

Dear Chairperson McCrory, and Members of the Education

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my Public Comment

Senate Bill 738 would regionalize schools based on the state manner similar to the probate districts ..."

Senate Bill 457 that "would require any school district with more than two thousand (2,000) students to join a new or an existing

I strenuously object to both bills!

Firstly, as a person living in Seymour I'm here to say the **SB** on Probate Court district lines, lumping Seymour together with Derby is an **arbitrary flawed notion:**

- Woodbridge is already in a highly successful regionalized school district to arbitrarily break up a school board region that has worked well to match SB738s Probate Court district plan.

- Ansonia and Derby are already holding talks to form a regional school district. Seymour would not benefit by joining with them. Just recent events, Ansonia City and Ansonia Board of Education sued the state for mismanagement or misdirection of budget funds creating a financial crisis with potentially catastrophic results. The local news reported that the Education had to weigh in on the issue before it was resolved, leaving taxpayers potentially wind up on the hook to pay for any more on shared services contracts. The fact that this recent scenario proves them risky, and merging schools with them to be just as risky. Moreover, If Ansonia & Derby need to combine with a third school district should combine with Shelton which has a better tax base than with risky Ansonia.

- Seymour's BOE school district is already doing shared services with Seymour's town government. Potentially more efficient than now, there is no need to merge schools with any other town.

- My daughter's bus ride is already long enough (20 minutes) across the river from our home in the northeast corner of town through heavily commuter congested local streets, especially at the school area, and also that bus has arrived after the first period morning. NOT want her trip getting even longer by bussing kids across

Ok sooo...

Secondly, SB457 is also arbitrary with it 2,000 student threshold.

•What is the +/- variable? How will enforcement kick in? For example, if multiple families move in & out over the course of a year and the enrollment drops from a hypothetical 2,015 down to 1,999 students ??? What then??? What are the repercussions?

•Furthermore, Seymour currently has 2,226 students now! How can a bill that exempts Seymour from this bill? Does that Exempt Seymour?

If forced regionalization absolutely had to happen, then the sense and policy sense to align and merge Seymour with, is to address fiscal responsibility tendencies, and better easier commuting options. We need to get busses caught in horrible commuter traffic south of Seymour. Seymour was merged with Oxford at the HS level for decades ago due to its own economic growth, to build its own HS about 10 years ago. Why would they'd give up their separate schools now.

If the purpose is actually just sharing superintendents, and then call these bill back and rewrite them, something along the lines of "Superintendents Across Districts", or "An Act to Share Purchasing", is a problem ridden. Which town's elected Boards would hold the superintendent accountable? Which Superintendent to let go? Which vendor to choose?

I truly do not believe any of these matters can be decided in a regionalized manner. They are, and should be, local decisions. I am against both.

Respectfully,

Julie Nintzel

[50 Briarwood Drive, Seymour CT 06483](mailto:jnintzel@seymourct.org)