

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

STATE OF MAINE  
ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
FIRST REGULAR SESSION

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
EDUCATION  
BILL SUMMARY



JUNE 1987

PREPARED BY:

David C. Elliott, Legislative Analyst  
Lars Rydell, Legislative Analyst

OFFICE OF POLICY AND LEGAL ANALYSIS  
STATE HOUSE, STATION 13 AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333  
(207) 289-1670

HELEN T. GINDER, DIRECTOR  
HAVEN WHITESIDE, DEP. DIRECTOR  
GILBERT W. BREWER  
DAVID C. ELLIOTT  
GRO FLATEBO  
MARTHA E. FREEMAN, SR. ATTY.  
JERI B. GAUTSCHI  
CHRISTOS GIANOPOULOS  
WILLIAM T. GLIDDEN, JR.



STATE OF MAINE  
**OFFICE OF POLICY AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

ROOM 101/107  
STATE HOUSE STATION 13  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333  
TEL.: (207) 289-1670

JULIE S. JONES  
JOHN B. KNOX  
EDWARD POTTER  
MARGARET J. REINSCH  
LARS H. RYDELL  
JOHN R. SELSER  
CAROLYN J. CHICK, PARALEGAL  
ROBERT W. DUNN, RES. ASST.  
HARTLEY PALLESCHI, JR., RES. ASST.  
KATHRYN VAN NOTE, RES. ASST.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
FIRST REGULAR SESSION

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE  
BILL SUMMARIES  
JUNE 1987

This document is a compilation of the bill summaries prepared by this office for the Joint Standing Committees and Joint Select Committees of the Maine Legislature. The summaries are arranged by LD number under each committee.

All Adopted Amendments are listed, by paper number (e.g., H-584 or S-222), together with the sponsor if it is a floor amendment or the designation "COMMITTEE" if it is a committee amendment.

Final action for each bill is listed to the right of the title. If final House action and Senate action differ, both are listed.

Please let us know if you would prefer a different format or additional information and if the summaries are helpful.

Key to Committee Reports and Floor Action:

OTP	Ought to Pass
OTP-ND	Ought to Pass in New Draft
OTP-ND-NT	Ought to Pass in New Draft, New Title
OTP-A	Ought to Pass as Amended
ONTP	Ought Not to Pass
LVWD	Leave to Withdraw
INDEF PP	Indefinitely Postponed

LD  
1004

AN ACT TO REVISE THE LAWS RELATIVE TO  
REAPPORTIONMENT OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE  
DISTRICTS.

LVWD

Sponsor: MELENDY, Mayo, Norton, Estes  
Committee Report: LVWD

SUMMARY: Currently, the State Board of Education is required to make a determination of the fairness of the apportionment of directors among the towns making up a S.A.D. if it receives a petition requesting it to do so which is signed by 10% of the voters in the district. If a reduction in the number of directors representing a municipality is required, that reduction is determined by lot. This bill would have required the petition to be signed by at least 10% of the voters in each municipality in the district and would have required any reapportionment to be approved by referendum in each municipality. If a reduction is required as a result of reapportionment, the municipal officers would have established how that reduction would be carried out.

The committee recognized that in any malapportioned district there will be advocates for the status quo who want to make it more difficult to reapportion and advocates of change who want to make it easier. The committee felt the existing procedures were sufficient to protect both sides and that to make reapportionment more difficult could infringe upon the one person, one vote requirement.

LD  
1055

AN ACT TO CLARIFY THE LAW CONCERNING SECONDARY  
EDUCATION COURSE REQUIREMENT FACILITIES.

LVWD

Sponsor: WARREN, Higgins, Tracy  
Committee Report: LVWD

SUMMARY: The intent of the bill was not to require school units to approve new school construction projects in order to provide mandated courses. If it is determined in writing by the State Board of Education that new construction is necessary in order to meet mandated requirements, the state subsidy for the project would have been set at the percentage the state share is of total school costs and not at the state share set for a school unit by the school subsidy formula. This latter provision would have eliminated the circuit breaker for school construction and not equalized local effort.