

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER, ROOM 466
5100 W. SAHARA AVE., LAS VEGAS, NV 89146

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2015

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bowler, Richard	Kubat, Charles
Bruins, David	Lavelle, Eleissa
Davis, Al	Lazaroff, Gene
Earl, Debbie	Lopez, George
Halsey, Jim	Philpott, Steve

Members Absent

Haldeman, Joyce
Hawkins, Frank
Reynolds, Jacob
Tate, Cameron

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Capital Program Office at 799-8710.

1.01 FLAG SALUTE.

1.02 ROLL CALL.

Jim Halsey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m.

1.03 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt the February 19, 2015, agenda.

*Motion: Davis Second: Lazaroff Vote: Unanimous
(Debbie Earl was not in attendance)*

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for October 16, 2014, with an amendment to show Charles Kubat's arrival.

*Motion: Kubat Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous
(Debbie Earl was not in attendance)*

3.02 APPROVAL OF THE REVISED MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Revised Minutes for September 18, 2014.

*Motion: Bowler Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous
(Debbie Earl was not in attendance)*

3.03 FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS. CONTINGENCY PLANS.

Mike Barton, Chief Student Achievement Officer, Instruction Unit, provided copies of a PowerPoint presentation, "Hazard Impact Probability Committee" (HIPC). Mr. Barton explained hazard impact was about predicting facility failure and looking at the various systems within a school and predicting which systems with the schools may fail first. The Instruction Unit manages those outages/failures that occur on a daily basis. The HIPC was led by Kim Wooden, Deputy Superintendent, Educational and Operational Excellence Unit, who created a subcommittee of individuals in the field to find a plan to deal with short and long term outages/failures in our schools.

Kristy Keller, Assistant Chief Student Achievement Officer, Performance Zone 11; Jaymes Arimetti, Principal, Rex Bell Elementary School; Karen Johnson, past Principal, Decker Elementary School; and Elizabeth Smith, Principal, Diskin Elementary School, provided their perspective on past experiences and contingency plans to handle various short and long term outages/failures.

In response to a question from Gene Lazaroff on when staff would have a targeted completion date for the contingency plan, Ms. Keller explained that a presentation is planned for the principals' meeting scheduled for the month of March to give the principals a chance to weigh in as users of the plan and the flow chart.

Ms. Keller reviewed the steps on the flow chart: Step 1 – Facility Failure Identification and Communication, Step 2 – Short Term Mitigation Strategies, Step 3 – Long Term Mitigation Strategies, and Ongoing Communication.

Lisa Lavelle questioned how soon after the system failure is identified that a determination is made on whether it is short or long term so that you can implement a plan. Ms. Keller explained the assistant chief will move to the school site and will work with the necessary staff and technicians to identify the time needed to repair the system, and the principal will be tasked with the problems associated with school personnel, students and their parents.

Ms. Keller explained that assistant chiefs are the supervisors of a number of schools and are part of a rapid response team for assistance in short and long term outages/failures and stated that each principal is given a list of contacts to facilitate an immediate response.

3.03 FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS. CONTINGENCY PLANS (continued).

David Bruins questioned if assistant chiefs have a list of parts that are required for each school's systems. Ms. Keller stated that this request has been given to Jeremy Hauser, Associate Superintendent, Educational and Operational Excellence Unit, and he has communicated with those in the Instruction Unit meetings which schools have the systems that are at risk. Mr. Bruins stated that if those systems are identified it would be proactive to have the necessary parts available to avoid a long term breakdown of a system.

Ms. Keller explained her endeavor to bring a Digital Spectrum Broadcast, a Homeland Security modality, through a wireless device in order to ensure facility failure communication is quick, timely, and clear.

3.04 FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAM. REVENUE UPDATE.

Jim McIntosh, Chief Financial Officer, provided copies of a PowerPoint presentation "Capital Fund Revenue Update," a quarterly report, and summarized information on the three revenue streams (property tax, room tax, real property transfer tax), and the capacity for a future program.

Mr. McIntosh explained that the Nevada Legislature moved quickly on Senate Bill 119 and the District was questioned as to what projects are ready to begin building. The master plan is not in place; however, the District does know where the capacity "hot spots" are located for additions and infrastructure needs. If approved, this legislation will provide the District authority to bond against the revenue. Staff recently went to the Board of School Trustees with a reimbursement resolution which will allow the District to spend capital funding today and reimburse it with the bond proceeds when issued. Mr. McIntosh stated that the District may have to dip into bond fund reserves, and then restore those reserves at the time we issue debt. Staff has moved quickly, identified 12 sites for new schools, and has started the design process.

3.05 STATUS AND PROCESS OF REFUND AGREEMENTS.

Ruby Alston, Director of Facilities and Bond Fund Financial Management, provided copies of "Summary Level Refunding Agreements Status" and summarized the information. Ms. Alston explained that when the District builds new schools, agreements are made with the utility companies. The District may install the infrastructure ahead of future developers/customers surrounding the school site. As future developers/customers tap into the utilities, the District receives refunds from the utilities as per the agreements and the time limits.

3.05 STATUS AND PROCESS OF REFUND AGREEMENTS (continued).

Gene Lazaroff questioned when do the agreements expire and does the District have procedures on how refund agreements are written and edited. The District negotiates with the utilities at a disadvantage, such as, the utility companies will not pay more than a certain amount of the cost of construction for off-site improvements, administrative costs, and engineering design and inspection. Mr. Lazaroff stated the cost to the District that would not be reimbursed amounted to approximately \$1 billion.

Mr. Lazaroff mentioned several other suggestions that were discussed at his Bond Oversight Committee presentation in March 2012 and recommended that procedures be put in place and pursue Nevada Revised Statutes.

Eleissa Lavelle recommended an evaluation of the approach taken at the time we do these schools, evaluate the District's leverage, and have someone attend this meeting that is responsible in the negotiating process.

Steve Philpott questioned if some of the entities are non-profit, what are they doing with the funds; and requested attendance by an entity's agent to explain why they feel that they do not have to refund the money.

Mr. Lazaroff questioned why the District is bearing the burden of school construction when master planned communities benefit.

Mr. McIntosh explained that the District's strategy is to provide a building for students to learn and is willing to review the March 2012 presentation and process for the next building program.

3.06 MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

Josh Chesnik, Coordinator of Technology/Performance Management, Operational Services Division (OSD), provided copies of "Quality Assurance/Quality Control Checklist," "Sample Document A Meets Standard" and "Sample Document B Requires Improvement."

Mr. Chesnik explained some changes that affects how schools are provided service, such as, moving from a central operation to a zone operation where the valley was divided into four quadrants. Each quadrant has four mini-zones and each mini-zone is supervised by an operations manager who becomes the central point of service all work (grounds, maintenance, custodial) for a school. This change enabled the service to be closer to the need and decreased windshield time and increased the amount of time servicing the schools.

Mr. Chesnik explained how supplies are stocked in order to service a system failure. The supplies are now in the process of being divided into zones in order to respond more quickly to the needs as they occur.

3.06 MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES (continued).

An “employee accountability team” was created and comprised of four individuals that contains a discipline component, employee training, fleet management, and data. The team meets biweekly/bimonthly with the zone supervisors to obtain feedback as it pertains to the zones. Mr. Chesnik provided an explanation on the purpose of the sample documents and their purpose of measuring the performance of the maintenance teams within the zones.

Gene Lazaroff explained that the purpose of his request for performance measures was to get a big picture, such as, identify the length of time to respond and complete a work order, a list of back logged essential maintenance repairs, and how well the department is performing.

Mr. Chesnik explained that the documents and process is a component of the whole. The department is aware of the need for those measures and gathering this information helps staff manage those resources.

3.07 EVALUATION OF THE FOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROTOTYPES.

Rory Lorenzo, Interim Director of the Capital Program Office, provided copies of “New Elementary School Prototype Evaluation,” a PowerPoint presentation, and summarized the background, delivery schedule, results, post occupancy evaluation, and the scoring criteria and results.

Steve Philpott explained the benefits of having the same mechanical system for the new schools in order for the suppliers to have sufficient stock on hand.

Charles Kubat expressed appreciation for the report and should be useful for the Board of School Trustees. Mr. Kubat also stated that based on the size of the site, energy use, and overall ranking, there appears to be two schools (Stuckey and Triggs Elementary Schools) that can be used for future prototypes.

3.08 REPORT ON PAST PERFORMANCES OF THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK CONSTRUCTION METHOD.

Rory Lorenzo provided copies of “Use of Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) contracting Report of Status,” a Power Point presentation, and provided an explanation for three delivery methods, chronological history of using CMAR, and the status of existing CMAR contracts.

Jim Halsey stated that it would be fair to compare the costs of a low voltage project using a design-bid-build process versus a CMAR would be helpful. Mr. Halsey stated that when a project consists of only one subcontractor, it does not make sense to use a CMAR.

3.08 REPORT ON PAST PERFORMANCES OF THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK CONSTRUCTION METHOD (continued).

Mr. Lorenzo explained the purpose of utilizing a CMAR process for the packaged low voltage projects.

3.09 REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Jim McIntosh provided copies of “Clark County School District Shovel-Ready Projects 2015-2016” and explained that the list was provided to the legislature.

Prior to losing a quorum a motion was approved to Table Agenda Items 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, and 3.13.

Motion: Lavelle Second: Earl Vote: Unanimous

3.10 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Tabled.

3.11 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES LIAISON.

Tabled.

3.12 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.

Tabled.

3.13 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Tabled.

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Sam King, community activist, expressed caution on the approval of Senate Bill 119.

5. ADJOURN: 1:40 p.m.

Motion: Lazaroff Second: Kubat Vote: Unanimous