Board Meeting Documents
December 15, 2025

Lake Mountain School District Policy Template

Policy Number and Title: 7002 School Naming
Policy Type: Community

Policy Statement: The Board of Education values meaningful participation from community members, students, patrons, and staff in the naming of schools. School names shape identity, reflect community values, and serve students and families for decades. This policy establishes a clear and consistent framework for naming and renaming schools in a manner that is inclusive, transparent, and aligned with the long-term interests of the Lake Mountain School District.

Definitions:
Board: The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name to be inserted when approved), the elected governing body responsible for establishing district policy and overseeing district governance.
Ex-Officio Officer: A district administrator designated to provide guidance, ensure consistency with district standards, and support the integrity of the process without voting authority.
Naming Committee: A temporary advisory committee established to recommend school name options to the Board in accordance with this policy.
Patron: A parent, guardian, or community member residing within the attendance boundary of the school.
School Community Council (SCC): A school-based council established pursuant to Utah law to advise on school improvement and community engagement.

Scope: This policy applies to the naming of newly established schools and to the renaming of existing schools when such action is directed or approved by the Board.

Reference:
- Utah Code Title 53G-4 Public Education System
- Lake Mountain Policy 7001 Community Committees and Public Advisory Groups

Policy Provisions:

1. **Board Authority**
   The Board of Education retains final authority for naming and renaming all schools within the district.

2. **Advisory Committee**
   When appropriate, the Board may utilize a Naming Committee to advise on school naming or renaming.

3. **Committee Formation**
   A Naming Committee may be established after the Board has approved the school attendance boundary and a principal has been selected.

4. **Committee Composition**
   The Naming Committee shall include PTA and/or School Community Council officers or members and patrons residing within the approved attendance boundary.

   The committee shall be co-chaired by the school principal and a PTA or SCC officer, member, or patron. The school principal shall serve as a voting member of the committee. A district administrator shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member to provide guidance and ensure alignment with district standards and Board expectations.

5. **Committee Role**
   The Naming Committee serves in an advisory capacity and is responsible for developing recommendations that reflect community input, apply consistent criteria, and support a fair and transparent naming process.

6. **Recommendations to the Board**
   The Naming Committee shall submit three recommended school names to the Board for consideration.

7. **Board Action**
   The Board of Education shall review the recommendations and formally name or rename the school through Board action.

Effectiveness: This policy is considered effective when school naming and renaming decisions follow a documented, community-informed process and result in Board-approved school names that reflect the identity and values of the school community.

Evaluation Standards: This policy will be evaluated by the Board and considered effective when school naming or renaming decisions are informed by documented community input, include the submission of three recommended names with a clear rationale, and result in a final school name adopted through formal Board action.

Review Cycle: This policy shall be reviewed by the Board at least once every five years or as needed to ensure continued alignment with district governance practices and community expectations.

Accountability/Reporting: The Superintendent is responsible for ensuring implementation of this policy and for reporting to the Board upon request regarding school naming or renaming activities.

Policy History
Adoption Date: January 2026
Effective Date: January 2026
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:
Revision History & Findings:

Lake Mountain School District

Policy Number and Title: 5501 Lake Mountain temporary name; final district name inserted when approved) Foundation
Policy Type: Finance and Operations: Foundations

Policy Statement: The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name inserted when approved) supports the establishment and operation of a School District Foundation to expand educational opportunities, strengthen community partnerships, and provide additional resources for students, educators, and schools.

This policy outlines the expectations and boundaries that guide the Foundation's work with the district. The Foundation operates as an independent nonprofit organization. Its efforts shall complement district goals, support approved programs, and contribute to the success and well-being of the students and staff of the district.

Definitions:

- **Advertising Partnerships:** Commercial or nonprofit advertising requests submitted for distribution to students or families in accordance with district procedures.
- **Board:** The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name to be inserted when approved), the elected governing body responsible for establishing district policy, providing oversight, and ensuring responsible stewardship of district resources.
- **District Priorities:** Goals, initiatives, or outcomes formally adopted by the Board.
- **Foundation:** The Lake Mountain School District Foundation (temporary name), an independent nonprofit entity established under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code to support district programs and initiatives.
- **Fundraising Partnerships:** Relationships or agreements between the Foundation and external organizations established for the purpose of raising funds.
- **Superintendent:** The Superintendent of the Lake Mountain School District, or an individual formally designated by the Superintendent to perform specific duties or responsibilities under this policy. The Superintendent retains accountability for all delegated actions.

Scope: This policy applies to all Foundation activities that interface with district operations, including fundraising, partnerships, advertising, communication, and donations to district schools, staff, or programs. This policy does not govern the internal operations of the Foundation, which remain the responsibility of its independent Board of Directors.

Reference:

- Utah Code 53E-3-403, Establishment of public education foundations
- Utah Code 53G-4-402(14), Powers and duties generally
- Utah Code 53G-4-404, Annual financial audit report
- Utah Code 53G-7-306, School district interfund transfers (spend revenues within the fund collected)
- Utah Code 53G-7-402, Internal auditing program, audit committee
- Utah Code 53G-7-503, Fees, prohibitions (elementary supply list notice)
- Utah Code 63G-2, Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA)
- Utah Code 63G-6a, Utah Procurement Code
- Utah Code 51-2a-102, State auditor requirements for audits and audit reports
- Utah Administrative Rule R277-113, LEA Fiscal and Auditing Policies

Policy Provisions:

1. **Purpose and Alignment**

    1.1 The Foundation exists to support district goals by providing financial resources for programs, innovations, and opportunities that benefit students and educators.
    1.2 Foundation supported initiatives must align with Board goals and support measurable improvements in student opportunities, access, or outcomes.
    1.3 Foundation activities may not conflict with Board policy, Utah law, district fiscal expectations, or ethical standards.

2. **Governance Boundaries**

    2.1 The Foundation is an independent nonprofit governed by its own Board of Directors.
    2.2 District operations, personnel decisions, and financial processes remain under the authority of the district and may not be directed by the Foundation.
    2.3 Donations and initiatives may **supplement** but may not **supplant** district budget responsibilities.
    2.4 Use of district branding, communication channels, or facilities by the Foundation must be approved by the Superintendent.

3. **Fundraising Partnerships**

    3.1 The Foundation may establish partnerships with organizations to raise funds in support of district schools and programs.
    3.2 The Foundation shall provide an updated list of approved fundraising partners annually.
    3.3 Schools may use Foundation-approved partners or select additional fundraisers consistent with district procedures.
    3.4 Fundraising activities must comply with district financial practices, safety standards, and legal requirements.

4. **Advertising Partnerships**
   4.1 The Foundation or district may not distribute advertising materials to students unless the advertisement provides a direct financial benefit to the district, a school, or the Foundation.
   4.2 All advertising requests must be reviewed and approved by the Superintendent or Communications Office.
   4.3 Schools must confirm district approval before distributing advertising materials to students.
   4.4 Commercial materials not approved for student distribution may be placed in school offices with principal approval.

5. **Donations and Use of Funds**
   5.1 All donations made through the Foundation become district property and must be used for the educational purpose for which they were collected.
   5.2 Donations must be expended in accordance with donor intent and district fiduciary responsibilities. Documentation must be maintained for audit purposes.
   5.3 Foundation donations may not benefit a specific student or be used to pay individual student fees, project costs, or travel. Donations may support a class, grade level, program, or school.
   5.4 Donations may not be used to personally benefit a district employee. Compensation must follow district payroll and procurement procedures.
   5.5 Purchases funded by donations must comply with district procurement rules, including technology and equipment purchasing standards.
   5.6 Donations intended for facility or capital improvements must comply with procurement law, facility standards, and district capital project approval processes.
   5.7 Items or equipment purchased with Foundation funds are district property and remain with the district if an employee transfers or leaves employment.
   5.8 Donations may not be used to circumvent district purchasing, facility improvement, technology, or safety requirements.

6. **Communication and Coordination**
   6.1 The Superintendent and Foundation Director shall maintain regular communication to ensure alignment and transparency.
   6.2 Foundation funded initiatives may be publicly recognized by the district.
   6.3 Foundation produced materials that use district branding must be reviewed before release.

7. **Financial Stewardship and Transparency**
   7.1 The Foundation shall comply with all nonprofit reporting requirements, including annual filings and independent financial audits.
   7.2 The district shall maintain documentation of all donations received and ensure their appropriate use.
   7.3 Foundation and district funds must remain separate and may not be commingled.

8. **Fair Access**
   8.1 Foundation supported initiatives must support fair access across the district.
   8.2 Opportunities funded through the Foundation may not restrict student participation based on ability to pay.
   8.3 Distribution of Foundation resources shall support district goals and address student needs across schools and programs.

Procedures:

1. District Foundation Coordination

1.1 The Superintendent shall designate a district liaison to coordinate communication and implementation.
1.2 The Superintendent shall meet with the Foundation Director at least quarterly.
1.3 District branding used by the Foundation must be approved through the Communications Office.

2. Fundraising Partnerships

2.1The Foundation shall provide an annual list of approved fundraising partners.
2.2 Schools using a partnership fundraiser must submit a fundraising request form.
2.3 School shall notify the district liaison of fundraising plans.
2.4 The district liaison shall maintain documentation of all approved and denied requests.

3. Advertising Requests

3.1 Entities must submit advertising requests with sample materials and a statement of benefit.
3.2 The Communications Office and Foundation Director evaluate requests for appropriateness and benefit.
3.3 Approved advertising must include an authorization code before distribution.
3.4 The district shall retain documentation of approvals for three years.

4. Donations and Grants

4.1 Donation Approval

- Principals must approve donation requests before patrons are contacted.
- All donations require Business Administrator review to ensure compliance with state law, proper accounting, donor-intent documentation, procurement requirements, and district financial controls.
- Checks must be payable to the school or the Foundation, not to individual employees.

4.2 Classroom and Grade-Level Donations

- Teachers must clarify how donations will be used.
- All students must be able to participate regardless of contribution.
- Donations should be receipted into the appropriate school or Foundation account.

4.3 Use of Donated Funds

- All purchases must follow donor intent and district procurement requirements.
- Items purchased with donated funds are district property.

4.4 Employee Donations Through Payroll

- Employees may contribute through payroll deduction.
- Funds must be used for educational purposes.
- Employees may not issue charitable receipts.

4.5 Donations for Students

- Donations cannot be used to pay a specific student's fees or costs.
- Donations may support a group, not an individual.

4.6 Donations to Outside Organizations

- When fundraisers support outside groups, funds are receipted into a third-party payable account.
- Schools are encouraged to support local needs benefiting district students.

4.7 Capital, Equipment, or Facility Improvements

- Must follow procurement law and district facilities approval processes.
- Donors may not independently purchase or install equipment or construction services.

4.8 Electronic Donation Platforms

- The Foundation may provide donation links or QR codes.
- Electronic platforms may not be used for school fees or required school items.

4.9 Staff Transfer or Departure

- Foundation accounts tied to an employee move with the employee if they transfer within the district.
- Staff leaving the district may direct remaining funds before departure.
- Undirected balances are reassigned by the Foundation.

4.10 In-Kind Donations

- Must be documented, approved, and meet district standards.

Effectiveness: This policy is effective when Foundation activities are aligned to Board adopted district goals, donations are used as intended, and fundraising, advertising, and reporting practices support fair access, transparency, and continuous improvement across the district.

Evaluation Standards:
This policy is considered effective when Foundation supported donations and initiatives are documented and used in accordance with donor intent and district procedures, aligned to one or more Board-adopted district goals, implemented without restricting participation based on ability to pay, and reviewed annually by the Board through a summary that identifies the scope of support, evidence of access or impact, and any recommended adjustments for future improvement.

Review Cycle: This policy shall be reviewed every five years or earlier as needed to maintain legal compliance and operational alignment.

Accountability/Reporting: The Board is accountable for maintaining the governance expectations established in this policy, and the Superintendent is responsible for ensuring implementation through administrative procedures and for providing the Board with the information necessary to evaluate alignment, use of funds, and outcomes related to Foundation activities.

Policy History
Adoption Date: January ___, 2026
Effective Date: January ___, 2026
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:
Revision History:

Lake Mountain School District Policy Template

Policy Number and Title: 7001 Community Committees and Public Advisory Groups
Policy Type: Community

Policy Statement: The Lake Mountain School District Board of Education believes effective governance includes listening to and learning from the community. Community committees and public advisory groups provide a structured way for parents, educators, students, and community members to share perspectives and practical insight that help inform district work and Board decisions. These committees are advisory in nature and are intended to broaden participation, support transparency, and ensure Board decisions remain connected to community experience and aligned with Board adopted goals.

Definitions:

- **Ad Hoc Committee:** A committee formed for a specific purpose and limited duration which dissolves upon completion of its charge.
- **Board:** The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name inserted when approved), the elected governing body responsible for establishing district policy and oversight.
- **Community Committee or Advisory Group:** A temporary advisory body established to provide input or recommendations on a defined topic identified by the Board or Superintendent.
- **Superintendent:** The Superintendent of the Lake Mountain School District, or an individual formally designated by the Superintendent to perform specific duties or responsibilities under this policy. The Superintendent retains accountability for all delegated actions.

Scope: This policy applies to all community committees and public advisory groups established by the Board of Education, Superintendent, or Superintendent’s designee and governs their formation, use, and oversight.

Reference:

- Utah Code Title 53G-4 Public Education System
- Utah Open and Public Meetings Act Title 52-4

Policy Provisions:

1. **Authority to Establish Committees**
   The Board of Education or Superintendent may establish community committees or advisory groups as needed to support Board work, district initiatives, or community engagement efforts.

2. **Advisory Role**
   Community committees serve in an advisory capacity only. They do not have decision making authority and may not act on behalf of the Board or the District.
3. **Membership and Representation**
   Committees may include School Community Council members or their designee(s), parents, staff, students when appropriate, and community members selected to reflect perspectives relevant to the committee's charge.
4. **Participation Rotation**
   To encourage broader community involvement, individuals who complete service on a district established community committee must wait one calendar year before serving again on another district community committee.
5. **Charge and Duration**
   Each committee shall have a defined charge and expected timeframe. Committees conclude upon completion of their assigned work unless extended by the Board or Superintendent.
6. **Support and Communication**
   The Superintendent or designee shall assign a staff liaison to support committee operations and ensure committee input is summarized and communicated to the Board or Superintendent in a timely manner.

Effectiveness: This policy is effective when community committees are used intentionally to gather input on defined topics, participation is shared across the community rather than concentrated among the same individuals, and committee feedback is clearly communicated to and considered by the Board as part of its decision making process.

Evaluation Standards: This policy will be considered effective when community committees are established with a clearly defined charge connected to Board adopted goals, membership reflects participation rotation, committee input is documented and shared with the Board, and the Board can identify how community feedback informed discussion or decisions.

Review Cycle: This policy shall be reviewed by the Board at least once every five years or sooner if required by changes in law, Board priorities, or governance practices.

Accountability/Reporting: The Superintendent shall provide summaries to the Board as appropriate identifying community committees formed under this policy, their charge, and the outcomes of their work to support Board oversight and continuous improvement.

Policy History
Adoption Date: January 2026
Effective Date: January 2026
Review Dates
Revision Dates
Revision History
Findings:

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING – DECEMBER 3, 2025

The Board of Education of the Lake Mountain School District met in a board meeting on Wednesday, December 3, 2025, at 6:00 PM. The board meeting took place in council chambers at the City of Eagle Mountain City Hall offices.

Board members present: President Julie King, Vice President Matt Isaacson, Charity Judkins, Joylin Lincoln, Melissa Sauser, and Ilene Strong. Not present: Julie Myers.

Also present: There were approximately 69 others in attendance.

President Julie King conducted the meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Jen Cherry, a teacher at Silver Lake Elementary.

INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT OR REFLECTION

An inspirational thought was given by Board member Melissa Sauser.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Malea Bliss, a Senate Candidate from Kearns, attended the meeting to express her support for the community. She noted that after speaking with city leaders, it is clear that growth is outpacing available infrastructure. She emphasized the need for smarter growth solutions, citing challenges such as commuting difficulties and limited access points that pose safety concerns. Her goal is to help develop a blueprint for responsible growth with infrastructure that anticipates future needs. She acknowledged the Board's responsibility to educate the next generation and noted that this is difficult when buses and traffic cannot move safely. She expressed her desire to be a partner and a voice at the Capitol to advocate for road funding. She reminded attendees that voting runs from December 5 through December 11th and encouraged support, participation, and engagement.

Monica Corry of Cedar Fort spoke in opposition to the proposed closure of Cedar Valley Elementary. She urged the Board not to rush the decision and to ensure all facts are fully reviewed before taking action. She expressed a desire to collaborate moving forward to achieve the best outcomes for students. Ms. Corry noted that charter schools expected to open in 2027 are not a guarantee, emphasizing that closing CVE in 2026 would create a gap in available options and does not align with projected enrollment needs. She also shared concerns about the laws referenced in the prior board meeting, stating she was unable to obtain clarification regarding satellite school options and safety issues. She said communication barriers with Alpine School District made it difficult to get accurate information, as teams were not aligned. Ms. Corry urged the Board to work collaboratively, be transparent, and involve the community in finding solutions. She concluded by asking the Board mot to rush the process and to keep CVE open.

Erika Douglas a 16-year Cedar Fort resident whose children attended Cedar Valley Elementary, spoke in support of closing CVE. She stated that she has never supported the school remaining open due to what she views as irresponsible funding practices. She emphasized that her concerns extend beyond finances, noting that she has long advocated for students to have access to art, music, and PE. If the school remains open, she believes these programs must be provided. Ms. Douglas, previously a special education teacher, district reading specialist and school librarian, expressed concerns about split classes, stating they negatively affect the detailed instruction needed in each subject. She argued that students need dedicated classes and access to appropriate specialists. She added that if students are moved to the new school, they will receive all necessary services without losing any supports. She noted that funds saved from closing CVE could allow the district to hire approximately 33 teacher aides, 18 first-year teachers, 15 Lane 1 Step 6 teachers, 12 school psychologists and SLPs, and 18 school nurses.

Mitchell Kneuppo of Cedar Fort spoke in opposition to the closure of Cedar Valley Elementary. He noted that fewer than 50% of Utah students are reading at grade level and emphasized his desire for his children to read, write, excel in science, and be academically challenged. Drawing on his experience as a flight instructor – where the consequences of insufficient knowledge are significant – he stressed the importance of ensuring students are fully prepared. He stated that if children are not given a proper education and adequate academic challenges, they will face difficulties once they leave the school system.

Ashley Lott of Eagle Mountain spoke in favor of closing Cedar Valley Elementary. She stated that the school is not equipped to accommodate the anticipated growth and the capital investment required to make it adequate would serve only as a temporary fix and represent a misuse of funds. Ms. Lott noted that when the emotional aspects are set aside, the data presents a clear picture. She emphasized the Board's responsibility to allocate resources equitably across the entire district, which serves 25,000 students, rather than concentrating disproportionate capital, staffing, and resources into a single campus. She encouraged the Board to redirect those funds to strengthen the district as a whole, acknowledging that significant growth challenges lie ahead. She urged the Board to vote to close CVE and to move forward with opening additional schools in the area.

Kelsey Guernsey of Eagle Mountain spoke in opposition to the closure of Cedar Valley Elementary. She shared that students are having positive experiences and are thriving due to the school's unique culture, where teachers know students and families personally. She emphasized that small class sizes support both academic success and emotional development. Ms. Guernsey expressed concern that the school's students would be reassigned to sites that are already overcrowded, which could negatively affect their learning. She also noted that longer bus rides would reduce family time as well as options for after school activities. She believes this decision will disrupt friendships, and create instability – particularly for students in the Fire Fly community who have already been asked to change schools once before. She urged the Board to keep CVE open until a better option, such as a new school in the Fire Fly development, becomes available. She concluded by stating that students deserve stability and access to quality education, and she trusts the Board to make the decision that best serves students.

Tyler Boud, a student of Cedar Valley Elementary spoke against the closure of Cedar Valley Elementary. He shared that he and his siblings previously struggled at Hidden Hollow, but since transferring to CVE they have made significant progress and are now doing well academically. He questioned why the school would be closed when the surrounding schools are experiencing overcrowding and the area is rapidly growing and noted that no clear reason has been provided for the closure. He expressed concern about the impact on families, businesses, students, and teachers, and asked the Board not to close the school or separate him from his friends. He concluded by reminding the Board that they were elected to represent the community, which does not want CVE to close.

Heather Wrigley of Cedar Valley spoke in opposition to closing Cedar Valley Elementary. She acknowledged that closing the school would generate some savings but argued it would place significant strain on surrounding schools and create avoidable challenges during the district's first few years of operation. She noted that while closure would save roughly 4% of the district's budget, the hidden costs – including overcrowded classrooms, teacher burnout, reduced programs, longer bus rides, lower academic performance, and increased behavior issues – would be substantial. Ms. Wiggley stated that keeping CVE open and maintaining Fire Fly within its current boundaries would address multiple concerns: it would allow the district to fully utilize the CVE campus, keep Fire Fly students within their chosen community, and support SPED students who thrive at CVE but have struggled elsewhere. She urged the Board to take time to evaluate the legal and logistical questions previously raised. She requested clarification on the statute cited regarding the satellite option, noting that the community is willing to close the road and build required fencing. She emphasized that keeping CVE open aligns with the Board's responsibilities and referenced a petition signed by 1,200 individuals asking that the school remain open until an alternative solution is identified. Ms. Wiggley concluded that the appropriate time for closure would be when the campus reaches full capacity and the West area is ready for a new school. She stated the community is actively seeking land, exploring funding options, and engaging legislative partners to support the establishment of a future school.

Ashley Cook of Cedar Fort thanked the Board for the work they have done and acknowledged the difficulty of the decision ahead. She addressed the common reasons districts close schools – under enrollment, consolidation, safety concerns, and financial challenges. She stated that Cedar Valley Elementary would only need an enrollment of 200 students to align with the district's average cost per student. With current enrollment at 130 and expected growth from the Fire Fly area, she believes enrollment will increase. Mrs. Cook noted concerns about the school eventually outgrowing the building but stated that the anticipated charter school opening in 2027 will absorb much of that future enrollment growth, preventing CVE from exceeding capacity. She acknowledged that the building needs repairs but emphasized that most major issues have already been addressed. Regarding staff, she asked how many Board members had directly spoken with the teachers and shared that the teachers she has spoken with want consistency for themselves and their students and want to remain together as a staff, but do not want to be reassigned to the Brylee Farms or the Fire Fly school. Mrs. Cook stated that keeping CVE open is the path that minimizes disruption and best supports both students and teachers. She concluded that this approach allows the Board to move forward with updated data, improved processes, and new approaches.

Mayor Wyatt Cook of Cedar Fort spoke in opposition to the closure of Cedar Valley Elementary. He began by congratulating the board and thanking them for their service, noting the weight of the decisions they face. He provided several clarifying points regarding the information surrounding the potential closure of CVE. He advised the proposed changes would add about five (5) minutes to current bus routes times causing about a twenty (20) minute round trip daily – with some students, such as those in Fairfield, experiencing longer rides. He noted this will impact the students study time and family time. He noted that while Alpine School District lists the school capacity at 300 students, he stated this number is flexible, as certain classrooms can be adapted or reconfigured as well as portables and a satellite option. Many schools address limited outdoor space by using split lunch and recess schedules, a common practice nationwide. And the charter schools planned for the area have received preliminary approval, which he described as a positive step toward addressing future growth in the area. Mayor Cook emphasized that CVE has been through significant challenges and, while currently small, the school will not remain that way as growth continues. He expressed concern that CVE might be treated similarly to how ASD handled schools in the West, urging the Board to pursue better options as a new district with a new governing body. He encouraged the Board to consider all alternatives and avoid closing CVE.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Board Handbook Creation

   President Julie King asked whether the discussion of the Board Handbook should be moved to a work session or addressed immediately as part of making board assignments. She emphasized the importance of establishing norms and practices early to prevent future issues. **President King** questioned if the Board wished to discuss during the work session on December 17th or prioritize the topic sooner.

   Board member Strong proposed beginning the work on a handbook. **President King** agreed, noting that someone could volunteer to lead the effort or the discussion could be held during a work session. **Board member Strong** asked whether this would involve policy work, and **President King** clarified that it would not. Instead, it would address expectations such as how to respond when a board member acts outside established norms, as well as responsibilities, committee selection, and overall board culture.

   Board member Sauser stated that a work session would provide the necessary time for an in-depth discussion. **President King** concluded by recommending that the topic be moved to a work session unless any board member objected. No board members objected.

2. Policy 4201: School Calendars

   President King explained the policy review process, noting that the first month is designated for discussion and edits, while the second month is reserved for action. Two policies are currently scheduled for review and turned the time over to **Board member Lincoln**.

   Board member Lincoln explained that discussing the policies at this stage allows the community time to review the proposals, provide feedback, and suggest revisions. She encouraged community members to

send comments to any Board member. She noted that without an adopted policy, the Lake Mountain School District must default to Alpine School District's policies. **Board member Lincoln** highlighted that ASD adopts its calendar only one year in advance, while she recommends adopting a three-year calendar to improve consistency. She emphasized the value of maintaining a common calendar across all three (3) new districts to support alignment and fluency. **Board member Lincoln** reviewed the policy components, including definitions, required codes, committee composition, and compliance expectations. The policy established procedures for the Superintendent to form a calendar committee and references information from ASD's calendar committee, including who participated. She noted that ASD conducted a comprehensive survey, breaking the data down by area, and the intent was to incorporate the range of comments and perspectives received. She added that the proposed policy accounts for calendar effectiveness, outlines a review cycle, and ensures the district tracks policy history.
President King suggested using the phrase "the Superintendent or their designee," noting that responsibilities could be delegated to another cabinet member or district leader.
Vice President Isaacson asked whether the policy permits the adoption of multiple calendars. **Board member Lincoln** confirmed that it does. **Vice President Isaacson** then inquired about the process for amending a calendar. **Board Member Lincoln** explained that once a calendar is adopted, it can always be amended. Some amendments may be required by state statute (e.g., Kinder testing dates for ASD last year which required a calendar amendment), but the option to amend is always available.
President King noted a numbering issue: there is no number 3, and it jumps from 2 to 4 and suggested a simple cleanup.
Board member Sauser asked, regarding the language in Section 2.1 on calendar requirements, whether early-release days are necessary and why they are listed in the same bullet as professional development days. **Board member Lincoln** explained that they were grouped together so families can more easily plan ahead and view all key dates in one place, noting that early-release days can be reviewed at a later time.
Board member Sauser then asked who served on the ASD committee when it was originally formed and when the LMSD committee would need to be established. **Board member Lincoln** responded that the committee membership is outlined in the definitions section. And she stated that if the Board approves the policy and adopts the calendars, a new committee would not need to be created until the 2027-2028 school year. **Board member Sauser** thanked **Board member Lincoln** for her work on the policies and for providing opportunities for community input.
Board member Judkins emphasized the importance of having a built-in process for reviewing and evaluating both policies and board practices to ensure they continue to meeting the district's needs.
Board member Lincoln agreed, noting that reflection is an essential part of being an educator. She expressed appreciation for incorporating this process and stated that ongoing reflection will help the Board improve over time.
President King referenced Section 2.1, explaining that the current language reads as if it refers to minimum days rather than early-release days. She suggested revising the wording. **Board member Lincoln** responded that the language can be tightened up and the definitions strengthened to provide greater clarity.

3. Policy 5201: Tax Increment Funding

Board member Lincoln explained that while partnerships between a school district and a community for economic development can be valuable, they should be used sparingly and guided by a clearly defined policy. The policy should outline the process and procedures so the community understands when and why such partnership may be considered. She noted examples such as solar farms, where large acreage is utilized without generating housing or supporting student growth, underscoring the need for clear definitions and criteria. She emphasized that any partnership must ultimately benefit students, as the district's core mission is educating students. The policy establishes standards of eligibility and clarifies that proposals must provide a benefit to the district, not solely to a private company. Because some aspects extend beyond the Board's or Business Administrator's expertise, the district may engage a third party to support evaluation and ensure transparent collaboration with stakeholders. Board member Lincoln added that procedures are outline without naming the Business Administrator directly, as that role falls under the designation of “designee”, though the Superintendent must remain fully informed. The policy also includes evaluation standards, accountability measures, and a review cycle.

Vice President Isaacson sought clarification on the provision for third-party financial reviews, noting the reference to three (3) TIF per year. He asked whether the policy limits the district to three (3), allows more than three (3), or permits an unlimited number without expense. **Board member Lincoln** explained that the number three (3) was intentionally included to keep the district’s primary focus on students and education rather than spending educational funds on evaluating economic development proposals. **Vice President Isaacson** confirmed that this means the district may contract for up to three (3) per year and not exceed that limit. **Board member Lincoln** reiterated that the intent is to restrict the use of funds needed for educating students. **Vice President Isaacson** suggested adjusting the wording to specify “up to three (3)”, while still allowing for additional contracts if necessary. He also recommended amending the language regarding who initiates and negotiates agreements, expanding it beyond the Superintendent to include the Board President or Board leadership. He further noted that the eligibility requirement is projects must create jobs above the average level – may exclude proposals such as solar farms, which typically do not generate new jobs. **Board member Lincoln** stated she could revise the language and make the necessary adjustments.

President King expressed strong support for the section on eligibility and standards for consideration. She highlighted the importance of requiring a financial benefit beyond the standard tax base, noting that the district often bears the greatest impact in these agreements. She appreciated provisions that allow for higher increments, litigation payments, or land donations, as well as the inclusion of the three (3) year trigger. She explained that some companies do not fulfill their commitments, leaving land undeveloped and failing to generate the anticipated revenue. She stated that it is important for the district to enter negotiations at a different rate than other entities and to clearly outline its requirements from the outset. Establishing this framework early helps ensure clarity during negotiations. **Board member Lincoln** agreed, noting that the district has “the most skin in the game”. She emphasized that educating students is central to the future of the community, and the district must secure the greatest possible benefit for them.

Vice President Isaacson asked if the three (3) year trigger means the agreement would expire if no action was taken. **Board member Lincoln** explained that the intent is to allow for renegotiation at that point, noting that the policy is designed to avoid binding future boards. Limiting the term to three (3) years ensures expiration and an opportunity to revisit the agreement. **Vice President Isaacson** recommended adjusting the language to clearly state that the agreement includes an expiration date.

ACTION ITEMS

1. November Minutes
   Board president Julie King recommended the approval of the November 25th board meeting minutes. Board member Sauser made the motion to approve the November 25th board meeting minutes, and it was seconded by Board member Strong.
   Board member Sauser expressed appreciation for Executive Secretary, Breanna Loniero, noting that she is currently supporting all four (4) school boards. She commended the high quality and detail of her minutes and publicly thanked her for the extensive work she is doing behind the scenes to support the Alpine Board and the three (3) newly formed boards during the transition.
   The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Consideration of Cedar Valley Elementary School Closure
   Board member Lincoln made the motion to close Cedar Valley Elementary effective the 2026-2027 school year, and it was seconded by Board member Strong.
   Board member Lincoln stated that this was a difficult decision because of her deep care for the community. She noted that her first connection to the school began in 1998 and that she values the small-town environment. She explained that the cost to educate students at CVE is nearly twice the district average, and although those costs would decrease if enrollment reached 300 students, the school’s capacity is only about 205 students before split classes become necessary. Split classes, she emphasized, should not be the long-term solution. She noted that an addition 71 students would strain the school and

projections are showing 78 additional students next year and continued growth beyond that. With only one class per grade, there are no alternatives if a student does not connect well with their teacher or if students have conflicts with peers – issues that can affect not just one year, but multiple years as the same students move up together. Board member Lincoln outlined the significant challenges of expanding the building into the parking lot, including sewer constraints, safety concerns, and the complications of students crossing the street. She added that a road cannot be fenced and that the state safety consultant evaluated the site. She also noted the absence of specialty classes, meaning students are not receiving the full benefits available in more comprehensive schools. She concluded that the Board's responsibility is to ensure safe schools and equitable opportunities for all the students. While she has deep respect for the community and appreciates small rural towns, acting now allows students to move together to Brylee Farms and helps prevent further overloading at the current school. Her vote, she stated, reflects what she believes is the best long-term solutions for students.

President King noted that several ASD staff members were present to answer any questions from the Board, including **Eric Woodhouse**, Executive Director of Operations; **Frank Pulley**, Director of Physical Facilities; and **Derek Farnes**, Director of Operational Analytics. She stated that each of them was closely involved in the boundary studies and discussions and is available to address any specific issues or questions.

Board member Strong noted that **Board member Lincoln** referenced several figures in her comments and, since she had heard those numbers previously, requested that an official district representative provide the exact data for clarification.

Mr. Woodhouse explained that he is not the Business Administrator and did not have the information readily available, but the figures had been shared in an email. He asked **President King** to read the information from the message sent by Business Administrator, Jason Sundberg. **President King** presented the figures, noting that they were from last year and would be slightly higher now.

Board member Strong shared that she approached the decision with a heavy heart. She recalled being on the other side of a school-closure discussion in her own neighborhood, where the community united to advocate for what they had built. However, she emphasized that she is also viewing the situation through her experience as a former principal in ASD, working in a high-growth area. She stated that the district needs additional classrooms and a new school, and looking at the data from a districtwide perspective, the numbers are deeply concerning as she has worked with teachers in overcrowded classrooms. She expressed gratitude for previous decisions that supported CVE, noting they were the right decisions at the time. However, based on the current data, Board member Strong said she believes closing CVE is the best decision for the district as a whole. She added that one of the biggest concerns raised during her campaign was the potential for increased taxes, and she committed to doing everything she can to avoid raising them. This decision is one way to improve efficiency and save money for the district.

Boad member Sauser thanked the community for their feedback on the proposed boundary change and potential school closure. She expressed appreciation for those who participated in the survey and those who provided public comment at ASD board meetings. She summarized two of the most common community questions: Why close the school now if the area is growing? And why is CVE being considered for closure when other areas with growth are not? **President King** responded that the Board has reviewed potential closures multiple times over the years. Several years ago, five (5) schools were considered for closure, and only two (2) were ultimately closed. With the upcoming district split, areas that have previously been hesitant to close schools will likely need to reconsider. She noted that school closures are the most difficult decisions the Board makes, followed closely by boundary changes, and sometimes boards avoid these difficult decisions, delaying them for years. Addressing why closure is being considered despite growth, **President King** explained that the CVE property presents unique challenges. The building was originally an LDS church and renovated into a school. It includes eight (8) traditional classrooms and a satellite area, but not all spaces are being utilized for classroom use. The practical maximum capacity is about eleven (11) classrooms, which limits flexibility as enrollment increases. She shared that the Board explored all alternatives – including adding a satellite building in the parking lot or placing multiple portables onsite. However, the state safety specialist advised that these options would be unacceptable because the area would need to be fully fenced and would be classified as a separate campus, requiring additional security measures. Each option introduced new complications, and the limitations of the site became increasingly clear. She concluded that the Board must determine when continued investment in a constrained site is no longer sustainable. Given the significant limitations and lack of room for expansion or flexibility, the Board needed to look toward more viable long-term solutions.

Board member Strong asked **Mr. Pulley** to address the safety concerns raised during public comments and to clarify the related legal requirements. **Mr. Pulley** explained that campuses must either be fully fenced or have active security during school hours. If a campus were added across the street, it would require full fencing, a secured entry point, and continuous monitoring. While this is possible, it would come with significant costs. He also noted that converting parking areas into additional classroom space creates further challenges – specifically, the loss of parking and drop-off areas – and the site has inherent limitations unless additional property is acquired.

Mr. Woodhouse discussed staffing challenges, noting that staffing decisions usually do not rely solely on district averages because student numbers fluctuate across grade levels. Current enrollment at CVE shows significant variation, and projections for next year include the need for eleven (11) full-size classrooms with 30-31 students in each. Although split-grade classes are possible, the district uses them sparingly because the Board has invested resources to limit them. Larger class sizes would overwhelm teachers and reduce administrative flexibility – particularly when student dynamics require adjustments. He added that by 2028 the school would need thirteen (13) full-size classrooms, which would exceed the building's capacity. While it is feasible to make it work, doing so becomes complicated and costly. He noted that a purpose-built school campus functions far better than attempting to retrofit spaces such as an LDS church building. He emphasized the need for fiscal responsibility and cautioned against building new schools too quickly, only to later have to close them due to insufficient enrollment. The district is trying to plan for the next thirty (30) years to avoid difficult decisions such as these in the future.

Board member Strong asked if the satellite could be moved to a different location. **Mr. Pulley** responded that portables are moved frequently across the district to meet growing needs. Moving it to another location is possible and would not pose a facilities concern.

Board member Judkins sought clarification, noting that the current site is projected to reach capacity within a year. **Mr. Woodhouse** stated that enrollment is expected to approach 269 by 2027 requiring eleven (11) full-size classrooms. **Board member Judkins** asked whether the current computer lab would need to be repurposed. **Mr. Woodhouse** advised that it would most likely be eliminated to be used as a classroom and explained that reaching capacity would also put stress on restrooms and lunchrooms and any adjustments at full capacity would impact everyone. He emphasized that once complaints about being at capacity begin, options for addressing them are very limited.

Board member Sauser asked about class size concerns and what class sizes would look like if CVE were closed. **Mr. Woodhouse** shared projected class sizes for specific grade levels and explained that larger schools offer more flexibility. In a bigger school, additional FTEs can be added and staffing can be adjusted to maintain consistent class sizes. Small schools do not have the same capacity to make these adjustments.

Vice President Isaacson noted that the information presented was compelling and questioned why the district would consider closing a school when additional classrooms are needed elsewhere. He stated that the rationale did not seem to align and asked how this would impact the new school at Brylee Farms. **Mr. Woodhouse** responded that **Mr. Farnes** could provide detailed enrollment projections, but current estimates show Brylee Farms remaining under 1,000 students. Mountain Trails is expected to be slightly higher, but additional portables can be added if needed. He also noted that if projected growth continues as expected, the district could build a new school in the Fire Fly area, which would allow that neighborhood to remain together.

Mr. Farnes asked whether the question was regarding projected enrollment at the new elementary school. **Vice President Isaacson** confirmed and added that his concern is why the district would close a school only to move students to a school that is already full. **Mr. Farnes** explained the three (3) boundary options that had been reviewed and posted for consideration. **Vice President Isaacson** said he had spent time reviewing the options and enrollment numbers and wants to give the decision careful consideration. **Mr. Pulley** noted that the new school would exceed 1,000 students if all classrooms held 28 students. The building has 38 regular classrooms, not including the computer lab or gym, and does not currently have a satellite or portables. **Vice President Isaacson** acknowledged that the school may not open at full capacity but asked what enrollment would look like after one (1) year. **Mr. Farnes** responded that under Boundary Option B, projected enrollment for 2029 is approximately 1,131 students.

Board member Sauser asked what would happen to the teachers and staff if the school were to close. **President King** responded that this had been discussed directly with the faculty. All contracted employees fall under a RIF process, which guarantees them a position elsewhere in the district. These employees receive priority placement before any openings are posted to the public. **Board member Strong** added that, in her experience, the district is generous and works to accommodate employee preferences. While staff may lose their current location, they will continue to be employed.

Vice President Isaacson asked whether the projected cost savings over three (3) years from closing the school would meaningfully contribute toward building a new school. **President King** clarified that these funds come from two (2) separate budget categories. She explained the difference between capital funds and M&O funds. Savings from a school closure would not go toward capital projects but could support additional teacher hires, special education resources, or other operational needs. **Vice President Isaacson** asked if there was an estimate of the potential savings. **President King** said the numbers had not been calculated, but similar schools average about $1.1 million in annual operating costs based on FY25 data. FY26 costs would likely be slightly higher due to an increase in salaries and benefits. **Vice President Isaacson** noted that this could mean roughly $3 million in savings over three (3) years and asked for clarification: is it impossible to add a satellite even if parking is lost? Is there simply no space? **Mr. Pulley** responded that while adding a satellite is technically possible, the challenge is determining where it could be placed. Putting it in the parking lot or on the playground would displace those essential areas – something would have to be sacrificed to make it work.

Mr. Woodhouse expressed appreciation for the thoughtful consideration being given to the issue, noting that it is appropriate for the Board to struggle with such decisions. He emphasized that there are no easy or clear-cut answers, and competing priorities must be weighed. He reminded the Board that their responsibility is to determine which priorities matter most. He added that the difficulty of the decision reflects the Board's commitment to the community, and that the community deserves this level of careful deliberation.

Vice President Isaacson noted that they had been warned this would be one of the hardest decisions they would face, but he did not fully realize how difficult it would be. He asked Mr. Woodhouse whether anyone on his team disagreed with closing CVE. **Mr. Woodhouse** responded that the question should not be framed as being "in disagreement", but rather whether the Board agrees on the competing factors and whether keeping the school open makes sense. He explained that the district's rapid growth and the limited flexibility of the site make the challenges significant. He also reminded the Board that they are creating a new district, which eliminates the economies of scale they previously relied on, resulting in a different budget reality. He added that all three (3) new districts are evaluating how to best use their existing buildings, which is why more boundary studies are being conducted than ever before – none of the new districts have the funding to build additional schools easily. He emphasized that decisions to build or close a school are equally difficult and should be weighed the same. Ultimately, they key question is whether the solution is long-term or short-term. The committee's recommendation remains to close the school.

Vice President Isaacson thanked Mr. Woodhouse, his team, and the staff they represent for the significant work put into this process, noting that he recognizes how much effort it required. He stated that their recommendation carries substantial weight for him. He also remarked that he did not anticipate how political the role would be and acknowledged the considerable pressure they are facing, especially with future budget constraints driven by legislative changes and an increasingly tight financial outlook.

Board member Sauser noted that the impact on transportation had not been fully discussed and asked what that impact would be – both if the school remains open and if it is closed – and where the funding would come from. **Mr. Woodhouse** explained that students who live more than a mile and a half from school qualify for busing. The district receives some state funding for these routes, but it does not cover the full cost, requiring the district to subsidize the remainder. In this case, these students are eligible and would receive transportation funding for travel to and from school.

Board member Strong thanked Tyler for his courage and expressed her admiration for his willingness to speak up for himself, his friends, and his school. She stated that she would take a personal interest in following up with him and his peers to ensure they do not experience any bullying during the transition.

Board member Judkins emphasized that the weight of this decision is fully understood by her and the entire Board. She noted the many hours spent on research and in conversations with the community, stressing the Board's commitment to listening to community perspectives to ensure decisions are well-informed and serve the majority. She shared a personal experience, expressing that her heart is deeply involved and heavy, as these decisions are incredibly difficult. She thanked community members and staff for their input and for helping the Board remain informed. She reiterated that no one is taking this decision lightly, as it affects what matters most – children – and the Board is striving to do what is best for as many students and families as possible.

Board member Sauser stated that the data clearly shows a need for additional schools in the area as soon as possible and emphasized the importance of planning for that now. She noted that the district must look ahead, strengthen logistical planning to account for continued growth, and establish backup plans and flexibility to reduce uncertainty and better prepare for future needs.

President King acknowledged how difficult it can be for those in the audience to feel as though only a small amount of effort has been put into this process. She emphasized that she has been deeply involved for months and that alternative options were extensively explored, even if that work is not always visible to the public. She noted that hundreds of hours have gone into this effort, including meetings she and Board member Lincoln held with a developer to review potential land options. She stressed the Board's strong commitment to long-term planning, noting the district's need of five high schools, five middle schools, and fifteen elementary schools and the rapid growth in the area. Having lived in the community for twenty (20) years and having had her children attend four (4) different elementary schools, she acknowledged that growth is challenging but unavoidable. She reiterated that none of these decisions are easy and that every Board member has devoted countless hours to this issue. The Board is committed to maintaining stability while adapting to meet the community's needs. She expressed her love for CVE, its community, and its traditions, and offered heartfelt gratitude to the staff, students, families, and community for making CVE what it is today.

Statement from Board member Julie Myers, who could not be present.

"I want to clearly outline why keeping Cedar Valley Elementary open is not only reasonable, but responsible. First, we already know the building can safely and effectively serve up to 300 students. Our current enrollment is about 130 – meaning we have room to grow without any major investment. Second, Firefly families do not want to leave CVE. They are deeply connected to this school and this community and that matters. Third, the overcapacity schools in Eagle Mountain want CVE to remain open. They do not have room for 200 additional students. Keeping CVE open gives our district a necessary pressure-release valve. Fourth, we have strong developer support for keeping this school operating. If CVE stays open until it reaches capacity or until a new school is built, the Lake Mountain School District stands to receive: Either a lot in Firefly at a discounted price, or if approved, BLM land donation for a future school site – valued at over $1.5 million. Sewer infrastructure extended to the lot, estimated around $6 million, paid for by the developer. These are extraordinary community benefits tied directly to keeping this school open a little longer. With opportunities like this, building a small additional structure onsite – if ever needed – becomes far more realistic. Fifth, CVE is not far from financial parity with the rest of the district. At our current enrollment, the cost is about $13,000 per student, which aligns closely with many districts statewide. We only need 200 students to be fully in line with Alpine's average, and all projections show we will reach that number soon. Finally, growth concerns have a solution already built in. A charter school is opening in the Firefly development in 2027 and the district plans for another elementary in Firefly by 2029. That means CVE will not be overwhelmed. We can comfortably support students until the new school opens – without major changes to the building. I also want to address our teachers, because their voices matter. It's been said that the entire staff wants to move together to a new school – but that is not accurate when referring to the Brylee Famrs school now under construction. At least two (2) of our teachers have already stated they would stay at CVE if it remains open, but they will not make the move to Brylee Farms. They live in Orem and if they are forced to relocate, they will simply transfer to a school closer to home. As for the rest of our staff, they are united in wanting to stay together

and transition specifically to the future Firefly school, not to the Brylee Farms boundary. Keeping CVE open allows our staff to remain stable and transition together when the time is right. In short, CVE is needed, financially reasonable, supported by families, supported by neighboring schools, and tied directly to millions of dollars in community benefit. This school can bridge the gap until Firefly's new elementary is built – and the community is asking for exactly that."
The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Open Business Administrator Search
Board member Sauser made a motion to open the Business Administrator search, and it was seconded by Vice President Isaacson. The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Initiate the Process to Create School District Foundation, 501c3
Vice President Isaacson made the motion to initiate the process to create the school district foundation, 501c3, and it was seconded by Board member Judkins. The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

5. Appoint Chair of School District Foundation, 501c3, Committee
Vice President Isaacson nominated Board member Judkins to be the Chair of the school district foundation, 501c3, committee, and it was seconded by Board member Strong. Board member Judkins accepted the nomination. The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

6. Updated Board Meeting Schedule
President King reviewed the updated board meeting schedule, noting that there will be an open meeting before any closed session meeting. She stated that not all of the listed meetings are expected to be held. She explained that the highlighted sections differ from the calendar approved last week and include updates related to candidate discussions and interviews. The September and November dates were clarified, and she noted that all items marked in yellow represent amendments to the original calendar.
Board member Judkins made the motion to adopt the updated board meeting schedule, and it was seconded by Board member Strong. The Board voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS

1. Construction of High School/Brylee Farms
President King invited **Frank Pulley**, Director of Physical Facilities, up to provide an update on the new high school construction. He reported that underground utilities have been completed and concrete work is underway. The building will have three (3) levels, with the gyms and auditoriums located on the basement level. The academic wings are stacked vertically and the gyms and auditorium will not have a second floor above them. He noted that this is a new model for the district – similar in concept to the middle school design but on a larger scale.
Board member Strong asked about the location of the football field and **Mr. Pulley** pointed out the field and parking lot on the site photos.
Board member Judkins asked about the location of the soccer field and **Mr. Pulley** outlined the locations of the soccer, baseball, softball, and other athletic fields on the site photos.
Board member Strong asked whether the road would be completed and **Mr. Pulley** explained that discussions are ongoing between the church, various cities, and a private developer regarding a potential connection. He noted that the road is not required, but would be a convenience for some families.
Board member Sauser asked about school entrances and exits and overall traffic flow and **Mr. Pulley** outlined the planned roads for entering and exiting the school. **Board member Sauser** inquired about traffic management during large events, such as football games. **Mr. Pulley** stated it would function like any other large event, possibly requiring a few extra minutes for entry and exit. **Board member Sauser** raised a concern about emergency access and potential choke points. **Mr. Pulley** confirmed there are

multiple access points for entering and leaving the site, and he reviewed the roads and parking lot exit points again.

President King asked if the school is expected to open on time and **Mr. Pulley** confirmed it is scheduled to open in Fall 2028. **President King** then asked about the planned locations for satellite buildings and **Mr. Pulley** displayed the satellite locations, noting that the current plan can accommodate sixteen (16), with the capacity for two additional satellites.

Vice President Isaacson asked about the school's capacity and **Mr. Pulley** replied that he has not run exact numbers, but a typical high school without additions accommodates around 2,500 students.

Mr. Pulley provided an update on School 133 at Brylee Farms reporting that the concrete has been poured and interior framing is currently underway. He highlighted several areas of the school under construction and noted that the front entryway has been completed.

President King asked if this school is the same design as Desert Sky and inquired about the differences in the kindergarten classrooms. **Mr. Pulley** explained that previous designs included restrooms in each kindergarten classroom, making them slightly larger. In this model, restrooms were removed, allowing for a full-sized classroom and more flexibility in placement. This approach is more cost-effective and allows kindergarten classrooms to be located anywhere in the school. **President King** asked about the playground and **Mr. Pulley** stated that there is not a dedicated kindergarten playground; instead, the playground is split and fenced, with one half for smaller students and the other for larger students.

Board member Strong asked if the project is on schedule and **Mr. Pulley** confirmed it is, noting that the school is set up for four (4) portable classrooms in the future if needed. **Board member Strong** asked whether electricity was pre-installed for future portables and **Mr. Pulley** confirmed that conduits are installed, with wiring left until later to prevent damage.

President King remarked that the project has gone smoothly despite its complexities and that everything is on track for opening. She asked if the building will be dried in within the next week or two and **Mr. Pulley** confirmed it is nearly 100% dried in.

Board member Sauser acknowledged the rationale for planning satellite buildings but encouraged created approaches in future planning to minimize the need for satellites. She also asked if Brylee Farms would be included in the Board's field trip on Friday.

President King replied that the trip will include a drive-by, but the Board cannot go on-site, but can be scheduled for later in the construction process.

Board member Sauser suggested a possible collaboration with Cedar Valley High School drone students to conduct a drone-based construction site visit. **Mr. Pulley** responded that the district already uses construction drones but welcomed student collaboration, noting that site visits can inspire future contractors.

2. <u>Naming Committee</u>

Board member Strong noted that 2,088 suggestions were received, including many strong ideas, and expressed appreciation for the community's involvement. She encouraged the Board to begin reviewing the submissions to become familiar with the input. The committee will narrow the list to three (3) options and present the four (4) names at the next board meeting. The review session is scheduled for Saturday, December 13th, at 1:00pm at Thunder Ridge Elementary, with the presentation prepared for Monday, December 15th.

3. <u>Board Members</u>

Vice President Isaacson shared that he participated in the paper screening process for the new administrative hiring of principals and assistant principals at both the elementary and secondary levels. He noted that the process is dramatically different from past practices and requires a significant amount of work, often involving late nights, but he is glad to serve. A rubric is used to score candidates and determine who advances to the next stage. The screening committee includes board members, community members, principals, and administrators, and is organized by the three (3) districts. He emphasized that this process allows district leadership to have input in selecting their future administrators.

Board member Sauser reported meeting with Richard Stowell of USBA on Monday to assist with the Superintendent application process. They are preparing a brochure for the position, and the application process is nearly finalized, with plans to release it by the end of the week. Drafts will be sent to the Board for review. She also requested time on an upcoming Board session to discuss the timeline and to engage community expert involvement in the progress.

President King reported that the City of Saratoga Springs approved the sale of the building last night. She stated that a $5 million contract was signed today, officially giving them a district office. She expressed gratitude to City of Saratoga Springs for partnering with the district and thanked City of Eagle Mountain for providing them interim housing.

Board member Lincoln noted that their first motion was made in the council chambers of their building and how exciting that was.

Board member Judkins praised the collaboration up to this point, noting that the process was seamless and exemplified community teamwork. She emphasized that both parties want each other to succeed, commended everyone involved, and expressed that she was extremely impressed.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Board member Judkins and seconded by Board member Strong, the meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM. The Board voted in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Lake Mountain School District

Policy Number and Title 5201 Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Agreements
Policy Type: Finance and Operations: Business Services

Policy Statement: The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name to be inserted when approved) ensures that Tax Increment Financing (TIF) agreements support the district's long-term fiscal stability and contribute to educational and community benefit. Through this policy, the Board establishes the expectations and boundaries that govern how TIF proposals are evaluated, negotiated, and presented for Board consideration. The Board expects all TIF agreements to include clear financial benefits to the district, transparent communication with stakeholders, and full compliance with applicable law. The Superintendent in conjunction with board leadership is responsible for reviewing proposals, coordinating District input, and bringing forward TIF participation agreements for Board review and approval in an open public meeting.

Definitions:

- **Board:** The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name inserted when approved), the elected governing body responsible for establishing district policy and ensuring responsible fiscal stewardship.
- **Tax Increment Financing (TIF):** A redevelopment mechanism that allocates a portion of increased property tax revenue generated within a project area to fund eligible improvements under Utah Code Title 17C.
- **Project Area Plan / Budget:** A plan produced by a municipality or redevelopment agency outlining project boundaries, objectives, timelines, financial structure, and legal compliance under Utah Code §17C-1-201.5.
- **Housing Set-Aside Funds:** Redevelopment funds reserved for affordable housing initiatives as required by Utah Code.
- **Additional District Benefit:** A specific, measurable benefit provided to the district beyond the increment percentage offered to other taxing entities, such as land, cash contributions, mitigation or impact payments, capital improvements, or enhanced increment participation.
- **Third-Party Financial Review (Optional):** An independent analysis of a TIF proposal. The district is not required to commission such reviews but may request one when additional analysis is necessary. If the District enters an advisory relationship with a financial firm, the contract may include up to three (3) TIF reviews per year at no additional cost.

Scope: This policy applies to all redevelopment, community development, economic development, and housing project area proposals initiated under Utah Code Title 17C that involve District participation in tax increment financing.

Reference:
- Utah Code Title 17C, Limited Purpose Local Government Entities—Community Reinvestment Agency Act
- Utah Code §17C-1-201.5
- Utah Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA)

Policy Provisions:

1. **Eligibility and Standards for Consideration**

   A TIF proposal may be brought forward for Board consideration only when it meets all of the following conditions:
   - Complies with Utah Code §17C-1-201.5, including statutory notice, required documentation, and timelines.
   - Provides the District with additional financial benefit beyond what other taxing entities receive, such as land, higher increment percentage, mitigation payment, or site-related improvements.
   - Triggers within three (3) years of executing the participation agreement. Projects that do not trigger by this deadline shall expire and may only be reconsidered through a new negotiation process, during which the district is not obligated to offer the same terms or level of participation.
   - Demonstrates a clear and measurable educational or operational benefit to the district.
   - Maintains a limited duration of participation, with a preference for shorter-term agreements.
   - Does not impair the district's long-term revenue needed for growth, capital needs, staffing, or classroom supports.
   - Does not include residential development.
   - Creates jobs with wages higher than the average median for the project area and/or region, or when job creation is not applicable, demonstrates comparable economic value to the District.

2. **Additional District Benefits**

   Projects must provide at least one of the following:
   - Land conveyed to the district for future educational or operational use
   - A higher percentage of increment than offered to other taxing entities
   - Mitigation or impact payments supporting enrollment or capital impacts
   - Funding or infrastructure improvements linked to District facilities, operations, or safety
   - Cash contributions allocated toward student services or District operations

3. **Financial Review and Use of Third Parties**
   - The district is not required to commission independent financial analyses and will avoid unnecessary expenditures.
   - The district may rely on economic data provided by municipalities or developers.

- The Board may request an optional third-party analysis only when needed to protect the district's fiscal interests.
- If the District enters a financial advisory agreement, the Board may approve funding for no more than three (3) TIF analyses per year, unless otherwise authorized by Board action.

4. **Collaboration on Housing Set-Aside Funds**
   The District shall collaborate with municipalities and redevelopment agencies to direct housing set-aside resources in ways that benefit District and public employees, such as:
   - Workforce housing near District schools
   - Housing assistance or incentives for educators and staff
   - Partnerships that reduce housing barriers for District personnel

5. **Stakeholder Communication and Transparency**
   - Proposed TIF participation agreements shall be presented in an open public meeting.
   - Required taxing-entity committee meetings shall be noticed and attended in accordance with OPMA and Utah Code.
   - Public communication shall clearly summarize fiscal impacts, proposed benefits, and potential risks.
   - Opportunities for public comment shall be integrated into the review and approval process.

6. **Approval of TIF Agreements**
   - Only the Board may approve or reject District participation in a TIF agreement.
   - Approval requires a majority vote in an open public meeting.
   - Final agreement terms must align with this policy's expectations and financial safeguards.

7. **Monitoring and Reporting**
   - The Superintendent or designee shall monitor project performance, triggered status, and fulfillment of District-specific benefits.
   - Annual updates shall be provided to the Board summarizing financial outcomes, compliance, and remaining duration.
   - The Board shall be notified immediately if a project fails to trigger within three (3) years or if agreed-upon terms are not being met.

Procedures:

1. The Superintendent or designee receives statutory notice and reviews whether the proposal meets eligibility criteria.

2. A written summary outlining compliance with law, projected revenues, District benefits, and fiscal considerations is prepared.

3. Consultation with municipal partners, legal counsel, or optional financial advisors may occur when necessary.

4. The proposal and summary are presented to the Board in an open public meeting with opportunity for public comment.

5. If directed, District administration may negotiate terms aligned with this policy.

6. The Board votes on the final agreement in an open public meeting.

7. The Superintendent ensures ongoing monitoring and reporting on project status and benefits.

Effectiveness: This policy is effective when TIF agreements approved by the Board comply with Utah Code, provide measurable additional benefit to the district, and trigger within the required three-year period, and when the district implements these agreements with transparent documentation, clear public communication, and consistent annual reporting to the Board.

Evaluation Standards: Implementation of this policy will be evaluated based on whether all approved TIF agreements meet the eligibility requirements and deliver the additional benefits identified for the District; whether annual reports demonstrate accurate tracking of project performance, triggered status, and financial outcomes; and whether public communication regarding TIF proposals and agreements is clear, accessible, and transparent to the community.

Accountability/Reporting: The Superintendent shall provide the Board with an annual report on all active TIF agreements, including project status, triggered timelines, financial outcomes, and the fulfillment of District-specific benefits. The Board uses this information to monitor compliance with this policy, ensure responsible stewardship of District resources, and determine whether continued participation in each agreement aligns with District expectations and legal requirements.

Review Cycle: This policy shall be reviewed annually**,** aligned with the district's financial training and budget cycle, or sooner if changes occur in Utah Code Title 17C or Board priorities.

Policy History

Adoption Date: 12/15/25
Effective Date: 12/15/25
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:
Revision History:

Lake Mountain School District

Policy 4201 School Calendars

Policy Type: Teaching and Learning; Operational Expectations

Policy Statement: The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name inserted when approved) adopts school-year calendars that comply with state instructional requirements and promote effective teaching, learning, and predictable planning for families and staff. Through this policy, the Board establishes the expectations and boundaries governing how school-year calendars are developed and brought forward for consideration. The Board expects the calendar development process to include transparent communication and opportunities for public feedback. The Superintendent is responsible for developing school-year calendars that meet these expectations, and all calendars shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval in an open public meeting in accordance with law and district policy.

Definitions

- **Board:** The Lake Mountain Board of Education (temporary name; final district name inserted when approved), the elected governing body responsible for establishing district policy and oversight.
- **Calendar Committee:** A representative advisory group convened by the Superintendent that includes administrators, teachers, staff, and parent/guardian representatives. The committee reviews instructional requirements, evaluates draft calendars, gathers stakeholder input, and provides advisory recommendations consistent with Utah Administrative Rule R277-419.
- **Instructional Day / Instructional Hours:** The minimum instructional time required under Utah Administrative Rule R277-419-5.
- **LEA:** Local Education Agency, referring to the Lake Mountain School District.
- **Minimal Day:** An instructional day on which schools operate on a reduced schedule and all students are dismissed earlier than the regular release time. A Minimal Day does not include an Early-Out or Early-Start days.
- **Superintendent:** The Superintendent of the Lake Mountain School District, or an individual formally designated by the Superintendent to perform specific duties or responsibilities under this policy. The Superintendent retains accountably for all delegated actions.

Scope: This policy applies to all school-year calendars adopted by the Board and to the Superintendent's processes for preparing, reviewing, and recommending calendars.

Reference:

- Utah Code 53F-2
- Utah Code 53G-7-202

- Utah Administrative Rule R277-419-4
- Utah Administrative Rule R277-419-5
- Lake Mountain Policy 1301

Policy Provisions:

1. Governance and Legal Compliance

1.1 The Board shall adopt school-year calendars that comply with all state instructional requirements, including instructional days, instructional hours, and reporting expectations.

1.2 Calendar adoption shall occur in an open public meeting and follow the posting and notice requirements described in Policy 1301.

1.3 The Superintendent is responsible for developing calendars that meet legal requirements, operational needs, and district instructional priorities.

2. Calendar Requirements

2.1 Each calendar adopted by the Board shall include:

- School start and end dates.
- Scheduled breaks and holidays.
- Early release and/or professional learning days.
- Required state testing windows.
- Make-up days for emergency closures.

2.2 Calendars shall support instructional continuity, equitable access to learning opportunities, operational feasibility, and predictable planning for families and staff.

Procedures:

1. Calendar Committee

1.1The Superintendent shall convene a calendar committee consistent with R277-419.

1.2 The committee shall review instructional requirements, evaluate draft calendars, and provide advisory input to the Superintendent.

1.3 Recognition of Alpine School District Committee Work (2027–2030**)** For the 2027–2028, 2028–2029, and 2029–2030 school years, the Superintendent may use the work of the Alpine School District Calendar Committee as the basis for calendar development, provided that:

- the committee met Utah Code and R277-419 requirements, and
- the resulting calendars meet all instructional and operational requirements for Lake Mountain School District.

2. Calendar Development and Scheduling Options

2.1 The Superintendent may recommend single-year or multi-year calendars depending on district needs.
2.2 Calendar drafts shall be prepared with sufficient time for public review and feedback.

3. Community Engagement
4.1 Draft calendars shall be posted publicly prior to Board consideration.
4.2 The Superintendent shall collect and consider public input from families, staff, students, and community members.

4. Submission and Communication
5.1 The Superintendent shall present proposed calendars to the Board for review and approval.
5.2 After adoption, the Superintendent shall publish and communicate the calendars.

Effectiveness: This policy is effective when school-year calendars are developed through a transparent, stakeholder-informed process; comply fully with Utah instructional requirements; and provide clear, timely information that supports instructional planning, operational needs, and student learning across the district.

Evaluation Standards: This policy will be considered effective when:

- 100% of adopted calendars meet Utah instructional day/hour requirements.
- Calendars are adopted at least 12 months in advance for single-year approval or 24 months for multi-year approval when feasible.
- Utah State Board of Education (USBE) reporting shows no corrective actions regarding calendar compliance.

Review Cycle: This policy will be reviewed when new calendars are approved.

Accountability/Reporting: The Board is responsible for reviewing and approving school-year calendars in accordance with this policy. The Superintendent is responsible for ensuring that administrative procedures support policy compliance, implementing the adopted calendars, and reporting relevant updates or compliance information to the Board upon request.

Policy History
Adoption Date:
Effective: 12/15/25
Review Dates:
Revision Dates:
Revision History:

2027-2028 RECOMMENDED

- 🟥 Counts toward 180
- 🟨 Doesn't Count
- 🟩 185 day
- ● First & Last day of school
- ▌ End of Term
- ◢ Minimal Day

August 2027

M	T	W	TH	F
2	3	4	5	6
9	10	11	12	13
16	17	18	19	20
23	24	25	26	27
30	31			

September 2027

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	

October 2027

M	T	W	TH	F
				1
4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29

November 2027

M	T	W	TH	F
1	2	3	4	5
8	9	10	11	12
15	16	17	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30			

December 2027

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	31

January 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
3	4	5	6	7
10	11	12	13	14
17	18	19	20	21
24	25	26	27	28
31				

February 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
	1	2	3	4
7	8	9	10	11
14	15	16	17	18
21	22	23	24	25
28	29			

March 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	31

April 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
3	4	5	6	7
10	11	12	13	14
17	18	19	20	21
24	25	26	27	28

May 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
1	2	3	4	5
8	9	10	11	12
15	16	17	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30	31		

Aug 13–Teacher Contract Day
Aug 16–Teacher Prof Dev Day
Aug 17– Teacher Contract Day
Aug 18–First Day of School
Aug 18-23–K Assessment Days
Aug 24–First Day of Kindergarten

Sep 06–Labor Day

Oct 13–1st Term Ends
Oct 14-15–Fall Break
Oct 18–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day

Nov 01–Teacher Prof Dev Day
Nov 24–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Nov 25-26–Thanksgiving Break

Dec 17–Minimal Day (No PreK)
–2nd Term Ends
Dec 20-31–Winter Break

Jan 03–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Jan 04–School Resumes
Jan 17–Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Feb 18–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Feb 21–Presidents' Day

Mar 10–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
–3rd Term Ends
Mar 13–Teacher Prof Dev Day

Apr 03–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Apr 04-07–Spring Break

May 26–Last Day of School
–Minimal Day (No PreK)
–4th Term Ends
May 29–Memorial Day

SEMESTER 1

Term 1 = 40 days

Term 2 = 42 days

SEMESTER 2

Term 3 = 48 days

Term 4 = 50 days

2028-2029 RECOMMENDED

August 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
	1	2	3	4
7	8	9	10	11
14	15	16	17	18
21	22	23	24	25
28	29	30	31	

September 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
				1
4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29

October 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
2	3	4	5	6
9	10	11	12	13
16	17	18	19	20
23	24	25	26	27
30	31			

November 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	

December 2028

M	T	W	TH	F
				1
4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29

January 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
1	2	3	4	5
8	9	10	11	12
15	16	17	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30	31		

February 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
			1	2
5	6	7	8	9
12	13	14	15	16
19	20	21	22	23
26	27	28		

March 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
			1	2
5	6	7	8	9
12	13	14	15	16
19	20	21	22	23
26	27	28	29	30

April 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
2	3	4	5	6
9	10	11	12	13
16	17	18	19	20
23	24	25	26	27
30				

May 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
	1	2	3	4
7	8	9	10	11
14	15	16	17	18
21	22	23	24	25
28	29	30	31	

Aug 11–Teacher Contract Day
Aug 14–Teacher Prof Dev Day
Aug 15– Teacher Contract Day
Aug 16–First Day of School
Aug 16-21–K Assessment Days
Aug 25–First Day of Kindergarten

Sep 04–Labor Day

Oct 18–1st Term Ends
Oct 19-20–Fall Break
Oct 23–Teacher Prof Dev Day

Nov 03–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Nov 22–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Nov 23-24–Thanksgiving Break

Dec 21–Minimal Day (No PreK)
Dec 22–2nd Term Ends
–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
(flexible)
Dec 25-Jan 05–Winter Break

Jan 01–New Year's Day
Jan 08–School Resumes
Jan 15–Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Feb 09– Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Feb 19–Presidents' Day

Mar 09–3rd Term Ends
–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Mar 12–Teacher Prof Dev Day

Apr 02–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Apr 03-06–Spring Break

May 25–Last Day of School
–Minimal Day (No PreK)
–4th Term Ends
May 28–Memorial Day

SEMESTER 1

Term 1 = 45 days

Term 2 = 42 days

SEMESTER 2

Term 3 = 43 days

Term 4 = 50 days

2029-2030 RECOMMENDED

August 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	31

September 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
3	4	5	6	7
10	11	12	13	14
17	18	19	20	21
24	25	26	27	28

October 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
1	2	3	4	5
8	9	10	11	12
15	16	17	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30	31		

November 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
			1	2
5	6	7	8	9
12	13	14	15	16
19	20	21	22	23
26	27	28	29	30

December 2029

M	T	W	TH	F
3	4	5	6	7
10	11	12	13	14
17	18	19	20	21
24	25	26	27	28
31				

January 2030

M	T	W	TH	F
	1	2	3	4
7	8	9	10	11
14	15	16	17	18
21	22	23	24	25
28	29	30	31	

February 2030

M	T	W	TH	F
				1
4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	

March 2030

M	T	W	TH	F
				1
4	5	6	7	8
11	12	13	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29

April 2030

M	T	W	TH	F
1	2	3	4	5
8	9	10	11	12
15	16	17	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30			

May 2030

M	T	W	TH	F
		1	2	3
6	7	8	9	10
13	14	15	16	17
20	21	22	23	24
27	28	29	30	31

Aug 10–Teacher Contract Day
Aug 13–Teacher Prof Dev Day
Aug 14– Teacher Contract Day
Aug 15–First Day of School
Aug 15-20–K Assessment Days
Aug 21–First Day of Kindergarten

Sep 03–Labor Day

Oct 17–1st Term Ends
Oct 18-19–Fall Break
Oct 22– Teacher Prof Dev Day

Nov 02– Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Nov 21–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Nov 22-23–Thanksgiving Break

Dec 20–Minimal Day (No PreK)
Dec 21–2nd Term Ends
–Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
(flexible)
Dec 24-Jan 04–Winter Break

Jan 01–New Year's Day
Jan 07–School Resumes
Jan 21–Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Feb 08– Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Feb 18–Presidents' Day

Mar 08–3rd Term Ends
– Teacher/Contrd Emp Work Day
Mar 12–Teacher Prof Dev Day

Apr 01–PTC Teacher Comp Day
Apr 02-05–Spring Break

May 24 –Last Day of School
–Minimal Day (No PreK)
–4th Term Ends
May 27–Memorial Day

SEMESTER 1

Term 1 = 45 days

Term 2 = 42 days

SEMESTER 2

Term 3 = 43 days

Term 4 = 50 days

ALPINE
SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASD Board Recommended: 3/11/25