

***Durham, Freeport, & Pownal
Reorganization Planning Committee
Meeting Minutes
June 18, 2008
Pownal Elementary School~Pownal***

Members Present: Paul Schumann, Allan Purinton, Jennifer Kaplan, Laurie Poissonnier, Sherry Dietrich, , Rick White, Cliff Ruprecht, , Nelson Larkins, Amber Snell, Wesley Bennett

Advisors Present: Shannon Welsh, Superintendent of Schools, Durham; Diane Boucher, Business Manager, Freeport/Pownal, Joe Feeney, Superintendent/Principal, Pownal

Also Present: Bob Kautz, Facilitator; Cathy Messmer, Business Manager, Durham; and no members of the public

Not Present: Fred Palmer, Rhonda O'Shea, Tim Giddinge, Elaine Tomaszewski, Superintendent of Schools, Freeport; John Gleason

- The meeting convened at 7:08 pm.
- Bob explained an update report was due to the Commissioner on June 13th and after reviewing the information with the Steering Committee due to time constraints, the report was sent via email. Bob asked the committee to review the letter and if any adjustments need to be suggested. The committee agreed this was appropriate.
- The agenda was reviewed and it was explained the facility report will be handed out at the end of the meeting so members could review before the next meeting.
- The previous meeting minutes were reviewed and accepted.
- There were no questions asked from the previous meeting.
- There were no public comments or questions.
- The Finance Subcommittee reviewed the changes that were made from the previous meeting regarding Section 6 and 13. Cliff explained how the items were distributed within the Plan. It was explained that some of the figures will be updated within the Section as they were supplied recently to the Finance Subcommittee. There are other figures that will be updated once they are received regarding the new Durham Elementary School. It was explained the mold repairs for Freeport will need to be placed in the correct area depending on what the state decides to reimburse. It will not affect the voters as it will either be reimbursed by the State or Freeport will assume this debt. There was question about how the state loans were allocated and if there was a contract. There was explanation that loans were allocated by the State Board and it is certified by the State of and the funding is guaranteed. There was discussion about bond dates and how they can be bumped to the next fiscal year. It was suggested that Durham's State portion for the new elementary school may need to be addressed within the Plan and put under Sections C & D as it could be possible it will be allocated in the next fiscal year. The issued

year for Durham's elementary school within the Plan is incorrect and changed to 2009. It was suggested there be language set under C & D be placed for this possibility. It was explained the RPC secretary would receive an update for Section 6 for placement within the Plan. It was suggested the last paragraph in Section 6 needs to have a colon. Section 13 was discussed. It was suggested that the heading be stated M.S.A.D #62 Land Transfer. Sherry had a question regarding deeds and surveys. The attorneys within the RPC were posed this question for their advisement. It was explained there is not usually a survey that is incorporated in the transfer of a deed. It is believed that if Pownal wanted the land back then Pownal would need to take on the costs. It was explained this section was added because Pownal is SAD and this had not been addressed within the Plan. Bob asked if there were any other issues members wanted to discuss. It was suggested that 13 B should state the same as the other paragraphs. After some discussion the term "member" was questioned and it was suggested the language be tightened up. It was asked if there was adding a definition for the word "member" added to the definitions. It was also suggested that the wording from the attorneys placed in section 3 was "each municipality" would replace member in Section 13 B second paragraph. It was questioned whether or not there should be language regarding cost sharing and state valuation. It was asked if it would be appropriate to state the RSU would use the applicable mil rate for a year and then the RSU would review the cost sharing method. It was stated the RPC may be engineering too much of a fix. It was asked to leave as is. There were more consistencies regarding numbering in section 13 B. In regards to changes to cost sharing method it was suggested there should be two scenarios and they should be numbered as such. The scenarios would be numbered and the word "or" would be ";or" will be placed after the second bullet. In the last section the wording "town" was used and will be replaced with "municipalities" and the word state regarding to the State of Maine will be capitalized in any places needed. Shannon explained she would review the Plan and it will be cleaned up by the RPC Secretary and sent again to attorneys for a final review. There was some changing in bullets and grammatical language. It was asked if there were other sections of concern and it was suggested that numbering should be cleaned up and Nelson offered to give his Plan for help with correction. Section 14 had language that had been previously stricken but will now remain within the Plan. There were more grammatical errors that were reviewed and changed. There were no other concerns voiced by the RPC members.

- Voting deadlines were discussed and there was concern about having a special referendum. There was some discussion regarding voting and the process to run for a Board. It was asked for the process to be reviewed. It was explained that the Plan vote stands now would be mid-September for the municipalities and paid for by the state. If approved, the Plan will then be issued to the State for certification. The next step would be election of Board members. It was agreed there can not be an assumption that the RSU Board will be up and running in November. Bob stated he would try to get more

definite information and there may be a draft timeline from another municipality the RPC could review. There was more discussion on the proposed timeline and the time frame of approval of the Plan by the State. It was confirmed Bob would have a timeline for the next meeting. There were no other questions on the draft plan; the plan in its entirety will be reviewed and voted on by the RPC. As well as a proposed timeline and the facilities study. The facilities study was handed out for review.

- The meeting adjourned at 8:03pm

Respectfully submitted by S.Brewer 6.21.08