

LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION
ACT 46 STUDY COMMITTEE MINUTES
GTMCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
NOVEMBER 10, 2015

Committee members present: Pierre Laflamme, Jeff Bickford, Laura Miller, David Whitcomb (arrived at 6:58 p.m.), Peter Ingvaldstad, Matt Mitchell, Angie Evans, Raven Walters, Tim Sullivan, Becky Penberthy, Patti Hayford, Kristy Wrigley, Bill Sander
Others: Edith Beatty, Marilyn Frederick, Steve Sanborn, Thad Tallman, Toby Tallman, Earl Domina, Theresa Sinclair, minutes

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

P. LaFlamme called the meeting to order at 6:01.

B. Sander moved to approve the agenda, seconded by M. Mitchell and the motion was passed.

2. Approval of Consent Agenda Items (Committee Minutes 10-27-15)

B. Sander moved to approve the consent agenda, M. Mitchell seconded and the motion was passed.

3. HPES/JES Public Forums Debrief/Discussion, Planning for Future Public Forums

P. Laflamme reported that in Johnson it was decided that the information on Act 46 should be included in the Town Report.

R. Walters reported that nothing new jumped out from the forum in Hyde Park. T. Sullivan said that he learned that every town has to vote for the act to do the accelerated plan and get the benefits. He added that S. Sanborn did a great job explaining the process but it had gone over his head the first time.

M. Frederick asked if they would need to vote town by town and Sanborn replied yes and that this would be needed to do the accelerated program.

P. Ingvaldstad asked whether they would be able to do the accelerated program even if an advisable town voted against the act and Sanborn answered that if an advisable town voted no they could do accelerated still but not if a necessary town voted against the act. Sanborn said that if any town designated necessary votes no the Act would be brought down but if an advisable town voted no the rest of the towns could go forward as a Modified Union (MU). The town that voted no would still be part of the Supervisory Union (SU) but not part of the MU and wouldn't get the benefits associated with it.

Frederick asked if a town is considered necessary or advisable would be determined by the number of students or their grade level and Sanborn answered it wasn't necessary to decide then but if that they would need more than 50% of the community to vote yes to move into a MU.

Walters asked if the benefits of moving into a MU were the same as the conventional and Sanborn answered yes and that they would be eligible for small school grants and no tax caps for the first year Ingvaldstad asked if they would receive the 8 cent tax benefit if over 50% towns vote yes and they still have the MU starting in 2017 and Sanborn answered yes, the votes are counted by town. Sanborn

said that they could start at the MU at the same time as accelerated but they would get 8 cents off the tax rate, not 10 cents.

Ingvoldstad asked if once they are committed and vote at the April 12th meeting and the new board starts working in 2016 and becomes a MU in 2017 they would get the 8 cents and Sanborn said that according to everything he has heard once they are committed they would continue with the model as written. There was a possibility of changes with caps or that there would be rearranging of the choice issue but only these two things could be considered to adjust, not the incentives or penalties. The choice issue wouldn't effect this SU.

Sullivan asked what would happen if they vote for accelerated but one town voted no would they have to be a MU and Sanborn answered that they would have to draft the article as either/or and they would be a unified union (UU) under the accelerated model in 5 years. If one or two towns vote no they would be a MU. Laflamme asked if this was covered in article 12 and Sanborn replied no, article 1.

Bickford if they publish the articles in the town report he thinks they should also include known questions the community may have. Sanborn said they could include a section of FAQ and the committee would need to decide how to present the information. It is up to the committee to decide to stay on the path to move to accelerated if what committee wants to.

Bickford said that at the Johnson meeting teachers were anxious about how the changes may effect special ed services, the school boards and whether they would be relocated around district so it would be great to have specific communication to share with teachers. E. Beatty said that Penberthy had suggested at an earlier meeting to speak with teachers and that she and Raymond had gone to Eden and Hyde Park to start to do this with principals and there has been positive feedback. She heard that neighbors had been saying this would close the Eden school and there are other misconceptions out there that should be addressed. Bickford said that changes to special ed are a perception that is carrying over and he would be happy to go over this with Johnson. Sanborn said that Essex took three votes to pass and the support by teachers and the Essex Junction Teachers Association were big pieces that helped to turn the corner.

Ingvoldstad asked how many schools they had gone to and Beatty answered two, Hyde Park and Eden, and that their visits had been spontaneous but that they were able to talk the staff.

Sullivan said he had a couple opportunities assert that there would be no changes relative to the merger before the merger and asked how facilities management would be handled by Central Office (CO). Frederick said that she envisioned it working like a large central district where a facilities manager would oversee a maintenance core and disperse staff based on work orders with emergency issues getting top priority. Custodial staff would still usually be at their same building unless there is a long term illness or an option to cover a slot and take a short term bump. In large buildings there is still usually a head custodian in charge. Also during large construction projects over the summer when the custodial staff doesn't need to be onsite they could go around to help at the other buildings then all come back to catch up on work together to get the school open on time. The system would give the schools greater flexibility but she has never seen custodial staff just bumped around buildings, maintenance is different and would go to different schools. Ingvoldstad said that it was a great question and that four superintendents ago the MS/HS/GMTCC had switched to a maintenance manager system that saved them thousands. Frederick said that as a buying group the facilities manager would be able to get better deals on purchases. Ingvoldstad said that the facilities manager oversees both food and facility needs and Frederick added that food is handled a little differently but there is one person managing operations for the statewide food buying group.

Beatty said that Essex has two COs but it is more efficient to have one CO and one budget. Frederick added that sharing equipment just makes more sense. Beatty said that sharing technology also makes more sense so that the systems could work together. In all she thought that the structure would stay

the same in many ways but that there would be a lot of opportunities in the long term for greater efficiency.

Mitchell asked what handouts were given in Hyde Park and Johnson and Laflamme answered that none were given in Johnson but that they were told where to access the information online. Walters said that Hyde Park did have a power point presentation of seven slides. Several slides were specific to Hyde Park but they will be shared with the other committee members to use as a base for building their towns' presentations. Frederick will provide the financial aspects for the presentations.

Mitchell said that they had talked about giving some background on who is on the committee, how they were formed, where they are at and why and Sanborn replied that he didn't think they need to give a list of names but that they are representing each town based on the number of students, the charge of the committee and what their work is, a discussion on what Act 46 is and the options involved with it.

Ingvoldstad said that he highly recommended they go into each others' presentations to see for themselves what is happening. Sanborn said that it was nice to see the community members there and able to speak as needed.

4. Drafting Articles of Agreement

Article 8 - Sanborn said that he thought that it was important to go through all of the articles and make critical decisions on who is advisable and how the board is represented, whether there should be members at large or if everyone should be necessary. He felt it was pretty clear in Vermont that the proportional population by town should determine membership. There are three models that the committee could take: all towns necessary, some necessary/some advisable or all advisable. There is a different model for board membership also, a "hybrid members at large" configuration, if they were to choose an 18 member board every community would have two members with six members at large being voted on by everyone from any community. Another way of looking at defining the school board is when voting have everyone be at large and have everyone in the SU vote for members as a group, which is legal in VT. Proportionality would leave very little wiggle room as they would have to be within 10% of the population. Every town would have at least one board member. A chart in the articles gave an example of how this would work out in the SU but they could choose to do less and change the configuration.

Sander said that in Article 9 it said "town and village" but no villages in Lamoille North have schools. Sanborn said that that is what the law says but they can take it out.

Sullivan asked if the designation of board members would be set in stone or could be revised by a future board. Sanborn answered that they can revise it and that this was based on 2010 census data unless they decide to do all members at large with at least one per town. If all members were at large they would be selected from the top vote getters in the election. He thought that if all towns were advisable or some advisable then they can't be members at large because if members were chosen from a town that votes no then it would be an illegal vote because they would all need to be necessary to make it work.

Ingvoldstad asked if the highlighted section of the article would need a vote or a consensus and Sanborn answered consensus.

K. Wrigley said that they had discussed in Cambridge deals from 10-20 years ago that are inconsistent with federal regulations for activities taking place on school property and she was worried that the new board would be responsible for this if policies are grandfathered without being looked at and she was not comfortable with this. Ingvoldstad said there is no federal regulation for alcohol on school property and they would be liable, but he had never heard of a lawsuit. Beatty said that one of the conditions for events at Cambridge like weddings was that there had to be two sheriffs

on duty. Wrigley said that this could open them up to new liabilities and there should be a way to reword it and clarify what would be grandfathered. Bickford said that there should be some time to get this all in writing so that the new board knows what they are taking on and request changes. L. Miller asked about specifically naming Front Porch Forum (FPF) in the article as they may not be around in five years. Sanborn said that they will have their lawyer go over it as FPF is not a legal place for warnings. They would need to do three public warnings but it is up to the board to decide where to present them.

Sullivan asked if this was an opportunity to talk about the use of “unanimous” in Article 8, which he felt was a concern. Sanborn said that this could be a super majority instead because if they are looking at a school closing they would need to have over 75% of the vote.

Sullivan also referred to a section reading “conveyance of school property...” and said that he just as soon that this would be the end of the matter and why were they making a legacy of it. Sanborn said that he thought by law if they got a property back and wanted to sell it they would have to by law pay back the state for construction money and he wanted that looked over. Sullivan withdrew his objection. Sanborn said that if a SU wanted to sell a property back to the community and then lease it to the UU for 99 years it would not be legal. Property in Belvidere if not used for educational purposes could be sold back to the community before unification but they should talk to a lawyer for how this should be reflected. Ingvaldstad said this also related to the GMTCC youth program at the HS land and this piece make it attractive so it would be a good discussion to have about the property. Mitchell asked if there is a bond on a school and they decide not to use it and give to town where does bond go and Sanborn replied that whatever is left of the bond would go with the property. Sanborn said that the word “unanimous” would be removed as this is covered by the decision in Article 4 for a super majority. Beatty asked why it said over 75% and not 76% and Mitchell said that this was because 75% would be 12.5 board members. Sanborn said that some of the language would need to be gone over by their lawyer.

Sander said that in Cambridge the athletic fields are owned by the town and there are lots of little unknowns and unforeseen possibilities that they would need to search out. Sanborn replied that this is an aspect of unification that everyone struggles with, the town would continue to own the land and hopefully would still allow the SU to use it for educational purposes but it could happen that the town would decide not to.

Miller asked if LUMS and HS would have to be mentioned separately because they are not owned by just one town and Sanborn replied yes, and as there would be no town to return it to they could sell it and divide the proceeds jointly. Miller asked what would happen to the capital reserves, including in regards to the Sweet property which is contingent as being donated first to the historical society or potentially second to the school and Sanborn said that he believes they should add a piece saying that earmarked funds voted on by the community would be conveyed to the UU but used only for the purpose voted on unless the community votes to change this.

Miller asked how this would apply to a bus reserve for Eden and Frederick said that she would think whatever was reserve would be used to pay down the note for the existing buses as they still would have to pay off the buses. The Sweet house is a different scenario where there is a trust agreement donating the property to the historical society, if the historical society doesn't want it then it would be given to the school. Sanborn asked if there had been a vote to accept the property yet and Frederick answered no. This means that there is no earmark for it at this time. Frederick said that she will look into the matter and verify that the plan is for it to go first to the historical society, then to Cambridge Elementary and whether the third option would be for it to go back to the historical society or sold.

Ingvaldstad reminded everyone to get permission from Laflamme before speaking to keep the meeting progressing as scheduled.

Sullivan said that they had covered this last week and he thought the consensus was that in matters of earmarks they would have to meet their obligations but that it would be up to the new board to do to do this as they saw fit and asked whether they were reopening the issue. Sanborn replied that all items earmarked and voted on would be used as earmarked unless a new vote is done.

Wrigley asked if there were any revisions to Article 7 and Sanborn answered yes a sentence was added. Miller said that she had only brought it up to have an answer ready if it comes up at her next meeting because of capital reserves and the Sweet property.

Whitcomb asked what they had found out regarding a 99 year lease and Sanborn replied that the lease was not legal and they would have lawyers look into it. Having the town buy a property and then lease it back to the school would not be legal. Whitcomb said that he had been speaking with Bernie *** on the phone about the issue of selling a property for \$1 and the Ed Secretary is looking into handling this in a different way and that this is discussed in the recent issue of the News and Citizen but he can't find the article. He wanted to know if anything was known of how the Ed Secretary's lawyer has suggested handling this another way to handle this. Whitcomb said that he would be fighting it because he didn't want to see property being sold to the town for \$1 because the school founders would be turning over in their graves if they knew. Sanborn said that he would look into this. Whitcomb said that before they get into Eden they need to know what they talking about and why were they going into meetings if they didn't have this information yet. Sanborn said that the law says that they need to go into the communities to get their input and pursue the questions that come up. They wont have all of the answers now but they will return if they move forward as a committee. Whitcomb said that what bothers him is that the people that they talk to don't even know what they are voting on and that Ricky Wescomb had told him that night that the governor hadn't even gotten to read the articles before they were signed and never came back to the discussion. Sanborn said that it was a good question and that they are talking about this at the state but it doesn't apply to this discussion.

Article 9 - A section reading "bears to the aggregate" was changed to "proportionality." This would also change if it was decided to have board members be at large. The last line of paragraph 1 also would be effected by whether the committee decided to have the board operate at large or as a hybrid. Questions that the committee should consider are whether they want to stay proportional which gives them more flexibility to decide if a town should be advisable and whether they wanted to have 18 members or 15. The choice for 18 would be the closest way to get a proportional number as there would need to be less than 10% variance based on population.

Sullivan said that he thought that the at large principle was a great way to go forward as they are all our kids but the communities are not all one so this could be a sticking point for some people. He was comfortable that the SU was a good transitional way to go forward.

Sander said it was a real concern that if they decide to go forward with all board members being strictly at large then all of the votes would go to residents of Johnson and Cambridge as people may not know candidates from other towns as well. Bickford agreed and said that the risk that the communities are not represented is too great. Ingvaldstad said that he was asking this the other week and was looking for a way that the smallest towns wouldn't feel like they are being run over and what he had asked not legal but this is. Ingvaldstad said that he was willing if the towns were interested to review this in five years and make sure that the decision being made now still works at that point on calendar and to look at ways to protect future boards so that the smaller towns do not feel run over. He added that another thing he liked about having members not proportional then they would have to run and couldn't just show up on the day of the election. Candidates would have to be

competitive he hoped and show what they stand for so that they could get the best people on the board. Sanborn said that it didn't look like there was any interest in scheduling a discussion in this article of whether they should choose proportional or otherwise at this time.

Article 10 - According to the article 1/3 of the board would change each year. Sanborn said that this basically is saying that the change usually would happen on Town Meeting Day (TMD) but because they would be holding the vote on April 12th this would mean that they would be sure of having a 5 week term.

Sander asked how this was handled in specifically in Essex where there were candidates for the 3 year terms but no one ran for the 1 year term, in this case the UU will have to appoint someone for the position.

Miller said that she didn't understand why people would be voted on in April for a one year term wouldn't start the board start until 2017. Sanborn answered that they wouldn't because if they decide to unify then the Secretary of Education would come to the unity meeting and swear in the members to begin work on the organizational phase. Miller asked how these numbers were decided and Sanborn replied that there would need to be 6 people each with one, two and three year terms. Miller asked if they could make all the members with 1 year terms start in 2017 and Sanborn answered no because they would be just setting up and making decisions for organizing the new board. Miller asked if they could make all the terms for one year and starting in 2017 and Sanborn answered that they can't be legal SB members until their term starts.

Sullivan asked if they could all be 3 year terms and Sanborn said he would have to see if that were legal but they would have the whole board leave all at once. Under the article as written after three years there would be six new members every year and every term would be for three years.

The article was edited to include the vote date of April 12th instead of TMD and to change the phrase "plus the additional months" to "minus the additional month."

Article 11 - Sanborn said that the timing of this article is important because they can't send out petitions until after the state board has approved the articles of agreement to give candidates a 30-40 day window to get petitions out to be signed by the community.

Mitchell asked how this would be determined and Sanborn replied that everything would be decided by Australian ballot.

Ingvoldstad said that going back to Article 10 could they check again whether they couldn't vote by the person getting the most votes assigned for three years and the next highest votes for two years and so on if there are two positions for one year that no one runs for and whether he couldn't in this scenario run for all three positions. Sanborn answered that they were going to ask for a first vote where the top candidates would be assigned to 3, 2, or 1 year terms by vote totals. Ingvoldstad asked what they would do if they didn't want a three year term and Sanborn said he would have to look into it.

Whitcomb asked what lawyer they have been using and how much the committee owes them.

Sanborn answered that they are using Pedro *** and have not spent anything yet. Whitcomb asked why they are not using the state sponsored lawyers and Sanborn said that they are using the same decisions using the AE lawyer and the VSBA lawyer. Whitcomb asked what was wrong with using the Secretary of State's office and Sanborn replied that it is not their expertise to which Whitcomb countered that elections are their expertise. Beatty said that so far all of the legal advice they have been using has been free but before the articles are put to the ballot they will need to have a lawyer look over them officially.

Article 12 - Under article 12 the local school boards would continue to manage their schools without interference until 2017.

Sander asked in towns where two people run for 3 year terms how would this work, as the top two votes or as separate races. Sanborn said it would be the top two candidates for each terms race. Whitcomb asked how they would warn if they were up for election this year and Sanborn answered no, the term would continue until the following December 30 when they would no longer be a member because there would still be decisions to be made in those 6 months. Whitcomb asked if the same members could potentially be on both boards and Sanborn said that this was true in both districts, adding that the people here on the committee are probably going to be on the same board. Whitcomb asked how they will warn the April 12th meeting and Beatty said that they don't know whether the act is going to be voted for or not yet.

Article 13 - No changes or comments were made.

Article 14 - The tech center was added to the list of schools. This article shows why the current school boards would stay on until December 31, 2017 as it would allow the SU an extra month to clean up any last details.

Article 15 - Frederick is currently working on the appendix referred to in this article. Frederick asked why Pedro was the lawyer they were working with and not Paul and Beatty said she can go over that with her.

Article 16 - Appendix B is being prepared at this time.

Ingvaldstad asked whether Wolcott's school choice was a part of this and Sanborn replied that it would be reflected in the tuition statements.

Article 17 - This article can be changed as needed and allows for students to remain within their own school or relocated if appropriate because of geography, parents' petitions, or other factors. Bickford said that he liked that students could go to the school closest to them and not be bound to town lines drawn in England 300 years ago. If one school had 400 4th, 5th and 6th graders and another had 200 they could have the flexibility to redistribute students more evenly. Penberthy said that they could potentially do a K-2 school at Belvidere for Eden, Belvidere and Waterville.

Walters said that it was a great opportunity for flexibility but she would like to see students in Pre-K, K and 1st grade grandfathered through grade 6 because it reads that students could be reassigned which sounds scary. Sanborn said that they can add language to grandfather students through 6th grade but that if a parent wants to they could petition the UB to assign their children to a school better suited for their childcare needs. Miller said that this could be an issue for Cambridge where Smugglers Notch hires 850 people who could all petition to have their children attend Cambridge and be dropped off at the resort after school. Wrigley said that she likes that the article empowers the board to meet the changing needs of the district and puts right out there that they have the discretion to make these decisions.

Ingvaldstad said that he like the idea of having a grandfather clause for the first 5 years of school so that a student could start Kindergarten in one school and not be kicked out. Walters said that she would advocate considering that students in a town school at unification could stay if in school but what Ingvaldstad was suggesting would really constrict the UB. The article was changed to read that students enrolled in a union school at the time of unification would have the opportunity to stay. Mitchell said that this should include pre-K which is available at several of the schools. Miller said that she liked including that students can stay in their schools. Bickford said that he liked that it

empowers the board and that if someone lived close to Waterville they wouldn't be forced to attend Waterville instead of Johnson if they were happier there.

Article 18 - Sanborn said that he has heard in public meetings that there is interest in keeping a school advisable committee in place. Laflamme said that he would like to know what this looks like in Essex. Sanborn replied that he didn't know how this will be handled yet.

Ingvoldstad said that this is a critical idea if unification is going to work and that there should be a group organized around the principal so not have only the superintendent report to the board what the schools are doing. Sander commented that they won't be able to decide anything but could make recommendations and appeal to voter without any real authority. Beatty said that there is a lot less local control happening because most policies are coming from the VSBA and there are procedures for how they are carried out at the local school level.

Ingvoldstad said that an example of a regional advisable board can be seen at the tech center where there is a group representing the five sending high schools. In 20 years the only time he has seen the SB vote against the advisable board was on a hiring decision.

Penberthy said this is a common idea and another example is stakeholders and that they should think outside the box to include police, business owners and other community leaders.

Sander said that the reason that the regional advisable board at the tech center works is because the HS board is going to accept their recommendations unless it is an exceptional occurrence. Otherwise it is an empty gesture that makes the people feel good but has no real power.

Wrigley said that she likes to think of it in a different context and wonders if it isn't what the board members should be doing anyway in their town under their responsibilities as an elected board. In the towns with fewer board members this role could be assisted by having more members at large.

Whitcomb said that the advisable board at GMTCC will cease to exist under the new system. Under the UB everything connected to this school right now from the advisable board through the superintendents office will cease to exist. Sanborn said that under state law there needs to be an advisable board at the tech center and it would continue to exist under the UB. Whitcomb said that the new board could set up any advisable board they want. Sanborn replied that it probably be many of the same people as were there that night. Whitcomb answered that they have no idea who would be on the board and once they take control then any advisable board working before would cease to exist and the UB could set up any board want unless this is specified within the articles.

Walters suggested wording of the article strikes a good balance between specificity and broadness and encourages public participation and involvement without limiting how this is accomplished so she thinks good as it is.

Ingvoldstad said that his personal opinion was that having an advisable board meet with the principal once a month like a committee then come back to the whole board could be the UB members but also should include someone from Smugglers Notch and other members of the community.

Laflamme said that it sounds like there is a well establish system with the tech center and that they don't want to change the complexion and necessity or non-necessity of representation on the town level and that these are two separate issues.

Ingvoldstad said state law says that they have to have an advisable board at the tech center so it isn't going to change under the act. He added that he thinks he likes the idea of having more perspective at the schools and he would like to focus this idea that they would meet at the school level and this be done in a knowledgeable way like committee talking about policies. They would make sure principal and people focused on elementary schools would have a direct link with the UB so they aren't way up in the clouds not knowing what is happening in the schools. He heard the previous night that the teachers believe that they won't have someone to come to to talk about their issues in the classroom and they need to make sure that can happen.

Sanborn said that the article states that they shall create strategies and structures for representation to receive input from the schools and that this gives the board flexibility.

Laflamme said that they should hope for best but plan for worst for protection.

Sanborn said that this is reflected in the line "shall create strategies." Ingvaldstad said that this is something that needs to be discussed because the public is going to come back and say what strategies have they put in place for them. Penberthy stated that shall=must.

Whitcomb asked for a copy of the articles of agreement from Essex and Sanborn said that they are available on their website as well as the Agency of Education's website where Essex and Mount Mansfield's articles are posted.

Laflamme asked if their boards were proportional or at large and Sanborn answered that they are proportional and that this circles back to whether they wanted to designate the towns as all necessary, some necessary/some advisable or all advisable. If an advisable town voted no then the other four could form a modified union and move ahead and the town voting no would continue to have a SB.

Ingvaldstad asked if this would apply even if there are less than 900 students in the towns voting yes and would they still get the 8 cents and Sanborn said yes because there would still be 900 students within the SU but the 8 cents would only be for those communities that voted yes.

Miller asked if when they are deciding whether a town should be advisable or necessary what would happen if they decided all should be necessary but some voted no, could they then change those towns to advisable. Sanborn said that Mount Mansfield voted all necessary first time but two voted no so the new committee changed to all advisable and on the revote only Huntington voted no and has their own SB and none of the benefits.

Laflamme asked if they could discuss this more at the next meeting because the time was getting late.

Whitcomb asked for copies of the information to be mailed for them to look over.

Sullivan asked if as they were on the path into this could they make a consensus if they would like to make a decision to table the topic or continue. It was decided that the committee would continue this discussion for a few more minutes.

Wrigley asked why wouldn't they just make all the towns advisable and Sanborn answered that they wouldn't be able to do accelerated.

Bickford said that the only potential downside would be if the two largest vote no, this could feel weird for the community but may not necessarily be a downside but they could change their minds and say just kidding and rejoin.

Miller said if all said were necessary then it would be all for one and one for all so if they don't come to a consensus then everyone would be on board together.

Ingvaldstad said that he was worried about passing budgets future, when the MS and HS did their renovations they passed every budget since then because they asked but on the other hand when SU started it was with a core group then other towns joined. He felt it is critical that the largest towns are behind this and necessary and others advisable because he didn't think they can do this without Cambridge, Hyde Park and Johnson as they have the largest populations.

Walters asked if only the largest towns are necessary then would they be taking the tax benefit away from the smaller towns instead of making all advisable so the benefits would be available to everyone.

Sander asked if one or two voted no then what would happen to the students in those towns when they are in HS. Sanborn answered they would still be in the SU and able to attend the school but would have a separate SB from the UB. Sander asked if they couldn't vote on the budget and Sanborn said that would need clarification.

Penberthy said that she thought that if Waterville voted no then they would keep their three member board and their budget would stay with them. Sanborn said that they would be assessed a per student cost.

Sander asked if they would have school choice and Sanborn said that they would not. Sanborn said that he will check into it and look at Mount Mansfield because he believes that Huntington still sends a board member.

Laflamme asked for a consensus on the matter. Mitchell said that he felt it should be all necessary or all advisable and they didn't want to be split up while coming together. Sander agreed. Sanborn said they could make a decision, still go to the lawyer and then have a formal vote. Miller and Hayford said it should be one or the other. Wrigley, Bickford, Mitchell, Walters, Penberthy, Sullivan and Ingvoldstad said all advisable while Whitcomb said all necessary. A consensus was not reached and the matter will be discussed again on November 30th.

5. Public Comment

T. Tallman said that in the discussion on board representation it sounded like the larger towns like Hyde Park would more get votes while smaller towns like Belvidere wouldn't get representation. Sanborn replied that it was written into the articles that towns would "at no time have less than one" board member and that they could write into the hybrid plan that every town has a voice.

Tallman also asked about when in the discussion about selling a property back to the town for \$1 how this would effect Belvidere if they would have to pay back portion of construction loan. Sanborn said that the property could be sold back to the town \$1 and if Belvidere then sells the property they would have to pay back the grant if they don't keep it for five years. Tallman asked if a 99 year lease was not legal how can the tech center property in Hardwick be legal and Sanborn said he will check into that.

E. Domina asked why they didn't do three board members from each town to reach 18 instead of two and several at large and Sanborn answered that they needed to have some at large members under the hybrid model. If they chose proportional it would need to be within 10% margin of error of the population.

Domina asked about the Sweet house fund and if after five years the board could decide that they no longer wanted it could it just be wiped out and Sanborn answered that if an item has been voted on as an earmark then it must be voted on by the community to change. Domina asked if the percentages could change and Sanborn not for earmarks unless community votes to change the purpose that it is earmarked for.

6. Next Agenda

Reporting on the public forms, Article 1 and a first draft of the articles will be discussed at the next meeting held on November 30th at 6:00 p.m. at the GMTCC.

7. Adjourn

MOTION: M. Mitchell moved to adjourn at 8:36, J. Bickford seconded, and the motion was passed.

Minutes submitted by Theresa Sinclair