

Lamoine Withdrawal Committee Meeting with RSU Board August 27, 2012  
RSU Central Office 6:30 p.m.  
Minutes

All LWC members present.

6:30 Met with attorney Bearor to be updated on language changes.

8:52 Meeting of LWC with RSUB; second negotiation session

RSU delivered a SECOND Draft 2 (Draft 2 Revised, dated August 24) to members of the WD Comm at 8:52 p.m. Neither the RSUB nor the Lamoine WD Comm had a chance to read these two documents. The RSU's Draft 2 Revised was offered without their reviewing Lamoine's Draft 2.

RSU's lawyer insisted on trying to read both of these side by side during the meeting.

Each section was reviewed. We asked the Board to indicate whether each section was acceptable or, if not, what was objectionable. ("Does the Board object to this section?"). They would not discuss or vote on the acceptability. Their lawyer said, "The Board will not vote on sections. It will consider whether the whole document is acceptable at the end".

The lawyer responded, for the most part; the Chair often nodded assent and encouraged the process.

No Objections were voiced by the Board regarding the following (some of which had minor changes that still need to be confirmed); Draft 2 Revised (buff copy) also has somewhat different language for a number of sections:

- 1 (may need to revise #3 to narrow it)
- 2
- 3 All sections except D (high school); need to add 504 language
- 4 add: "within five years of the date of withdrawal."
- 5
- 6
- 7 A (their new format drops B and revised A; see Draft 2 Revised)
- 8
- 10
- 11 (Draft 2 Revised has new language)
- 12 A, B, and D (subject to insertion of updated financial figures reflecting "reciprocity")
- 13 (drop intro phrase to paragraph 3)
- 14 (listed as 15) All except 4, Termination

Sticking Points that we think remain (be we're not sure because they would not commit one way or another:

3 D Language regarding assurance of high school opportunities for Lamoine students (from RSU 24; Ells; MDIRSS)

7 C New (a) and (b) added by Lamoine (reimbursement for transp)

9 RSU insists on requiring Lamoine to pay for more admin contracts; D. Bridgham suggested we "make an offer" in the context of signing on with the RSU for continuing services like Food Service. We asked him to provide data on the costs and quality of such services so we could decide if this approach would be productive for the town.

12 C Lamoine's claim of reimbursement for 4 IT teachers

14-4 (listed as 15-4) Termination: Lam seeks 1 year, as per law; RSU seeks open-ended)

Gordon agreed to inform the RSU Superintendent of this summary to see if she agreed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Doug Stewart, Secretary