

OPEN SESSION MINUTES  
MINUTEMAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL DISTRICT  
REGULAR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING  
MARCH 15, 2016 6:30 PM  
PAUL REVERE ROOM, MINUTEMAN HIGH SCHOOL

**Present:**

Jeff Stulin, Chair (Needham)	Jennifer Leone (Lancaster)
Carrie Flood, Vice-Chair (Concord)	Sharon Antia (Lincoln) (arrived at 6:45 PM)
David Horton, Secretary (Lexington)	Jack Weis (Belmont) (arrived 6:36 PM)
Alice DeLuca (Stow)	Pam Nourse (Acton)
Ford Spalding (Dover)	Doug Gillespie (Weston)
Vince Amoroso (Boxborough)	
Judy Taylor (Carlisle)	
Dave Manjarrez (Sudbury) (left at 8:40 PM)	
David O'Connor (Bolton)	

Absent: Sue Sheffler (Arlington), Mary Ellen Castagno (Wayland)

**Also present:** Ed Bouquillon, Kevin Mahoney, Jack Dillon, Elizabeth Rozan, Bob McLaughlin, Diane Dempsey, Sheila Nagle, Werner Fritz, Bill Blake, Nancy Pierce, Al St. George

**1. CALL TO ORDER: OPEN SESSION**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM; he later noted that the meeting was being recorded by Mr. Manjarrez.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Bob McLaughlin, Belmont Warrant Committee and member of the former Regional Agreement Amendment Subcommittee (RAAS), expressed his concern with the possible vote listed on the agenda for a contingency to approve bonding under 16 (n). He explained that this was not allowed as presented, under the new Regional Agreement, quoting from Section IV (I) of the document (pg. 6). "If one or more communities vote disapproval of the debt, the Committee, by a majority of the weighted vote, may then seek authorization for the debt via Ch. 71, Sec. 16, Subsection (n)," as shown in Attachment A. He expressed his view that a district wide vote is divisive and expensive, and suggested checking with bond counsel regarding the appropriateness of this possible vote.

[Mr. Weis arrived at 6:36 PM.]

**3. CHAIR'S REPORT, *Jeff Stulin***

**a. Comments from the Chair**

The Chair pointed out that there are a number of concerns about when various clauses in the new Regional Agreement take effect and noted that it is complicated. He clarified that the state confirmed it was necessary to recalculate the FY 17 assessments based on the language of the new agreement, that weighted voting would not take effect until July 1, 2016. It was noted that the Agreement indicates the weighted votes would be calculated by July 1, without specifying the year, and the Chair clarified that

initial implementation would be July 1, 2016, as this is the first July 1 of the new Regional Agreement, not 2017 as originally stated. He also noted that in order to incur debt under 16 (d), a 2/3 vote of all School Committee members of the District, without regard to weighted vote, is required. This means 11 affirmative votes. In response to a question, it was clarified that postponing the bonding vote was delayed to have assurance that the Regional Agreement was in place, with the exemption in effect that the departing towns would not be liable for new debt incurred by the District. It was also clarified that these departing representatives still have the right to vote as School Committee members, until their departure effective July 1, 2017.

#### **4. PRINCIPAL'S REPORT, *Jack Dillon***

##### **a. Update on MCAS Dates and Possible Vote**

Mr. Dillon explained that the DESE's website indicates they are still behind in setting the MCAS dates. Therefore, no vote was needed at this time.

##### **b. Approval of Overnight Field Trip: Environmental Technology Program to Eastham, MA, May 17-20, 2016**

Mr. Dillon explained the details of this trip, pointing out it is anticipated that 27 students and 3 chaperones will be attending. The member from Lincoln noted that she served as chaperone when her son went on this trip, and she expressed the opinion that it was both highly educational and fun. The Superintendent confirmed that this trip meets all policy requirements. The following vote was then taken:

##### **ACTION 2016 # 20**

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Gillespie)

To approve the Overnight Field Trip of the Environmental Technology Program to Eastham, MA May 17-20, 2016 as presented.

**Vote:** Unanimous

#### **5. ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT, *Kevin Mahoney***

##### **a. FY 17 Budget Update: Revision to FY 17 Revenue Plan and Town Assessments**

Mr. Mahoney affirmed what the Chair had referenced, namely the confirmation from the DESE that the FY 17 Assessments needed to be calculated according to the new Regional Agreement. He explained the details of the calculation, pointing out that there were no changes to the revenue plan amounts, but the dollars were redistributed. The operating costs were calculated using a rolling average based on the four most recent annual October 1 enrollment figures. The calculation factor for capital assessments is based on enrollment (4 year rolling average), FY 17 Total Foundation Enrollment, and Minuteman Enrollment plus Community Foundation Enrollment. Withdrawing towns will not be assessed for any new capital costs incurred after December 2015. He also explained that he notified all the towns of the changes, and notified all towns with an increase as well. The following vote was taken:

##### **ACTION 2016 #21**

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Spalding)

To recertify the approval of the FY 17 Budget Assessments (v. 6.3, dated 3.15.16), as presented

**Vote:** Unanimous

##### **b. Notification of Retirement Board COLA Consideration**

Mr. Mahoney explained that there was no action required by the School Committee, but that he was notifying them of the Minuteman District Vocational Technical School District Retirement Board's intention to consider and vote at their April 28, 2016 meeting whether or not to increase the COLA up to 3% on the first \$13,000 of the retirement allowance for eligible retirees of the system.

##### **c. Notification of Disposal of Vehicles**

Mr. Mahoney explained that there was no action required by the School Committee, but that he was informing them of the disposal of three vehicles, as noted in the packet.

**d. Acceptance of Grant: \$500,000 from the Commonwealth's 2016 Mass. Skills Capital Grant Program**

Mr. Mahoney explained that Dr. Bouquillon had sent out information about this grant receipt, and that now the School Committee needs to formally accept it. The Superintendent explained that the funds will be used to purchase equipment for the Advanced Manufacturing Program, and further explained in response to a question, that the Metal Fabrication and Advanced Manufacturing Programs have been combined and will use the new equipment in the combined program that currently exists, and that the funds need to be expended by June 30. He commended the efforts of Michelle Roche, Steve Sharek, Maryanne Ham, and Joe Pitta for securing this grant. He also noted that there were letters of support, including one from the Superintendent of the Lexington Public Schools. The member from Stow expressed her enthusiasm that Minuteman was a recipient, and the member from Dover noted that the Governor has \$85M for these grants, and hopes that Minuteman will be eligible for a continuation grant in the future. The following vote was then taken:

**ACTION 2016 #22**

Moved (Spalding) and seconded (DeLuca)

To accept the \$500,000 grant from the Commonwealth's 2016 Mass. Skills Capital Grant Program, as presented.

**Vote:** Unanimous

**e. Acceptance of OPEB Trust Agreement**

Mr. Mahoney pointed out that there are a number of steps related to addressing the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liabilities. On July 7, 2015, the School Committee voted to adopt the provisions of MGL Ch. 32 B Sec 20 that allow the local option for the District to establish the OPEB Liability Trust Fund. The next step is the drafting of the OPEB Trust Agreement. He called attention to the draft provided to the School Committee for review. He pointed out that it has been reviewed by Attorney Brian Fox of Murphy, Hesse, Toomey and Lehane, and noted that the School Committee can approve the form of the agreement and name the trustees in accordance with the Trust Agreement. He emphasized that this draft proposes the composition of the Board of Trustees, but the School Committee has discretion in establishing who the Trustees will be.

The motion to accept was moved (Leone) and seconded (Spalding). In response to questions, Mr. Mahoney pointed out that a line item in the amount of \$50K was funded as the initial deposit in the FY 16 Budget, and that another \$50K was appropriated in the FY 17 Budget. With regard to a concern about board composition and expertise in investment management, he pointed out that the fund would be professionally managed eventually, and that the School Committee would have sole discretion on trustee composition. Concern was raised about item 6.1.4 of the draft, which indicates that the trustees could borrow or raise funds. It was clarified that the withdrawing towns would have no obligation for any funds. Why the trust would need to borrow or raise funds at all was questioned. Cash-anticipation borrowing was suggested as one possible reason. It was pointed out that the trust would be independent, and fund obligations would be absorbed by the trust, not the District. Mr. Mahoney also explained that he got the draft from another district, and that it was reviewed by the attorney. The member from Belmont suggested that the trust is comparable to a Stabilization Fund. He raised a concern about how the District would cull funds from the trust, for what purpose, and under whose administration. Mr. Mahoney called attention to Article 2, which describes the sole purpose and the fiduciary responsibility, and noted the small steps that have been taken so far to establish it. The appointing authority and the role of the Treasurer were pointed out; it was reiterated that the mechanics to expend funds were unclear. The member from Boxborough cited his experience with the Town of Boxborough and with the Acton-Boxborough Regional School District, and pointed out that these trusts grew out of a change in the GASB regulations from 2008. Having a trust in place, with a reasonable reserve set aside serves as a "ballast" to satisfy auditors' concerns, so that bond rating can be maintained. It was explained that the funds are invested and the interest earned reverts to the funds. The member from Belmont summarized that though

he understands the trust would involve dedicated funds, with interest, and that it would be managed under the guidance of trustees with fiduciary responsibility, and power only to disburse funds to the Minuteman District to pay for costs at the request of the Minuteman School Committee, his view was that this draft of the OPEB Trust Agreement was unduly murky. Given that there was no critical timing, for a vote, it was suggested that this be tabled for further review. The member from Dover noted that Dover and Wayland recently established trust agreements that could be reviewed. The following vote was then taken:

**ACTION 2016 #23**

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Weis)

To table the establishment of an OPEB Trust for Minuteman High School and the approval of the form of the OPEB Trust Agreement as presented, until next meeting

**Vote:** Unanimous

**6. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT, *Ed Bouquillon***

**a. Update on DESE Approval of Regional Agreement**

The Superintendent noted that the Commissioner sent out an approval letter, with the signed Regional Agreement dated 3.11.16, at 4:00 PM on Friday. There were no questions.

**b. Bonding for the Building Project**

**Vote #1: To bond under M.G.L. Ch. 71, Sec. 16 (d)**

The following motion was made (DeLuca) and seconded (Spalding), and was read aloud:

VOTE: That the Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical School District (the "District") hereby appropriates the amount of \$144,922,478 for the purpose of paying costs of designing, constructing and originally equipping a new district school, to be located at 758 Marrett Road, Lexington, Massachusetts, and for the payment of all other costs incidental and related thereto (the "Project"), which school facility shall have an anticipated useful life as an educational facility for the instruction of school children of at least 50 years, and for which the District may be eligible for a school construction grant from the Massachusetts School Building Authority ("MSBA"), said amount to be expended at the direction of the School Building Committee. To meet this appropriation, the District is authorized to borrow said amount, under and pursuant to Chapter 71, Section 16(d) of the General Laws, and the District Agreement, as amended, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The District acknowledges that the MSBA's grant program is a non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need as determined by the MSBA, and any Project costs the District incurs in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the District and its member municipalities; provided further that any grant that the District may receive from the MSBA shall not exceed the lesser of (i) forty four and three quarters percent (44.75%) of eligible, approved Project costs, as determined by the MSBA, or (ii) the total maximum grant amount determined by the MSBA, and that the amount of borrowing authorized pursuant to this vote shall be reduced by any grant amount set forth in the Project Funding Agreement that may be executed between the District and the MSBA.

FURTHER VOTED: That within seven (7) days from the date on which this vote is adopted, the Secretary be and hereby is instructed to notify the Boards of Selectmen of each member town of the District as to the amount and general purposes of the debt herein authorized, as required by the District Agreement and by Chapter 71, Section 16(d) of the General Laws. The secretary is further instructed to send the draft warrant article language to the 16 Boards of Selectmen.

The Superintendent noted that this was reviewed by Bond Counsel, District Counsel, and was approved by MSBA. The Chair explained that since a supermajority of all member towns (11 affirmative votes) is required, as noted earlier, he would call the vote by roll call. The member from Lincoln asked about the address in Lexington, not Lincoln, and the Superintendent noted that this is the current mailing address of the school, and it will remain the same. With regard to the legalities of the withdrawing towns voting to bond, it was noted that there was no legal mechanism to take away the voting power of members

intending to leave the District, but that the towns do not need to place the debt item on their Town Meeting Warrant. The absence of a vote is deemed a yes vote. The member from Boxborough further explained that 11 affirmative votes are required to authorize debt under 16 (d) and the representatives from the withdrawing towns remain School Committee members until July 1, 2017, according to the newly approved Regional Agreement. He confirmed the spirit of the Board of Selectmen discussions, and in that spirit, he explained that Boxborough will not schedule the debt article on their warrant; in 60 days their position will be deemed approved, and he urged other withdrawing towns to do the same. To the question of what a vote to “pass over” would mean, it was noted that an absence of a vote is deemed a yes vote. The member from Sudbury suggested confirming this with a review of town bylaws. In response to a question about debt exclusion, the Superintendent confirmed that this is up to the towns. The member from Boxborough stated that the *School Committee members* are voting on the debt at this meeting, not the towns. The vote of members from departing towns does not obligate the towns in any way, but it meets the requirement of the 2/3 affirmative votes. The member from Sudbury referenced his letter, placed at the table per his request, as shown in Attachment B, and noted that with more than 11 votes, he will abstain, but if there are not sufficient votes, he would step up to vote to approve funding under 16 (d) only in order to facilitate moving the process forward for the benefit of all 16 towns. The member from Concord noted that the true benefit is for future students. The following vote was then taken:

**ACTION 2016 #24**

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Ford)

To bond for the Building Project under MGL Ch. 71, Sec. 16 (d), as presented

By Roll Call:

Gillespie	yes
Nourse	yes
Weis	yes
Antia	yes
Leone	yes
Horton	yes
Flood	yes
Stulin	yes
DeLuca	yes
Spalding	yes
Amoroso	yes
Taylor	yes
Manjarrez	abstain
O’Connor	yes

**Vote:** 13 in favor, 1 abstention, with 14 members present PASSES

**c. Possible Vote: To bond for the Building Project under MGL Ch. 71, Sec. 16 (n), contingent upon the failure to authorize debt under 16 (d), as presented**

**Vote #2: To bond under M.G.L. Ch. 71, Sec. 16 (n) – contingent upon disapproval of debt authorized under Section 16(d)**

The following motion was made (DeLuca) and seconded (Flood), and was read aloud:

VOTE: That, contingent upon the disapproval of the debt authorized by the Committee under Chapter 71, Section 16(d) of the General Laws, the Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical School District (the “District”) hereby appropriates the amount of \$144,922,478 for the purpose of paying costs of designing, constructing and originally equipping a new district school, to be located at 758 Marrett Road, Lexington, Massachusetts, and for the payment of all other costs incidental and related thereto (the “Project”), which school facility shall have an anticipated

useful life as an educational facility for the instruction of school children of at least 50 years, and for which the District may be eligible for a school construction grant from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (“MSBA”), said amount to be expended at the direction of the School Building Committee. To meet this appropriation, the District is authorized to borrow said amount, under and pursuant to Chapter 71, Section 16(n) of the General Laws, and the District Agreement, as amended, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The District acknowledges that the MSBA’s grant program is a non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need as determined by the MSBA, and any Project costs the District incurs in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the District and its member municipalities; provided further that any grant that the District may receive from the MSBA shall not exceed the lesser of (i) forty four and three quarters percent (44.75%) of eligible, approved Project costs, as determined by the MSBA, or (ii) the total maximum grant amount determined by the MSBA, and that the amount of borrowing authorized pursuant to this vote shall be reduced by any grant amount set forth in the Project Funding Agreement that may be executed between the District and the MSBA.

The debt authorized by this vote of the Committee shall be submitted to the registered voters of the District’s member towns for approval at a District-wide election in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 71, Section 16(n) of the General Laws.

The Superintendent noted that he had conferred with Bond Counsel, District Counsel, MSBA, and the Department of Education regarding this vote, and had considered putting a specific date (June 18) in the motion. He noted that after consulting the calendar and considering the Annual Town Meetings and the MSBA deadline of June 30, 2016, this was the best day for a District Wide Ballot. However, he was advised to leave the date off.

The Chair explained that while it may seem premature, the clock is ticking and the mechanics for a District Wide Ballot are complicated. He pointed out that this vote is suboptimal. In response to the concerns raised by Mr. McLaughlin under Public Comment, the member from Concord, who had been the chair of the RAAS group, pointed out that she is in total agreement with the Chair, and noted that in 2013-14, the assumption was that there were 2 years to completion. With the current agreement and the commitment to the communities, the time line has been compressed. She emphasized that this vote is only contingent upon disapproval of the debt under 16 (d). The member from Dover urged supporting the 10 towns in the District. The Superintendent confirmed that all 16 towns would have to hold the District Wide Ballot. The timeline notice, the mechanics, the 120-day deadline of the MSBA’s January 27 letter, possible extension of the June 30 deadline, and the MSBA process were discussed. The question of what the ground rules for the vote would be under Section IV (I) of the new Regional Agreement (pg. 6), given that weighted voting begins July 1, 2016 was raised, and Superintendent noted that it was confirmed by Bond Counsel that the Committee can move forward with 2/3 (11 votes). The relevant statute that points to a 2/3 vote [under 14 (d)] was referenced, as was Ed Lenox’s September, 2015 opinion letter.

The member from Belmont pointed out that with regard to the “if/then” argument, which Mr. McLaughlin addressed, disapproval could be triggered by one town, and the town clerks would have to arrange the ballot, by law, within 10 days. Whether this would actually happen, whether it was a courtesy to give them notice, and whether MSBA would really block the project by not granting an extension were issues he raised, and he urged sticking with the true spirit of the process, to allow the Town Meeting process to fulfill itself, and holding a special School Committee meeting to vote on 16 (n) if necessary.

The possibility of informally letting the towns know so they could be planning for the possibility of a 16 (n) vote was raised. The Superintendent noted that preparations have already begun; he pointed out that the project is not yet at “yes”, and if he did not leverage every opportunity for the future of the school, he would be remiss. Some members expressed that they did not see what the issue was with supporting the 10 remaining communities.

The member from Sudbury pointed out that the Ad Hoc Selectmen met and came up with a Regional

Agreement that all 16 towns agreed to, and those people of good faith came together and built trust. He emphasized that the result of their efforts is an approved contract under which the Minuteman District is now operating. He stressed that taking this vote is creating a situation for a possible injunction that could jeopardize the entire project. He urged the Committee not to risk legal action because of superimposing a decision by attorneys that does not respect the Agreement.

The member from Concord reiterated that this vote would only be contingent upon the failure of 16 (d), and it addresses the timing issues.

The member from Boxborough expressed his agreement that the if/then argument is a good one, and because the proposed vote does not comply with the wording of the new Regional Agreement, it could be considered unlawful and the vote could be challenged. He agreed that it was suboptimal, and that anticipating a negative action by one of the 10 towns prematurely could have a chilling effect. He also suggested deferring any School Committee action on a 16 (n) vote until Bond Counsel could be present. The Chair suggested that legal opinion notwithstanding, the Selectmen have benefited from the process, and could offer some flexibility to smooth the way for member towns. He also noted that while there are imperfections in the proposed approach, if legal issues are found, then the vote could be voided. The member from Stow wondered what was behind what she perceived as a fear factor in voting on (n), and she stressed the myriad details involved in a municipal election. The member from Sudbury emphasized again that the Regional Agreement is a legal contract, and asked for a postponement. In response to questions, the Chair noted that if weighted voting isn't taking place until July 1, until then the previous way of voting prevails. The member from Belmont emphasized that it is important to listen to what the School Committee wants; he expressed his opinion that taking this vote is disrespectful to the communities served, and it disregards the new Regional Agreement. The member from Bolton pointed out that it is important to have a plan of who needs to know what by when. He expressed his opinion that it is important to telegraph intention for the benefit of students and families, and to honor the commitment to them.

The member from Boxborough reemphasized the concern for the lawfulness of such a vote, the authority for it, and the potential challenge that could invalidate it. He pointed out that if the Committee waited for the potential event, then took the vote if needed, there would be no challenge. The member from Dover expressed his appreciation for the comments related to honoring the Regional Agreement. To the question of how the Superintendent might be restricted, if the vote were not taken, he noted that he can still prepare and spend some money for legal opinion. The member from Lexington suggested adding an amendment to the motion related to waiting for legal opinion. The Superintendent did not think this was appropriate. The member from Stow emphasized the intention of allowing citizens to exercise their right to vote. The member from Lincoln thought that voting rights were not the issue. Rather, she saw the issue as the confused legality; the communities are already well aware of the plan to go to 16 (n) if needed. The member from Sudbury pointed out that the country is based on rules of law. He emphasized that the vote does not include wording such as: "notwithstanding the Regional Agreement contract," and urged that this should be cleared with the attorneys. The member from Lexington urged seeing the opinion in writing, and the Superintendent stated he would ask Counsel. The question was moved, and after the Chair explained that this vote requires 2/3 of those present and voting (14), the following vote was taken:

**ACTION 2016 #25**

Moved (Flood) and seconded (Leone)

To move the question

**Vote:** 10 in favor, 4 opposed **PASSES**

The following vote was then taken, by roll call, with the Chair explaining that this vote requires 2/3 of *all* members (16), for a vote of 11 affirmative, as follows:

**ACTION 2016 #26**

To bond for the Building Project under MGL Ch. 71, Sec. 16 (n), only contingent upon the failure to authorize debt under 16 (d), as presented

By Roll Call:

O'Connor	yes
Manjarrez	no
Taylor	yes
Amoroso	no
Spalding	yes
DeLuca	yes
Stulin	yes
Flood	yes
Horton	yes
Leone	yes
Antia	no
Weis	no
Nourse	yes
Gillespie	yes

**Vote:** 10 in favor, 4 opposed, with 14 members present DOES NOT PASS

The Chair noted that despite this not passing, it will come up again.

**7. SCHOOL BUILDING REPORT, *Ford Spalding***

**a. Update on School Building Committee Membership**

The Chair of the School Building Committee noted a change in the Arlington representation on the School Building Committee, and made the recommendation to appoint a new member. The following vote was then taken:

**ACTION 2016 # 27**

To appoint Nawwaf Kaba (Arlington) as voting member of the Minuteman School Building Committee, replacing Anthony Lionetta

Vote: Unanimous (with 1 member not at the table and not voting)

[At 8:20 PM, Mr. Manjarrez left the meeting.]

**b. Presentation: The Building Project PowerPoint**

The Chair of the School Building Committee explained that the intention of this presentation is to have a complete set of documents with relevant information that can be used as Town Meeting considers a vote to bond the building project. He explained that it has been presented to some audiences already, and has gone through much iteration, as he has received feedback. With that in mind, he invited comments in writing. He emphasized that when presenting information on the project, consistency is imperative.

The Superintendent reviewed the presentation, which contained 38 slides, covering such areas as: an explanation of Minuteman, a vision for the future, goals, why enrollment will increase, characteristics of the project, photos of the new campus and anticipated spaces, program offerings, academy design considerations, the need, the MSBA Feasibility Study process, the cost of doing nothing, comparisons between new construction vs. non-MSBA renovation, why Minuteman has more expenses, the quality of the Career and Technical Vocational High Schools, cost comparisons with other recent building projects, cost and tax impact, assumptions and projections to FY 20, town specific cost impact, next steps, why we

need to act, Governor Baker quote, using a CM@ Risk, and the anticipated process to renovate a 1970s building, as shown in Attachment C.

The Superintendent asked for any comments to be sent to him. In response to questions, he noted that what is not covered are soft costs, and that mention of new towns possibly joining may be after April 4. The member from Acton noted that her town would be looking for more Acton specific information.

## **8. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **a. Special Policy Task Force, *Alice DeLuca***

#### **Update on Policy Review**

Ms. DeLuca noted that 4 health-related policies (Accident and Illness, Communicable Diseases, Medication, and Student Health Services and Requirements) have been under review and will be forthcoming for 1<sup>st</sup> Reading.

## **9. SECRETARY'S REPORT, *Dave Horton***

### **a. Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Horton noted that he had received a number of amendments to the minutes. He reviewed them as follows:

Pg. 1 Line 23

Pg. 2 Lines 46-47

Pg. 3 Line 29

Pg. 4 Lines 16, 22, 33

An additional amendment was offered at the table:

Pg. 3, Line 45.

These amendments were considered “friendly amendments” and the following vote was taken:

#### **ACTION 2016 #28**

To approve the past minutes of 3.1.16, as presented and amended

**Vote:** Unanimous

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Rozan  
District Assistant

David C. Horton  
Secretary

### **ATTACHMENTS TO THE MINUTES OF 3.15.16**

- A. New Regional Agreement, approved 3.11.16
- B. Correspondence from Dave Manjarrez re voting intention on debt
- C. Power Point related to Building Project for Annual Town Meetings, 2016