com](http://www.nancyspicks.com)

I am a conservative Christian and spend a lot of time researching the ballot for acceptable candidates and proposition selections. Because of this, I was often asked my ballot opinions and started, many elections ago, to record my

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

choices to give to those who ask. The criteria I use in making selections are described in the following paragraph. If you agree with my criteria, you probably will agree with the results of my research.

The following ballot choices are, in my opinion, the best to uphold strong family values, to oppose the senseless killing of innocent unborn children, to oppose granting special minority status based on sexual orientation, to provide parents with educational choice, to protect community standards of decency, to reduce the size of government and control government spending, to install judges that will only interpret the law and not make laws, and to perform the job successfully based on good character qualities and office qualifications. The selections are made from personal knowledge, interviews, research, various voter guides, voting records, party platform positions, candidate statements, testimonies of reliable secondary sources, and various news media.

STATE

Office  
Candidate

**GOVERNOR**  
**RANDY NEWMAN**

I have a Republican ballot and so can only vote for Republicans in this primary. (The liberal platform of the Democrats make their candidates unacceptable.) Arnold Schwarzenegger will win this Republican primary but Robert Newman, who has no chance of winning is getting my vote as he better represents the conservative viewpoint. In the primaries, is the time to make a statement. Socially, Arnold is liberal. Fiscally, too, he now more mirrors the Democrats. Many of his appointment have been a big disappointment.

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**  
**TOM MCCLINTOCK**

**SECRETARY OF STATE**  
**NO RECOMMENDATION**

McPherson is not conservative and not pro-life. He is running uncontested in this primary.

**CONTROLLER**  
**TONY STRICKLAND**

**TREASURER**  
**CLAUDE PARRISH**

**ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**CHUCK POOCHIGIAN**  
**INSURANCE COMMISSIONER**  
**NO RECOMMENDATION (no conservative)**

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**  
**District 4 RAY HAYNES**

Unabashed at speaking the conservative viewpoint, like McClintock, Haynes is one of my political heroes. As a state senator and assemblyman, his voting record is nearly impeccable, a friend to the family and pro-life. He has earned a stay in politics.

**STATE SENATE**  
**District 35 NO RECOMMENDATION**

Pro-Life Conservative Diane Harkey lost in primary by razor thin margin to Tom Harman (256 votes, I think). So, pro-abortion Harman is running against pro-abortion Democrat Caballero in special run-off to replace John Campbell's vacated seat. I hope Diane will run again and we can all work harder on her campaign. Perhaps, a vote for Harman would help the Republican minority, however. Your call!

**STATE ASSEMBLY**  
**District 68 VAN TRAN**  
**District 70 CHUCK DEVORE**  
**District 71 TODD**  
**District 73 MIMI WALTERS**

**SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**  
**DIANE A. LENNING (Solid Conservative)**

FEDERAL

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**  
**DICK MOUNTJOY**  
A former state senator, Mountjoy is another outstanding conservative candidate in all areas. He will face liberal Diane Feinstein in general election. He is going to need A LOT of help in the general election.

**UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE**  
**District 40 ED ROYCE**  
**District 42 GARY MILLER**  
**District 46 DANA ROHRBACHER**  
**District 47 ROSIE AVILA**  
Biola grad, Rosie will try to unseat ultra-liberal, Loretta Sanchez in the general election. As an unwavering conservative & Christian, Avila has served on the Santa Ana School Board for yrs & is a great candidate to challenge Sanchez. Tell all in the Santa Ana area to vote "Rosie".

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

**JUDICIAL**

**JUDICIAL-SUPERIOR COURT NO. 4**

**NANCY PADBERG**

Conservative, pro-life, smart, qualified. She would make a very good judge.

**COUNTY**

**COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS  
NO RECOMMENDATION**

**COUNTY SUPERVISOR**

**District 2 JOHN MOORLACH**

**District 4 CHRIS NORBY**

**District 5 PAT BATES**

The above 3 are outstanding conservatives, pro-life, pro-family, and principled. Pat Bates' campaign has turned ugly, 99% due to Cathryn DeYoung, who has done everything possible to malign Bates. Don't believe it! Bates is a solid conservative who can be trusted. DeYoung isn't & can't. Bates has the endorsement of just about every conservative office holder in the county.

**COUNTY ASSESSOR**

**MIKE LEBEAU**

**COUNTY AUDITOR**

**NO RECOMMENDATION**

**COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

**TONY RACKAUCKAS**

**COUNTY PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR**

**JOHN WILLIAMS (a solid conservative)**

**COUNTY SHERIFF**

**BILL HUNT**

Hunt is known to be a person of integrity and has the backing of the OC Deputy Sheriffs association. Current sheriff, Mike Carona, has acknowledged some costly mistakes, is a good guy, but I feel should have kept his original promise to run for only 2 terms.

**COUNTRY TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR**

**CHRIS STREET (a solid conservative)**

**PROPOSITIONS**

**PROPOSITION 81 Reading, Literacy & Libraries  
No, No, Big Fat No!**

Bonds mean debt. Libraries and literacy programs

should come from regular tax revenues, not borrowing \$600 million & paying back \$1.2 BILLION from future generations. We are still paying off library bond measures approved in 1988 & 2000. **SAY NO TO ALL BONDS ALL THE TIME.** California must live within their means & not borrow.

**PROPSOITION 82 Pre-School Education  
Another No, No, Big Fat No!**

This one is so bad, it is hard to know where to start. Prop. 82 is a very expensive program to allow 4 yr. olds to go to preschool **paid for by the rich?** Don't count on it! That's what the originators want us to believe to be able to sneak this in. The rich can move and the fine print allows the legislature to raise taxes on everybody to fund, if necessary. Christian pre-schools? Not eligible. One elected official the State Superintendent of Public Instruction would oversee the program. Dangerous! Would create another expensive department & you know the liberal Rob Reiners of this world will not stop at 4 yr. olds. They will want to get their hands on our 3 yr. olds, then 2 yr. olds next. Don't need it! Can't afford it! Questionable benefit! Say "No" to it!

**MEASURE A- Prohibits Eminent Domain  
Enthusiastic Yes!**

Prohibits County of Orange, under forced "Eminent Domain", from taking property from private owners & conveying it to another private party. This is one of those measures where a "yes" vote says, "No". A sensible, sound measure to correct a wrong.

*Vote!*

**Tuesday  
June 6th**

(Continued on page 9)



(Continued from page 8)

# The Buzz May 30

Will residents ever see a financial statement from the Mission Viejo Community Foundation? The "Foundation Update" published in the Summer 2006 City Outlook lumps cash donations, pledges and in-kind donations together at \$360,000. While the Foundation's goal to raise money for the community center expansion is commendable, residents have asked for a balance sheet that shows overhead and cash received. The city's 2005 grant was approximately \$184,000, and the Foundation's director makes \$9,000 a month.

\*\*\*\*\*

Council candidate Bill Barker's letter to The Buzz last week indicates "the people" will have the last word. When Barker served as chair of the Community Services Commission last year, was that the case? Barker's job was to moderate public hearings, including the one regarding a joint-use gymnasium with the Capo school district. Instead of letting residents speak – the purpose of the hearing – Barker gave a lengthy monologue about *his* views. He made the residents wait a long time while he spoke, and he added his own comments after each speaker.

"It's all about ME!"

\*\*\*\*\*

Besides Mayor Lance MacLean, how many more gonging bellwethers are needed on the council to promote a city gymnasium? With three high school gyms, two middle-school gyms in the works, countless unused outdoor basketball courts and a gym the city practically gave to the YMCA, should taxpayers get dinged for another gym? One of the main gymnasium proponents in the community said he'd be satisfied if some of the outdoor courts had a carport-type roof so play could continue on rainy days.



\*\*\*\*\*

Those who oppose Capo USD's new \$52 million administration building can make their point with a protest. Parents and other community members will rally at 4 p.m. on Tues., June 6, at the new CUSD Education Center, 33122 Valle Road, San Juan Capistrano.

\*\*\*\*\*

In the 2002 city election, Councilwoman Gail Reavis worked hard to help Trish Kelley win a council seat. Months after winning, Kelley turned against Reavis, eventually launching a nasty campaign against her. Kelley in 2004 went door-to-door campaigning for Frank Ury, who stopped supporting Kelley after his election. In 2006, Ury has recruited Diane Greenwood and Justin McCusker, who will run against Kelley and other incumbents. Mission Viejo politics are akin to watching "The Twilight Zone" reruns.



\*\*\*\*\*

This fall's council race is afflicted with the Mac factor – Councilman Lance MacLean is running for reelection, and 20-something Justin McCusker has filed his intent to run – Big Mac and Baby Mac. Big Mac has been in office 3 1/2 years and appears to have no support beyond his immediate family. Baby Mac, to the best of anyone's knowledge, has never attended a council meeting.



VOTE Tuesday  
June 6th

# The End