

April 23, 2008

Commissioner Gendron  
Maine Department of Education  
23 State House Station  
Augusta, Maine 04333-0023

RECD APR 30 2008

Commissioner,

I have received your letter of April 11, 2008 responding to the Consolidation Plan submitted by the Litchfield, Sabattus, Wales, and Oak Hill CSD #15. Your letter requested we resubmit a revised Plan to address a number of items you listed as either needing correction or were not included in the Plan we submitted. After reviewing your letter, and our Plan a number of times, I believe we have already fully addressed each of the items listed. Please allow me to respond to each of the issue you addressed in your letter.

Item 1: section 2 of the Plan – the only differences between the version you provided and asked we place in our Plan is you rounded to a single decimal place the % deviation of voting power, while our schedule went to 2 places. Additionally, you have shown the column % population where we “hid” it in the schedule we provided. This has no impact on the numbers, or the ability of our citizens to understand our allocation method. It is requested that this section be accepted as printed and submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Item 2: section 6 of the Plan – the Plan clearly states that no debt of any SAU will be transferred to the RSU. The mere fact that we did not provide a list of outstanding debt in no way changes this “clear direction” to the RSU board that no debt of current SAU’s is to be moved to the new RSU. It is requested that this section be accepted as printed and submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Item 3: section 7 of the Plan – you have asked for a blank sheet of paper to be added to the Plan. Section 7-A paragraph 2 of the Plan includes the following:

“At the time of this Plan’s writing there were no employees of the existing SAUs who fall into this category. However, should it become known that there are some, or a new employee is hired that fits this category, Exhibit 7-B will be established and kept updated.”

This continues to be the case. It is requested that the request for attachment of Exhibit 7-B (a blank sheet of paper) be withdrawn and the lack of such not be reason for delaying approval of our Plan as submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Item 4: section 12 of the Plan – you have asked for an estimate of cost savings to be achieved by the formation of the RSU. It is the belief of every member of the RPC that consolidation and formation of an RSU will not result in any savings within several years. We have listed, in the spirit of full disclosure and openness with our citizens those items which we believe will result in increased costs, and also identified steps already taken in the recent past by our current SAU’s to reduce costs. Since we do not believe that cost savings will be experienced anytime in the next several years, if ever, it is

requested that you withdrawal this objection and approve our Plan as submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Item 5: section 13-B of the Plan – our plan was drafted and submitted on the assumption that the Governor’s pledge to modify the cost sharing options would in fact be in place prior to the stand up date of the new RSU. LD-2323 as signed by the Governor allows for our stated cost sharing formula to be used. It is therefore requested that this objection also be withdrawn and our Plan submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup> be approved.

Item 6: section 13-C of the Plan – as we drafted our Plan we felt the legislation currently in effect was clear enough on the issue of how to determine which board members would serve how many initial years. If it was lacking LD-2323, as signed by the Governor, is very clear on the method to be used in determining lengths of initial terms of RSU board members. Therefore it is requested that this request also be withdrawn and our Plan as submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup> be approved.

We have scheduled, and notified citizens of public informational meetings to begin on May 5<sup>th</sup> to educate them on our Plan, and to answer questions they may have. It is our stated intent to have our Plan approved on June 10<sup>th</sup>, or voted upon, and then elect RSU Board members in November should our citizens approve the Plan. Additional delays would move this timeline well into next year and not allow the new Board members enough time to properly carry out their responsibilities in order to stand up the new organization on July 1, 2009.

It is requested that our Plan, as submitted on March 14<sup>th</sup>, and to which you replied on April 11<sup>th</sup> be approved by you as being in compliance with current statutory requirements and allow our citizens to vote their desire on June 10<sup>th</sup>. Due to the compressed timeline it is requested that your response be provided within a few days at most. We are continuing to hold the public informational meetings, and would prefer we discuss an approved Plan and not a non-approved Plan that we can not bring before them for their approval on June 10<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully;

Robert E. English  
Chair,  
Litchfield, Sabattus, Wales, and Oak Hill CSD #15 RPC.

cc: State Senator John Nutting  
State Senator Earle McCormick  
State Representative Nancy Smith  
State Representative Scott Lansley  
Superintendent Susan Hodgdon  
Bill Cumming, RPC Facilitator  
RPC Members