

**LAMOILLE NORTH MODIFIED UNIFIED UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT #58
ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2020**

Present: Belvidere: Stephanie Sweet; Cambridge: Mark Stebbins, Sue Prescott; Laura Miller, Jan Sander, Bill Sander, Bernard Barnes; Eden: David Whitcomb; Hyde Park: Patti Hayford, Tina Lowe, Lisa Barry; Johnson: Katie Orost, Bobbi Moulton, Mark Nielsen; Waterville: Bart Bezio; Catherine Gallagher, Deb Clark, Michele Aumand, Wendy Savery, Dylan Laflam, Brian Schaffer, Janet Murray, Erik Remmers, Jan Epstein, Melinda Mascolino, Jennifer Hulse, David Manning, Galen Reese. **Clerks** - Belvidere: Cathy Mander-Adams; Cambridge: Mark Schilling; Eden: Candy Vear; Hyde Park: Kim Moulton, Johnson: Rosemary Audibert; Waterville: Nancy Larose; Ken Adams, Lynn Sibley, Walter Pomroy, about 10 other people

Bill Sander called the annual meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Article I: To determine whether Roberts Rules (Revised) or other rules of order shall govern the parliamentary procedures of the meeting.

Whitcomb made a motion that the Roberts Rules of Order (Revised) be the procedure used for the meeting. Moulton seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Article II: To review and approve the minutes of the February 18, 2019 Annual Meeting.

J. Sander made a motion, seconded by Barry, to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2019 Annual Meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Article III: To elect by ballot the following officers: a) Moderator; b) Clerk; c) Treasurer

Nielsen nominated Bill Sander to be the Moderator. Barry seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. By consensus, one unanimous ballot was cast for Bill Sander as moderator, which then passed unanimously.

J. Sander nominated Donna Griffiths for Clerk. There were no other nominations. Whitcomb made a motion that by consensus one unanimous ballot be cast for Donna Griffiths as clerk. Ken Adams seconded the nomination and the motion passed unanimously.

J. Sander nominated Kim Moulton for Treasurer. There were no other nominations. Whitcomb made a motion that by consensus one unanimous ballot be cast for Kim Moulton as treasurer. Moulton seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

At this time, B. Sander asked if there was any objection to any of the administrators speaking when appropriate during the meeting. There was no objection.

Article IV: To establish compensation for the duly constituted officers and Board of Directors of said Modified Unified Union School District.

B. Sander asked for clarification on the amount of compensation for each position. Gallagher stated the annual compensation for Board Chair was \$1,800, Board members received \$1,500, the Treasurer received \$8,000 and the Clerk received \$500, plus mileage and \$150 per special meeting.

Lowe made a motion that the Board Chair be compensated \$1,800 on an annual basis. B. Sander noted that was for the Chair of the Supervisory Union (SU) and Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District (LNMUUSD). Hayford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Whitcomb made a motion to maintain Board members annual compensation of \$1,500. Moulton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Bezio made a motion to maintain the Clerk's annual compensation of \$500, plus mileage and \$150 per special meeting. Orost seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

J. Sander made a motion to maintain the Treasurer's annual compensation of \$8,000. Moulton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

In response to a question from Orost, Clark explained the duties of the Treasurer, which included reviewing Board Orders, signing checks, balancing the checkbooks, taking deposits to the bank, preparing the annual Treasurer's report, and working closely with the Finance Department. Clark stated Moulton spent 16 to 18 hours a month on these duties. Miller stated she reviewed the Board Orders and she estimated that alone took over 100 hours annually, so she assumed the Treasurer spent a good deal more time on her duties.

V: To hear and act upon the reports of the Modified Unified Union School District

Deb Clark, Business Manager, reported that reports were included in the annual report on pages 23-36. The notice of report availability was mailed to District households on January 9th. This year the use of a postcard notification saved the District \$5,218. The report was also available at town clerk offices, online at LNSU.org website and upon request at the Supervisory Union's (SU) central office.

The Treasurer's report of cash at year-end showed that on June 30, 2019 there was \$4,942,698 in the checking accounts. Audit statements were available at the SU and online at LNSU.org website.

The FY21 budgets for the LNMUUSD were as follows: a combined elementary budget of \$13,423,750 which included \$544,778 grant funded expenditures. After revenues, this came to a combined education spending of \$12,023,071, resulting in a per equalized pupil spending amount of \$18,278. The combined secondary budget was \$14,706,565. After revenues, this came to a combined education spending of \$13,572,711, resulting in a per equalized pupil spending amount of \$16,759. The Technical Center budget was \$3,258,547. These budgets provided educational services, health and wellness services, transportation services, and more for six campuses, including GMTCC. It covered 1,613 students, excluding student numbers from Cambridge Elementary.

The elementary level afterschool programming participation was as follows: Eden at 80%, Hyde Park at 49%, Johnson at 63% and Waterville/Belvidere at 92%. These budgets supported extra programming opportunities such as, but was not limited to: dance programs, outdoor education programs, Lego robotics, maker spaces, computer shop, performing arts, junior iron chef events, gardening, student clubs and athletics. There was significant community use of all facilities. Most weekends, evenings and many holidays the campuses are active with many community events.

A voter asked if the extra programming activities were in addition to afterschool activities. Clark stated that while some programs started in the elementary afterschool program, most of the additional programs were over and above the afterschool program. Staff was hired to support those additional programs and paid for through the budget.

VI: To receive from the Board of School Directors of said District its estimate of expenses of the Lamoille North Modified Unified Union Grade Schools for the ensuing year. This is a public hearing regarding the budget. (See Article XIV)

Deb Clark reported that the elementary expenses approved to move forward by the Board on January 13, 2020 were as follows:

The proposed FY21 budget of \$13,423,750 was an increase of \$682,728, or 5.35%, from FY20.

The elementary revenues estimated for FY21 was \$1,400,679, an increase of \$62,413 over the current fiscal year, or an increase of 4.66%

The elementary non-grant budget drivers by object code were presented by line item and also through a chart and outlined the major drivers for the increases. The total increase was \$635,826. Clark reported that salaries accounted for the biggest increase in the budget, at 43.04% of the total increase. However, there were also mandatory expenses that the District had no choice but to incur and some of these costs were increasing in the double digits. Health care costs were increasing 13%; Hyde Park Electric would be increasing their rates by 15%, which would affect the large campus and the Hyde Park elementary school; and property insurance would increase 11%. Regarding nutrition service increases, Clark explained that the State no longer allowed guaranteed breakeven contracts. They now had to agree to a fixed rate for services. That was estimated to increase the food service costs by \$25,000, and in addition to the normal rate hikes, that would increase that line item by \$31,000. The mandated expenses were 33.41% of the total increase.

A voter asked about the increase of \$208,148 listed under “All Other Benefits” in the Elementary Non-Grant Budget Drivers by Object handout. This was a 27.10% increase. Clark explained that included in that line item was the Vermont State Teachers Retirement System (VSTRS). A change was made in 2016 that required that every employer contribute an annual amount for each newly hired teacher. The number of newly hired teachers increased and, additionally, every year the annual amount increased. That number would be going up by not just the annual increase that the State instructed districts to pay for, but also by the number of individuals on the roster. It was essentially a dual increase. In response to a question, Clark stated there was a fixed amount of \$1,400 per teacher that the employer contributed to the State’s teacher retirement system.

Walter Pomroy stated it was an insult to his intelligence to be told that items were mandatory and there was nothing to be done about it. He noted that the District had done something about the health insurance through the HRA. He stated there were things that could be done through contracts and by changing insurance policies. Pomroy asked what the School Board and School Board Association had done in terms of lobbying Montpelier to address the retirement system, noting it was a mess and would bankrupt the state. Unless the school boards did something about the retirement system this issue would come up every year. Regarding the increased electric costs, he asked if the work done on the Hyde Park Elementary School had made it more efficient and whether solar panels were being planned for the high school roof. He stated he hadn’t seen anything in the plans for the upcoming work at the high school to incorporate solar panels. Pomroy stated it wasn’t enough to say there wasn’t anything they could do about all the increased costs. Pomroy stated that if these issues weren’t addressed, next year the District would cross the excess spending threshold and the taxpayers would revolt. He believed that every item in the budget was manageable. The main thing he thought needed to be addressed was the spending per pupil costs. Pomroy stated he understood it was difficult to address these costs but it could be done.

Clark stated these costs were ones that the School Board did not have direct control over. The health care plan was now a statewide health care plan and no longer negotiated at the local level. Additionally, they were always looking for more ways to be energy efficient and a lot of efficiencies were added at the Hyde Park Elementary School. The electricity costs projected weren't as big a hit at the elementary level, both because of the new building and because it was blended with the other towns. However, the secondary level was paying the entire cost.

Miller explained that, as a member of the Board, the entire Board had looked at the budget as if it were their own money coming out of their pocket. When looking at the negotiated teacher contracts, there were many districts that paid higher salaries than Lamoille North. In order to hold on to the current teachers and not have to retrain new people, it was important to retain these good teachers. Therefore, the salaries were increased a minimal amount. As a member of the Budget Committee, Miller stated they had looked at all the line items and reviewed what could be done so that people would be comfortable with the budget. There were cuts that could have been made but they would have decreased programs for students. Ultimately, the bare bones budget versus what was being presented tonight equaled \$22 per \$100 of property value. In looking at the programs and services that would be removed, it was a very drastic decrease for that amount of money. She stated the Committee felt it wasn't doing their job to provide what the students needed to be successful if they cut programs.

Pomroy stated that Cambridge was going to be voting on a budget for their elementary school with a per pupil spending of \$16,816. Lamoille was presenting a budget of \$1,300 more in per pupil spending. In 2017, Johnson's per pupil spending was \$13,959. Cambridge's 2017 per pupil spending was \$13,816. The tax rate between Johnson and Cambridge was \$0.01 different. Over that four-year period, Cambridge had raised their taxes by \$0.12, less than 2% a year. The LNMUUSD was raising the tax rate by \$0.265 cents over the same four years. He asked what Cambridge was doing differently.

Clark explained that the Act 46 incentive diminished every 2 years, which equaled \$20 per \$100,000. Pomroy explained his numbers ignored the CLA and state incentives and was only in reference to raw spending. Clark stated that without looking at it, she couldn't verify or refute anything, but she did know that \$20 of the tax rate change was the loss of \$0.02 incentive. She noted that Cambridge worked really hard again with their budget. Their spending was increasing 4.31% for their total expenses.

Lynn Sibley stated she too was very concerned about what appeared to be a passive resignation of mandated unfunded costs. She stated this would last forever. The State had been pushing unfunded mandates for decades. Health insurance costs wouldn't be going down. She didn't see certain contributions going down. Sibley thought this was an unsustainable budget. She noted the sending elementary schools had a poverty rate of 13%. Johnson Elementary School had a poverty rate of 26%. Student enrollments did not appear to be increasing. Sibley was concerned that next year the community would be faced with these same issues. It seemed that there needed to be a very aggressive look at what the district could do to deal with these issues. In the late 1980's and early 1990's the high school could not pass a budget, with the voters returning budgets several times. The result was that for a number of years 1% raises were given to people who most needed the raise, the support staff. Administrators also received 1% raises. It came to the point where four teachers needed to be laid off, programs were gutted and valuable teachers were sent away. Sibley stated the District very soon could be facing those types of difficult choices, with sports programs being cut next.

Clark repeated Miller's point, stating that the Budget Committee had looked very carefully at the budget and noted that any cuts would result in student-facing cuts.

Mark Nielsen stated that if Pomroy and Sibley wanted cuts he'd be happy to do that. He asked them to

outline what cuts they would like to see made. Nielsen stated that he was on the Budget Committee and they went line by line through the budget. He noted that one-third of the seventeen member School Board were accountants and other members were very aggressive about reducing costs. He noted that two years ago, in order to lower costs, several Facilities employees were removed from the budget at Johnson Elementary. At the next budget meeting, there were more members from the community at the table than Committee members and they requested that Facilities bring the employees back.

Nielsen stated that a 5.1% increase was difficult to accept. However, he was in Montpelier once a month and listened to school boards throughout the state that were having the same issue. The cost of benefits was a problem for every district. Nielsen stated he had been lobbying in Montpelier and had addressed the Senate Education Committee about Act 46. The state created this law and he told them they needed to fix it. This budget was not lavish; it was bare bones. He believed that if the budget was turned down and programs or services were cut, there would be members of the community coming to Board meetings to request they reinstitute those items. The District was a member of the Vermont School Board Association and that organization lobbied on behalf of the District.

Pomroy asked if the District had discussed consolidating or closing schools. Nielsen reported that a space use study had been done. It was determined that it would be less expensive to retrofit the Belvidere Elementary School to solve a space issue than it was to close the school. Clark explained that the discussion about how that would work would be starting next month.

B. Sander agreed there were some items in the budget that weren't mandated, but contributions to the State Teacher Retirement Fund was mandated. The State had underfunded the State Retirement Fund for years and the approach being used now to fund it seemed reasonable. B. Sander stated that State Treasurer Beth Pierce had done a remarkable job in terms of maximizing return on investments. Because of inflation, Sander didn't believe you could compare what happened in the past with expenses to what was happening now.

B. Sander said he had been on the Board for over twenty years and he thought it was important to note that there was a period of time when the graduation rate at the high school was 65%. It was now over 90%. He noted that didn't happen by itself. It took dedication and money. The District was more adequately funding education now than in years past and they were receiving a lot of value for that spending.

Sibley stated she had been presenting a cautionary tale because she was one of the administrators who had to make the drastic cuts. The budget was turned down three or four times. The hardest thing to do was to gut programs and lay off teachers and she didn't want to see the District go back there. Nielsen agreed with her and noted that the vote to bring the budget forward to the taxpayers was not unanimous.

Article VII: To receive from the Board of School Directors of said District its estimate of expenses of the Lamoille North Modified Unified Union Middle and High Schools for the ensuing year. This is a public information hearing regarding the budget. (See Article XV)

Clark reported that the Board approved the FY21 middle and high school expenses on January 13, 2020. The secondary expenses totaled \$14,706,565. This was an increase of \$706,936 or 5.05%. The revenues for FY21 were expected to come in at \$1,133,854. This was an increase of \$73,888 or 6.97%. The non-grant budget drivers were discussed. They were able to find savings of \$94,121, or 30.08%, in the HRA line item. After a year or more on the new Affordable Care health plans, they were able to develop a utilization rate, so funding at 100% was no longer necessary. Costs that were

not in the direct control of the District comprised 43.79% of the budget. The items in this category included health insurance, VSTRS contributions, bond interest and principal, property insurance, electricity and tech education tuition as far as the number of students being estimated to participate.

Clark outlined some key factors in building the FY21 budget. The following figures were mostly from the December 1, 2019 letter from the State Tax Commissioner. Education spending statewide was forecast to increase 5.01%. The State was forecasting a decrease in equalized pupils statewide of half a percent. The forecast for equalized per pupil spending growth statewide was 5.53%. The statewide property yield was increasing from \$10,648 to \$10,883 for FY20. The state income yield was increasing from \$13,081 to \$13,296. The excess spending threshold had increased from \$18,311 to \$18,756. Clark reported that in FY20 neither the LNSU nor LNMUUSD Districts were subject to threshold penalties and no penalties were expected for FY21. The average state property tax rate was forecast to be \$1.567. The average state announced income sensitivity was 2.55%. Clark noted that over 73% of the District's communities received some sort of tax reduction benefit from the income sensitivity calculation. The State non-residential property tax rate would be \$1.654, up from \$1.594. As of June 30, 2019 the District had an unassigned fund balance available of \$399,858. Of this, \$248,451 had been applied to the FY21 budgets to hold down tax rates.

Additional items that Clark noted was that this budget was a 5.15% increase to the LNMUUSD combined education spending, with the State saying 5.01% was what they were anticipating. 45.6% of the total LNMUUSD education spending was raised through the local State property tax, leaving 54% of that money provided by other State revenue sources. 38.86% of the combined \$1.3 million increase to elementary and secondary education spending was due to increases in unavoidable costs based on state mandates and rate hikes. Without those changes, the estimated tax rate would be \$1.5635 or \$40 per \$100,000. \$20 of the \$74.70 increase in property tax was due to the decrease of the two cents of the Act 46 incentive rate. \$62,893 was the additional bond cost for the high school renovation project, which equated to \$1.80 of the \$74.40 increase. There was a 1.67% decrease in the Supervisory Union assessment.

Clark then outlined an estimate of the FY21 homestead rates, which would impact the final tax rates. Clark explained if the yield and the common levels of appraisal (CLA) went up the tax rates would decrease. Waterville's CLA had gone up almost ten points and their taxes would be decreasing. Per the AOE, early reports of budgets were showing more spending than anticipated. This could lower the yield rate issued by the State, which would increase final tax rates. Clark reported the blended LNMUUSD FY21 rate, after incentive and before the CLA was 1.5952, a change of .0747. This resulted in an increase of \$74.70 per \$100,000 of property value.

In the estimated FY21 LNMUUSD tax rates there was a combined educational spending amount of \$25,595,782, a 5.15% increase. The equalized pupil figure of 657.79 at the elementary schools had decreased by almost 18. The equalized pupil figure at the secondary level of 809.89 had increased by almost 19. After the CLA, Waterville's change per \$100,000 of property value decreased \$81.20, Belvidere increased \$13.50, Eden increased \$88.30, Hyde Park increased \$97.30 and Johnson increased \$146.10 per \$100,000 of property value.

Pomroy asked about the bond, noting that information provided in September for the bond vote noted that the total debt service for the coming year was only going to increase \$76,000. The current information provided a higher number. Clark replied that the debt service for the bond would be less than 70,000. She noted there were also interest changes. The District had received some refinance interest benefit and that was beginning to wane. That had been a large savings in the first year and the biggest year in the debt schedule was FY22. Pomroy asked why that figure had changed \$20,000 over the last few months. Clark stated they received different estimated bond projections based on the

interest rate that the bond bank was looking at. The interest rates and the loss of the savings made the difference. The bonds would retire in FY23 and there would be several more years of higher interest expenses.

Article VIII. To receive from the Board of School Directors of said District its estimate of expenses of the Green Mountain Technology and Career Center for the ensuing year. This is a public information hearing regarding the budget. (See Article XVI)

Clark reported on the notables of the Tech Center's FY21 budget: responsibility changes in the administration allowed for the elimination of one administrative position. There would no longer be an Assistant Director position, and the Adult Education and Co-op Coordinator positions would merge into one full time position; funds to support general program activities had increased after having been cut substantially in FY20; they would be looking to grant fund an exploratory Foundations program in order to generate continued student interest in the Tech Center while increasing student full time equivalencies (FTE's); and, this year the .87% increase in expenses equated to a \$682 decrease in the per pupil tuition, due to the modest increase in the six semester average FTE and increases to state tuition assistance.

Clark stated the FY21 budget proposal was \$3,258,547, an increase of \$28,021 from FY20. Revenues were expected to be \$2,078,166 with a total tuition to be raised of \$1,180,381. Divided by the six-semester average FTE of 129.10 students, the FY21 per pupil tuition would be \$9,143.

Gallagher reported that as of today the Tech Center had more applications for next year's programs than they had had in five years. Gallagher also noted that student enrollment was fluid but there were now more students in pre-school than they'd had in the last four years. It was steadily climbing and now sat at 264. Gallagher was guardedly optimistic that enrollment numbers would slowly continue to increase. Clark stated that would help with the equalized pupil numbers.

A voter asked about an article she'd seen in VTDigger that discussed alternative models for Tech Center funding, as the current model made it less than desirable for sending schools to give up their students.

She asked if the District was looking into this. Remmers, Director of the Technical Center, stated he knew of the issue and the Directors Association was working to develop a position on it. Gallagher explained that the Foundations Program that Remmers was developing with the high school had to do with increasing access to students in Grades 7-12. One of the requirements of Tech Center programs was that students had to be 16 years old. Foundations would bring more students in from the five sending schools and increase access to students in middle school. That was one way of looking at different enrollment models and different programming. That, in tandem with what was happening at the state level, was part of the broader discussion.

Article IX: Shall the voters of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District #058A establish a Special Reserve Fund for future unanticipated costs associated with Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Health Savings Accounts?

Clark stated the use of reserve funds could save taxpayers from the sharp peaks of unanticipated utilization of Health Reimbursement Arrangements (HRA) and Health Savings Accounts (HSA) benefits. Pomroy urged the voters to defeat this article as he thought this was the improper use of a reserve fund. Pomroy stated reserve funds should not be used for everyday annual line item expenditures that were budgeted for on an annual basis. Reserve funds were for long-term projects such as capital items or bonds, not for items that were funded annually. Additionally, he stated the HRA was put in place to reduce the cost of health insurance. However, with the reserve, the District

was passing through the extra costs for the health insurance while keeping the savings for the HRA. While a portion of the health insurance costs was considered by the District to be mandated, the HRA was a surplus and being put into a reserve. Taxpayers were being charged twice.

Clark explained that these dollars could be reserved. FY21 was the first budget that would involve estimating the use of the HRA at anything less than 100%. The reserves were being created so that the taxpayers were protected in future years from years when utilization was closer to 100% and not 80%. If over the long run 80% utilization proved to be consistent a discussion could take place about eliminating the reserves. Clark noted these were taxes that had already been collected. The HRA dollars would now be isolated. They would only be there as a cushion if in any budget year the expenses came back higher than expected on those line items only.

A voter asked about the bigger picture about health care costs and wondered how an HRA was addressing the overall cost of health insurance. Clark stated the health insurance was now a statewide plan and districts had no control over the amount of employer exposure at the HRA level. As an employer, the District was now mandated to provide funds to an HRA at a specific level. There has been 80% utilization of the HRA funds. An HRA was tied to a high deductible plan. Clark stated the District was not able to explore health care options. However, the Vermont School Board Association was working as a group to try to address the costs that districts no longer had direct control over.

A voter noted that health care would be provided to teachers no matter what. The costs were in line with what town employees were receiving. Gallagher stated that she was concerned that taxpayers didn't understand that the local boards did not negotiate health care anymore. B. Sander stated that he appreciated that the coverage was now universal and each district's employees were receiving the same benefits.

A voter asked if health insurance costs were increasing like this everywhere or just in this particular field. Clark stated it was going up everywhere. She explained that the District's insurance was purchased through the Vermont Education Health Initiative (VEHI), a non-profit. Most of the school districts purchased their insurance through this group. It was a lower premium rate than other places. They had reserves that were waning and they were now requesting a 13% increase on the basic plan that this budget was based on. This amount could be revised as the Regulatory Board was concerned it wasn't enough to cover the new statewide health plan. Last year there were double digit increases.

Orost made a motion to establish a special reserve fund for future unanticipated costs associated with the HRA/HSA. Sweet seconded the motion.

Pomroy stated that the next article requested \$78,000. The total budget for the HRA was \$267,000 for the coming year. The District was asking to create a reserve fund that was close to 30% of that line item. He stated there is a lot of industry experience of the HRA and good data should be available on usage. He noted that HRAs were developed to offset the cost of health insurance but now the District was asking voters to pay for both. Pomroy strongly urged people not to approve this so that these funds could be rolled back into the budget. Clark noted that the experience rating she had referred to was the District's experience and there had only been a year's worth of HRA usage.

The motion then passed, with Pomroy voting against.

Article X: Shall the voters of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District #058A hold an amount of the unassigned audited fund balance in the amount of \$78,532 as of June 30, 2019, in the established Reserve Fund for the purpose of meeting the Health Reimbursement Arrangement and Health Savings Account needs of the Lamoille North Modified Unified School

District #058A?

Orost made a motion to assign \$78,532 of the unassigned audited fund balance in the established reserve fund to meet the HRA/HSA needs of the LNMUUSD #058A. Moulton seconded the motion. Clark explained that the \$78,532 was the amount of the surplus coming out of FY19 that was directly related to the elementary school HRA funds that were budgeted and unused.

The motion passed, with Sibley and Pomroy voting against.

Article XI: Shall the voters of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District #058B establish a Special Reserve Fund for future unanticipated costs associated with Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Health Savings Accounts?

Clark stated again that the use of reserve funds could save taxpayers from the sharp peaks of unanticipated utilization of the HRA and HSA benefits.

Orost made a motion to establish a special reserve fund for #058B for future unanticipated costs associated with the HRA and HSA. Bezio seconded the motion. Prescott asked if the reserve needed to be used within a certain timeframe. Clark stated it need to be used within five years.

The motion passed, with Pomroy voting against.

Article XII: Shall the voters of Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District #058B hold an amount of the unassigned audited fund balance in the amount of \$72,882 as of June 30, 2019, in the established Reserve Fund for the purpose of meeting the Health Reimbursement Arrangement and Health Savings Account needs of the Lamoille North Modified Unified School District #058B?

Orost made a motion to assign \$72,882 of the unassigned audited fund balance in the established reserve fund to meet the HRA/HSA needs of the LNMUUSD #058B. Moulton seconded the motion.

The motion passed, with Sibley and Pomroy voting against.

Article XIII: To transact any other business to properly come before the meeting.

A voter requested that the Board consider solar energy alternatives with any roof work being done, especially on the middle and high school campus. Orost stated it definitely would be considered. Clark responded by noting that the campus had a lot of acreage. There was some gray area about placing panels on the roof. If the District considered a solar array, it might be worth considering using the acreage rather than the roof. She stated solar energy was always a topic and there were already several agreements in place for solar energy.

J. Sander made a motion to recess the meeting until March 3, 2020, seconded by Moulton. The meeting recessed at 8:36 p.m.