

**HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL DISTRICT
BUDGET COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 22, 2020
MEETING MINUTES**

A meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School District (COOP) Budget Committee was conducted on Thursday, October 21, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. at the Hollis/Brookline Middle School Library.

Chairman, Darlene Mann, presided:

Members of the Committee Present: Raul Blanche, Vice Chairman
 Matthew Maguire, Secretary
 Tom Enright
 Lorin Rydstrom
 Cindy VanCoughnett, School Board Representative

Members of the Committee Absent: David Blinn
 Brian Rater

Also in Attendance: Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Mann lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS - None

APPOINTMENT OF MEETING OBSERVER

Noted was that Brian Rater was in attendance at the joint meeting of the Brookline Select-board, School Board, Finance Committee, and 2020 Budget Committee Study Committee. The Town of Brookline is considering a change from a Finance Committee to that of a Budget Committee.

Chairman Mann appointed Cindy VanCoughnett to serve as Process Observer.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

COOP Budget Committee September 24, 2020

There being no objection, acceptance of the minutes was tabled until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

PUBLIC INPUT - None

GENERAL BUSINESS

- Monthly Results

Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator, spoke of the year-end report provided (copy attached). The majority of the savings depicted are related to COVID. Other savings resulted from vacant positions going unfilled (hiring savings/interim positions). Those changes also resulted in a significant savings in benefits.

The only area resulting in a deficit was site improvements, which was in large part related to the tech. ed. upgrades made based on upgrading the Tech Ed. program. The result is an offset to the tax rate of \$1,125,088. Conservatively predicted had been a return of \$900,000.

The summary of the Unreserved Fund Balance (UFB) identifying what the impact is to each community was shared previously and will be updated with the latest information.

Vice Chairman Blanche asked for clarification of the balance of \$1,678,922 listed on the year end summary. Ms. Seeley stated that to be the total expenditure. Factored in are revenue and monies approved by the voters to be allocated to the various funds. The result is the UFB balance of \$1,125,088.

Noted was that the Retained Fund Balance was increased to \$189,000 (1%) because of the current environment.

Chairman Mann spoke of the additional grant funding (\$200/student) being provided to every district in the State to address COVID related expenses during the pandemic. This additional funding is not tied to any other grant or federal funding received.

There being no objection, the agenda was adjusted to include discussion of the SAU budget in the FY22 budget overview.

- FY22 Budget Overview
 - Preliminary Budget Overview

The version of the budget before the Committee is the result of the second round of Administrative discussions (typically goes through 4 rounds). The initial round resulted in a proposed increase of approximately \$1 million (4.85%). The second round reduced the percentage of increase to slightly over 3%.

Superintendent Corey has requested the Committee consider making a change in the Athletic Trust moving it from a lapsing fund to a revolving fund.

- Review Assumptions/Priorities/Goals/CIP

In response to a higher need of the students, an existing employee was put into the role of Case Manager at the high school. The position will need to be added to next year's budget. In previous budgets, the position of School Resource Officer was shared (duties and cost) with the Hollis School District. The Town of Hollis has applied for and is hopeful to receive grant funding for a Community Officer. Some of that position will cover the Hollis School District. The COOP District will take over the full cost of the SRO in the coming year. A placeholder is included for an increase to the line item.

Once the USDA Wellness Policy is updated through all the three district school boards, there will be the need for a Wellness Policy Coordinator in each school to manage the goals the policy sets forth. A \$500 stipend is proposed in each of the schools.

Shared positions for both schools include the Nurse substitute (funded in this year's budget). The hope is to fund at least one of these positions in FY22.

Under the heading of Academics, typically pulled out are textbooks that have a cost exceeding \$5,000 (do not include language arts). Those planned for purchase were identified. Lab table replacement is a request from the high school. Principal Barnes believes the existing tables came with the building. The number of tables was unknown.

The high school is looking to purchase a Soprano Sax and the performing arts team is looking to renew a subscription to Soundtrap. This software assisted in the production of the online theatre productions during the spring.

The middle school is looking to fund the Shakespeare guest speaker, which is the traditional activity embedded in their curriculum. They would like to move that from being parent-paid to be included in the budget. The middle school is looking to purchase social studies textbooks and science textbooks for grade 7. Sibelius is an online subscription for the music teachers. The District used to have that in place in all the machines that were in the music department, but they have decided they really just need it for the teachers. The warranty on the new equipment (laser machine) in the Tech. Ed. Department needs to be renewed for FY22.

Under the heading of New Computer Equipment, identified for the high school is Phase II of the Technology Plan; Chromebooks, and associated carts, for social studies, science (biology and chemistry), and world language. There is nothing identified as new for the middle school.

Under the heading of Replacement Computer Equipment, both schools are looking to replace staff laptops (10 in high school and 11 in middle school), staff desktops (middle school; 1 in library/3 in main office), student desktops (4 in Library), and a printer (library).

Asked if there is an overall service contract among the schools, Ms. Kelly stated the SAU does have a contract for all repairs.

Projectors are requested for both buildings (10 in high school/3 in middle school). Except for 4 of the projectors in the high school, they are all part of a regular replacement cycle. The additional projectors in the high school have been requested by the math department. The math department is also requesting 10 staff laptops (graphics capabilities). The math department is also requesting 2 Smartboards.

Chromebooks for both the high school and middle school are requested. Chromebooks are not supported after five years, and the existing are at end-of-life. Identified was the worst-case scenario understanding some of the Chromebooks that are currently out in the community will not come back or will come back damaged.

Chairman Mann questioned if the expectation is that, as we move our way through phasing and replacement, students would not need to bring their personal Chromebooks to school. Ms. Seeley stated her belief the district is headed in that direction, but she is uncertain if that has been made to be part of the plan. Vice Chairman Blanche questioned the percentage of students having school supplied Chromebooks. Ms. Seeley was uncertain although believes it is a significant percentage.

Under the heading of Shared Services/Software, the only item is filtering software; would be pushed out to district owned Chromebooks to provide the filtering in the home environment as in the school buildings. The district continues to use the free version of Zoom; however, approx. 20 licenses have been purchased (higher level features allowing elementary classes to have breakout rooms, etc.). It is rumored that the DOE will be purchasing Zoom licenses.

Under the heading of Safety Issues, proposed is a camera for the turf field; the primary purpose being for safety. Asked if it would be set up in a fashion that would permit the recording of events, Member VanCoughnett commented on that, having been mentioned the previous evening during the School Board meeting.

Vice Chairman Blanche stated his assumption the Police Station would have a view of the entire field. Ms. Seeley stated her belief that would be the case as they have access to view all the other cameras.

Middle school nurses have requested two (2) additional Epi Pens. Also sought at the middle school are handheld radios for staff (15).

Under the heading of Athletics, there are 6 sports that are not included in the athletic fee structure each having costs associated with them (parent paid). The desire is to include the cost in the upcoming budget (would be offset by parent contribution), and to incorporate those sports into the athletic fee structure going forward.

Listed under Facilities/Maintenance are Phase IV of the roof at the high school, masonry repairs in the patio area and on curbs, road paving (Phase II; 2nd lane), upgrade HVAC software (currently using Windows 7), A/C in engineering classroom (to protect new computers), window blinds, window screens, Phase III of window sealing, and storage shed (outdoor gear).

Member Rydstrom recalled the discussion around the security upgrade for the main office that occurred last year, indicated it to be a high priority. Ms. Seeley stated it is a high priority, but it also has a high price tag. She believes the desire is to address first the paving. Part of the paving would be to widen a section to provide access for emergency vehicles around carpool.

The middle school is requesting MPR tables/chairs (Phase IV), upgrade security systems/alarms, HVAC preventative maintenance contract (already in place at high school), building systems evaluation (review of systems with an eye on energy efficiencies), and Phase II of window replacement.

- Preliminary Guidance Discussion

Chairman Mann remarked that the Round 2.0 budget review document provides all of the details and indicates the HEA and HESSA contracts are in negotiations; therefore, estimates are not yet available. All of the items combined with the increases to the contribution to the New Hampshire Retirement System (NHRS) and the Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) of increase for health insurance (10.9%), etc. bring the total budget view (excluding Collective Bargaining Agreements) to \$25,849,637, which is a 3.89% increase over the current budget.

The operating budget components alone total \$24,474,563 as compared to the operating budget of approximately \$23.6 million last year, and a 3.8% increase.

Member Enright questioned how the \$240,000 (\$200 times approximately 1200 students) COVID grant will be managed. Ms. Seeley stated it will be offsetting costs already incurred in addition to personnel costs. The SAU has had to hire several people to manage teaching remotely and in-person. The Committee will be provided with a breakdown.

Chairman Mann noted the budget information was compiled into the spreadsheets created to address guidance. The first spreadsheet is the typical format utilized for preliminary guidance and the second gets to the guidance multiplier. It is an expansion of the calculation based on a view she and Tom Gehan, Chairman, Hollis Budget Committee, have been working on to bring consistency between how we are addressing that multiplier, which they will use as they are evaluating both the Town and school district budgets.

Beginning with the initial budget and removing items which are considered fixed, non-negotiable or to be negotiated separately, you get to the guidance base, which in the past has been the CPI or some view of CPI. You apply that and say that is the level of the increase we would attach to the budget. You add back some items and come up with a guidance estimate. What the Committee began discussing, a few years prior, was the fact that incorporated in that guidance base is HEA and HESSA salaries, which are addressed in their own way through the CBA. The Committee has discussed how to take that CPI based multiplier and make an adjustment to it.

Whether we further reduce the guidance base by removing salaries or identify the amount, then identify those salaries and adjust the multiplier itself, it gets you to the same point. We would either take the prior year guidance base of \$15,618,714, reduce it by the prior FY salaries subject to CBAs (\$7,666,192) and apply a full

0.80% to the lower amount, or whatever that percentage is going to be, or we adjust the percentage after consideration of those CBA based salaries.

Listed on the spreadsheet is a 0.80% original multiplier, which is CPI based, makes an adjustment for the salary attributions, and gets that adjusted multiplier down from 0.80% to 0.41%.

Once that calculation takes place, the information is carried over to the first spreadsheet, and used to identify an increase to the budget. We then add back the amounts outside of guidance, e.g., special revenue/food service, debt service at new level anticipated for FY22, special education as anticipated for FY22, and NHRS increase. The result is the guidance operating budget of \$24,380,065 after which you would add in the additional warrant articles to build back up to the total budget view.

At the last meeting, the Committee discussed using actuals as the basis for developing preliminary guidance and putting out a guidance view for the budget. What we have is an FY20 actual, a year that we are in right now that incorporated some changes that wouldn't be accounted for if you just took the actuals from last year, e.g., COVID related items. The second spreadsheet shows the FY20 actuals and the addition of two adjustments; any FY21 articles (\$548,122) and the COVID adjustment (\$950,000), which came about after a review of the results that yielded the year-end UFB of \$1,706,088, and, after allocations to the various trusts, resulted in a total year-end UFB of \$1,125,088 being returned to the tax base.

What we get from that guidance base view is a view that is \$139,419 different from the guidance base that is calculated in the way we have historically calculated guidance.

Chairman Mann suggested the Committee engage in a discussion of whether it is believed the 0.80% is the right starting point, how to go about addressing preliminary guidance, and applying that multiplier and adjustment to the FY21 budget and the adjustments. The way it has typically been done would yield an operating budget of \$24,380,065, which is about \$94,500 lower than the current view before the Committee.

Further discussions on impacts of HEA, HESSA, shifting the expendable trust (would require a Warrant Article), how to address the maintenance trust, etc. are separate.

Member Rydstrom noted the first spreadsheet did not exclude the CBAs. Chairman Mann stated they are taken out and adjusted on the second spreadsheet. On the 2nd spreadsheet (guidance multiplier calculation) taken out are all the CBA related salary costs in identifying and evaluating the impact on the multiplier (the \$7,666,192 attributed to prior FY salaries subject to CBAs is removed). Asked if the amount is inclusive of benefits, Chairman Mann noted it to be salaries. Benefits remain included in the guidance base and are subject to the multiplier of 0.41%. What we have been told is that we can expect a 10.9% increase in our rates. The NHRS rate is going up to 21.02% (approx. 18% increase) for professional staff and 14.06% for support staff (approx. 25% increase).

Vice Chairman Blanche questioned how the COVID adjustment (\$950,000) was derived. Chairman Mann stated she went into the Business Administrator's file and reviewed the underruns from last year noting savings in areas such as the transportation contract, professional development, special education, etc., which would have been paid. She made a judgment on what she thought that amount would be. There is likely some movement with that number. Ms. Seeley was asked to look at that number again.

Asked if any special education students are remote learners, Ms. Seeley stated her belief there are a few. Vice Chairman Blanche suggested there could be savings resulting from special education transportation not being required. Chairman Mann commented that is the situation this year. She is uncertain an assumption is being made that we are continuing with this model next year. The assumption is the budget is moving forward and everyone is 100% in school for next year.

Vice Chairman Blanche commented it would be nice to also understand what the costs would be if remaining under the current model. Ms. Seeley commented on that being difficult to do. Chairman Mann stated it would likely be managed the same way this year's budget is being managed; went into it never assuming that this was the model, and you make it work because you have to. Ms. Seeley commented there may be areas of savings, but there would also be areas of increases. Vice Chairman Blanche clarified the amount does not necessarily have to be understood, but it would be helpful to understand the areas within the budget that could be impacted.

Chairman Mann commented on the fact that there are contracts in place such as the transportation contract, outside contracts for student services, the risk of compensatory services being required if certain services cannot be provided, etc. Should the situation be like that of the current year there remains an obligation. This year the transportation contract was renegotiated.

Ms. Seeley commented there are a great deal of unknowns, and it all comes down to how long you would be in remote as that has a dramatic impact on costs.

Member Enright was uncertain of the utility of the Business Administrator expending valuable time to make assumptions to provide such input. Chairman Mann noted, ultimately, it is not the decision of this Committee how that happens; it is a management decision on how to move forward. If the view is that we move forward at 100% then that is how we build the budget. If we don't move that way, then you have to manage all of the variables.

Vice Chairman Blanche agreed he would not want to add any burden on the shoulders of the Business Administrator unnecessarily but wanted to understand the 6-7 parameters that the \$950,000 figure was derived from. Noted were the areas of athletics, transportation, substitutes, professional development, benefits, and wages due to stipends that were not paid.

Member VanCoughnett stated agreement there is the need to build the budget based upon 100% in school participation. If any funds remain at year end, they are returned to the taxpayers. Chairman Mann commented given the situation with how we ended FY20 and because of the unknowns and how you evaluate that, she is uncertain this is the year to consider utilizing adjusted FY20 actuals as the basis for determining guidance. Ms. Seeley stated her agreement.

Hopefully, this year is a good starting point. Although you have 20-30% of the student population out, you are still paying staff to deliver services. We still must run the same number of bus routes and hope to be able to do it through the year. Ms. Seeley added it is closer, but we are spending more on salaries because we must hire people for some of the activities that we have between remote and in-person. There is also an enormous amount of PPE that must be purchased, etc. Chairman Mann added there are also surprising offsets like the \$200/student that no one was expecting.

Member Rydstrom questioned what inflation rate the 0.80% multiplier is based on and was informed it is the CPI of 0.80%.

Asked for clarification, Chairman Mann stated the \$25,755,140 is the Budget Committee's calculated view of the total budget other than HEA and HESSA. The \$25,849,637 (3.9% increase) is the total Superintendent's view (Round 2) excluding the CBAs. On an operating budget view (what would be in the operating budget article), the Budget Committee would be at \$24,380,065 and the COOP view is \$24,474,563, which is a difference of \$94,498.

If using the view of actuals, the Budget Committee number would be at \$24,239,531, which is a \$235,032 difference.

Member Rydstrom remarked given that guidance results in a 3.5% increase, he is not pleased with it. There is a 1% inflation rate. Ms. Kelley noted the 18% increase in NHRS, etc. Member Rydstrom responded it is driven by factors we cannot control so we must control something else. Chairman Mann spoke of some of the uncontrollable increases, e.g., special education increase is nearly \$350,000, increase in NHRS is nearly \$300,000. Vice Chairman Blanche commented on the nearly \$1.2 million being returned to the taxpayers. Chairman Mann noted professional development is \$105,000 lower this year because of eliminating professional development stipends from the contract, there is a lane change reduction of \$80,000, etc.

In the communication received from the Superintendent, a request was made to consider guidance relief with the NHRS and GMR. Chairman Mann suggested being \$95,000 apart, she does not believe there is the need to consider relief for GMR as she believes the Administration could close that gap.

Member Enright questioned if it is known what the health of the Health Trust is given COVID as their reserves were restricted by the State. Ms. Seeley stated the SAU is receiving a contribution holiday this fiscal year. The Health Trust is fiscally healthy.

Chairman Mann stated the total FY19 budget increase was 2.3%, the FY20 budget increase was 7.3%, and the FY21 increase was 1.86%. Without CBA information, the current budget, from the Budget Committee view, is at an increase of 3.5%.

Member Enright suggested, for discussion purposes, when considering contracts, there is another 1-1.25% increase coming.

Asked if there is any flexibility in the budget for the maintenance trust, Ms. Seeley noted the information before the Committee was the result of the 2nd of 4 rounds of discussion on the budget.

Chairman Mann suggested comparing the GMRs provided and actuals realized over a period of several years to consider if it is feasible to plan for an increase less than the GMR provided of 10.9% (9-9.5%). If a trend cannot be seen that is good information for the Committee to have. Ms. Seeley commented there have been years where it was spot on. Most years the actual is less.

Chairman Mann remarked if the athletic expendable trust is taken out, and moved to a revolving fund, it reduces the budget by \$67,000. Ms. Seeley was uncertain what the first year of doing that would look like as she has yet to speak with the DRA on the matter.

- SAU Budget

Asked if the SAU Budget Assessment (\$983,075) listed is based on the current SAU budget, Ms. Seeley stated it to be an estimate as the calculation has not yet been made. She believes it represents an 8% increase.

Chairman Mann noted the contracted increases of the SAU office staff are between 2-4%. Two versions of an SAU budget have been provided for review. When looking at a salary change from 3% to 2%, you impact all of the aspects of that, e.g., FICA, NH Retirement System (NHRS), dues. The budget that included a proposed 3% salary increase resulted in an overall increase (over last year's approved budget) of 9.9%. By reducing the proposed salary increase to 2%, the increase over FY21 would be approx. \$135,000 or 7.4% or a little over 9% if not utilizing any funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB) as a revenue source (as was done last year). The calculated budget is \$135,000 above that of the FY21 budget, but because the funding mechanism changes, \$161,000 more needs to be raised through taxes.

Recommended best practice that comes from the Department of Revenue Administration is to maintain a fund balance of between 7 and 10%. The fund balance is currently hovering around 7%. It is not anticipated the fund balance would be utilized to offset the budget (as a revenue source).

There are no new staff members in the SAU budget. The Facilities Director was hired last year; partial year cost in the current budget, and a full 12 months in the next. There are no increases to professional development. The cost of a storage shed is included in the budget. The purchase was made so that files could be moved from the SAU office to accommodate an office space for the Facilities Director.

Member Enright stated appreciation for the concern that an approx. 5% increase is higher than desired. It needs to be below 5%.

Asked about the special education trust fund, Ms. Seeley stated she has not heard that the fund would be looked to in the COOP District. It is currently funded at \$180,000. The Committee has taken the position that \$225,000 is the cap.

Member Maguire stated agreement with the budget being below 5%.

Chairman Mann commented we would basically be saying there is no multiplier to the budget so that the \$64,000 that would have been calculated is eliminated. That would bring the operating budget down to 3.1% (budget view not actual view). That would be a difference of \$159,000. The school district would need to reduce its operating budget by \$160,000 to get to a 3.1% operating budget change.

Member Rydstrom remarked that is not his number. Asked what his number is, he indicated he does not have one. He understands there are certain expenses we have no control over, but there are expenses we do have control over, and if you are running a business and there are expenses you cannot control, you cut the other expenses. Vice Chairman Blanche commented the Committee could defer adding \$45,000 to the special education trust or perhaps not set aside monies for the roof repair this year.

Chairman Mann noted there is \$200,000 identified for the maintenance trust, but all those items are in the operating budget. There might be some shifting. If it is currently in the operating budget, then we need to evaluate if we would put \$200,000 in an expendable trust or would we reduce that by \$100,000. This might not be the year to add funds to the special education trust. If we move the athletic trust to a revolving account and can take \$67,000 out of the budget, we will have taken \$200,000 out of the non-operating parts of the budget. The Administration would still need to look at the operating pieces of the budget to close that gap. There are two ways to close the percentage growth. The Committee is looking for the Administration to close it on the operating budget side, but there is also movement on the other side.

Right now, the easiest thing for the Committee to say is on the elements outside of the operating budget the Administration would have most of the support; saying the Committee wouldn't fund the special education trust, and wouldn't put \$200,000 into the maintenance expendable trust (perhaps \$50,000[±]).

Chairman Mann does not believe the Committee has ever put forward a budget where it has said there is no inflationary adjustment on \$7.5 million of the budget or no inflation factor on \$15 million of the budget. The Committee recognizes NHRS is going up significantly, there are additional special education services, and there is a GMR impact. She is comfortable with a 0% multiplier, which would result in \$160,000 that needs to come off the operating budget itself.

Member Rydstrom remarked this is not the first time the Committee has had the conversation around the net budget being too high.

Chairman Mann stated appreciation for the perspective. In moving to a process like this that utilizes an analytical approach to how we get to guidance, she believes the Committee has been able to resolve and manage the budget effectively and put together budgets that in some years are as high as 5-7% and in other years are under 2%, because of this process. She would not want to risk, after all the years the Committee has put into developing the process, appearing arbitrary by saying it just needs to be lower.

Member Rydstrom responded he does not wish to be arbitrary either. He also does not want to be Chicago. The costs that cannot be controlled are real costs having a consequence to them. It may be that you must have less services.

Vice Chairman Blanche commented the items mentioned by the Chairman, in total, appear to be substantial, and is the process and analytical data driven approach. It is probably somewhat easier to substantiate and propose rather than just taking a number out of the air.

Member Rydstrom remarked it is easier to substantiate especially if the formulaic result is 3.5% plus the labor contract, resulting in 5%, and that is formulaic, and we all agree to that. But in totality it is too high.

Vice Chairman Blanche stated he would be in favor of a 0% CPI and the other measures discussed, e.g., not funding the special education fund, and funding the maintenance trust at a lesser amount.

Member VanCoughnett commented that is a good way to offset the increase in the benefits, and not have to take it from general education. There are only two areas that can be looked to for cuts: general education and building maintenance. Every time we cut it is coming from general education, and those students are the ones that end up suffering, or it is the building maintenance, which cannot continue to be pushed down the road.

Member Maguire questioned if the contingency fund has been looked to in recent year. Ms. Seeley could not recall off the top of her head. Chairman Mann stated that to be something she could not support as there is a limited retained fund balance and we have an uncertain educational model. We don't get a lot of additional funding.

MOTION BY MEMBER BLANCHE TO SET THE PRELIMINARY GUIDANCE MULTIPLIER AT ZERO, WHICH RESULTS IN A GUIDANCE OPERATING BUDGET OF TWENTY-FOUR MILLION THREE HUNDRED FIFTEEN THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED TWENTY NINE (\$24,315,329 DOLLARS)

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MAGUIRE

ON THE QUESTION

That represents a gap that would need to be closed of \$159,233.

Member Rydstrom questioned where in that the contracts come in and was informed it would be after that. Chairman Mann noted the guidance being discussed is preliminary, and it gives a direction. The Committee comes together again in November when, although information on the CBAs would not be available, there would be a better sense of the budget.

Member Rydstrom commented then that would be based on the totality.

Vice Chairman Blanche questioned if the other items discussed would be reviewed by the Administration. Chairman Mann stated the desire for the Business Administrator to come back before the Committee with information that will be sought from the DRA relative to the Athletic Expendable Trust. Similarly, with the Maintenance Expendable Trust, if items currently listed within the budget are allocated as expenditures from the Maintenance Expendable Trust, that would move towards closing the \$160,000 gap. She stated a preference to review those elements at the next meeting when the Committee has a better view of the budget.

Vice Chairman Blanche stated agreement noting the Committee could also then have a discussion of prioritization.

- School Board Update

Ms. Seeley commented the School Board has been discussing bonding some of the items that are within the Maintenance Expendable Trust. Even if a very small number (perhaps \$1.5 million), and perhaps doing two phases of the roof and additional paving.

Chairman Mann stated the bond threshold has changed because of HB 1558. The threshold to pass a bond is now a 60% (3/5 majority) whether an SB2 community or not. There is no longer the 67% threshold, and bond rates are extremely low.

Vice Chairman Blanche commented with the interest rates being as low as they are, it might be a good direction to take. Member Enright stated his immediate response to that is positive.

MOTION CARRIED

5-1-0

Member VanCoughnett voted in opposition

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Mann stated the District's offering of free lunch has been extended until the end of the school year. Ms. Seeley noted the downside of that is getting the free and reduced lunch applications again, as many funding sources depend on that information.

AGENDA BUILDING

Chairman Mann noted the 4th Thursday meeting in November falls on Thanksgiving. She proposed changing the meeting date to November 19th.

PROCESS OBSERVER READOUT

Member VanCoughnett commented on how well the meeting ran.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MEMBER ENRIGHT TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER RYDSTROM

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

The October 22, 2020 meeting of the COOP Budget Committee adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Date: _____

Signed: _____