

1) If the school district had not performed the sale-leaseback and had instead paid for the renovation with its own SPLOST money, the project would have cost half of what it will cost now -- a total of \$39 million less (The land purchase and the renovation cost \$39 million. Now, the total price tag of the project -- \$52 million buyback, plus \$25.9 million in rent -- is \$78 million.) What is your response to that?

I would refer you to the articles we shared with you previously about the need and reason for the purchase, as well as the benefit of the sale-leaseback. Also, as we stated in answer to question #4 on May 13, 2011, the total cost for the ISC at the time the initial renovations were complete was \$43,988,242. The cost to purchase and renovate the ISC would not change regardless of how it was funded. It is what it is. Second, as publically communicated numerous times at the time of the ISC sale/leaseback, the transaction was a "financing" transaction as a way to free-up funds for classroom construction. As with any financing transaction there is always a "cost of borrowing." This "cost of borrowing" against the ISC is reflected in the form of the lease/buy-back payments. As a comparison, the "cost of borrowing" the same \$43,988,242 in the COPS transaction would have been well over \$70 million in principal and interest.

2) Former CFO Jeff Weiler said the purpose of performing the sale-leaseback was to complete the school district headquarters renovation without attracting controversy by spending taxpayer money on it. "They did it this other way so they didn't have to use capital money," Weiler said. "That way, we didn't have to say we used capital money that would have — should have — gone to [building] schools." What is your response to Weiler's quote?

This is not true. I believe this is explained above.

3) Weiler said that the ISC sale-leaseback was one of the reasons that he left the Gwinnett school district. "I chose to move on because there was too much of that stuff that I just wasn't comfortable with," Weiler said. "And it was stuff that I would have had a hard time — if I was there now — trying to justify....Put it this way: I wouldn't have wanted to been up trying to explain all this. I don't know that I could have easily, with a straight face, explained it. I certainly wouldn't want to do that here [in Nevada]." What is your response to his quote?

I think the investigation file on Mr. Weiler which we are making available to you this afternoon speaks to the real reasons why he left. He was escorted from the building by a police officer under a cloud of allegations of unethical and unprofessional behavior... allegations that we found to be supported by facts. Mark my words, had I known all of this when his current employer called me for a reference I would not have given him one.

4) Weiler said that the opening of the second GIVE location in 2003 – at the old Norcross High School – offered enough space to alleviate any crowding issues within the GIVE program, negating the need to move the GIVE East program into the old Lawrenceville Middle School. He also said that the old Norcross High School was large enough on its own to house the entire GIVE program, if necessary. What is your response to that? Jeff Weiler is not now nor has he ever been an educator. The very nature of an alternative school and the fact that they serve students who have been paneled out of traditional schools due to their bad behavior speaks to the fact that you would not want large numbers of students in a given alternative school. In addition, what you are missing is that access to alternative schools is the big issue. Having one center is not best for our students. We currently have two GIVE Centers and I contend it would be better if we had a few more in other locations around the county as this would allow more students to continue their education while they are long-term suspension. (Remember, we do not provide transportation to the GIVE Centers.) It is better for the students, the school system, and the community if these students stay in school and do not fall behind.

5) Weiler disputed Mr. Wilbanks' contention that the school district administration buildings were overcrowded prior to the opening of the ISC. "We weren't overcrowded," he said. "I don't recall it being that bad. Now, could you use more [space]? Of course. But I would not agree with that." What is your response to that? Mr. Weiler has selective memory. In the five-and-a-half years Mr. Weiler worked for me there was not one time that he voiced any opposition to the ISC. In fact, he suggested several financial options. You should also know that the need for the ISC was established long before I became

superintendent and this facility has allowed us to better serve teachers and our growing student population in Gwinnett County Public Schools.