

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
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, MAY 17, 2018

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bowler, Richard	Kubat, Charles
Douglass, Theresa	Lazaroff, Gene
Earl, Debbie	Philpott, Steve
Byron Goynes	Reynolds, Jacob
Halsey, Jim	

Members Absent

Davis, Al
Lavelle, Eleissa
Lopez, George
Morley, Thomas
Munford, Harvey

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Facilities Division at 702-799-0591.

1.01 FLAG SALUTE.

1.02 ROLL CALL.

Mr. Jim Halsey, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:36 a.m.

1.03 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

3.07 was moved to after 3.01. Motion was approved to adopt and accept the May 17, 2018, agenda.

Motion: Halsey

Second: Earl

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Motion to approve the February 22, 2018 meeting minutes with change on page 6.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Blake Cumbers introduced Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer.

Mr. Goudie thanked the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) for allowing him to move up his item immediately after the 3.01 item, Approval of Minutes.

3.07 CAPITAL FUND REVENUE UPDATE.

Presentation by Jason Goudie. The property tax current rate is \$0.5534 through March 2025. Clark County School District (CCSD) has the authority to bond or use pay-as-you-go. The 2015 Capital

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.07 CAPITAL FUND REVENUE UPDATE. (continued)

Improvement Program has an estimated capacity of \$3.15 billion. CCSD room tax rate is 1.625 percent per capital. CCSD also has the authority to bond or use pay-as-you-go. CCSD has an estimated budget of \$97,500,000 for 2018 and a budgeted amount of \$100,000,000 for 2019. Real property transfer tax is tax on transfer/sale of real property. CCSD rate is \$0.60 per \$500 of value and CCSD has the authority to bond or use pay-as-you-go. CCSD has an estimated amount of \$31,000,000 for 2018 and a budgeted amount of \$32,000,000 for 2019. Regarding the current structure of the 2015 Capital Improvement Program general obligation bond proceeds for fiscal years 2016-2025 are \$3,152,000, general obligation revenue bond proceeds are \$737,300,000, Room/real property transfer tax (RPTT) pay-as-you-go proceeds are \$227,400,000 totaling \$4,116,700. For years 2018-2025 the numbers are estimates and subject to change. The assumptions are 6 percent interest/20 year term debt. We try to maximize the general obligation bond resources and maximize the general obligation revenue bonds early and then as a pay-as-you-go funding source. We do use conservative revenue estimates.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: When is the extension of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitor's Authority coming online? Is it beyond 2019?

Mr. Goudie: I believe it is past 2019 but I don't know.

Mr. Philpott: How much more bonding capacity do we still have left?

Mr. Goudie: That didn't change our capacity.

Mr. Philpott: I mean overall, the whole pie.

Mr. Goudie: I don't know, I'll have to get the number on that. We don't build any assumptions that require for us to go back for additional taxes.

Mr. Kubat: The totals on the current structure went up through 2019 then they are basically declining. What's causing that? Is that just the assumptions of growth over time and real property tax revenue and so on?

Mr. Goudie: A lot of that depends on the different type. Are you talking about the property tax one?

Mr. Kubat: The GO bonds proceeds are declining, so therefore the totals are declining over the years. What is the reason for that? Obviously the total is a function of the other pieces but what do you think is doing all of that?

Mr. Goudie: There's a couple things that is built into the totality of when funds are needed, and then additionally as we get towards the end of our program the bonds are going to start expiring and maturing so we have to build in more level rated debt so that we have it protected over time versus back ending it which we believe is a little bit riskier because we are trying to level it out over time, it does decline towards the end of it.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.02 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE BYLAWS AND RULES.

Mr. Cumbers: We brought this forward because the only direction the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) and staff has had for the filling of vacancies for at large positions was a memorandum from Walt Rulffes, previous superintendent, to provide that direction. What we are trying to do is incorporate this language into the bylaws themselves. We're asking you to review the language that we've put into the bylaws and then make a recommendation to the Board of School Trustees (BOST) whether or not you want to incorporate that language into the bylaws.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: My understanding is that the trustee themselves are sitting over certain spots on the board is that correct?

Mr. Cumbers: Yes, you are.

Mr. Reynolds: When I got appointed to this committee the trustee worked specifically with me and this seems to suggest that, so this is one that would not be under the trustee specifically?

Mr. Cumbers: There's two groups. This pertains to the at large group.

Mr. Halsey: Does this wording that's in here how we are operating now to fill the at large seat?

Mr. Cumbers: That is correct. We are just incorporating that language into the bylaws.

Mr. Lazaroff: Have we ever done something to excuse someone from the board due to absences?

Mr. Halsey: I don't believe we have but I know trustees have removed people from the board and then appointed people who would attend so that has happened in the past.

Mr. Neal: So to answer your question we provide that information to the BOST so they can make a decision on that. But that information is provided to the trustees.

Motion to approve the new language being added to the BOC Bylaws and Rules.

Motion: Lazaroff

Second: Douglass

Vote: Unanimous

3.03 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Kubat noted that there had not been a report by staff and/or liaison representatives in quite some time partly because staff has not been asking for input by liaison members. In the past the starting point has been the staff asking if they could meet with a liaison but nothing has come up in quite a long time. He stated he was just making an observation.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Ruby Alston provided committee with CCSD 2015 Capital Improvement Program Summary Status Report Revenues and Expenditures as of April 30, 2018 and CCSD 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Projects in Progress as of April 2018.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. (continued) QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: If I'm looking at the red and the percentage in red of the rate of completion, is that indicating that we are behind schedule?

Ms. Alston: Yes.

Mr. Reynolds: There's nothing to indicate to me where it should be. For example, Crestwood is at 30%, the schools around it are at 50%, 60%, should it be at 50% or at 60% or should it be that 35%?

Ms. Alston: It should be at 50% or 60%. It doesn't mean that Construction Management isn't taking measures to get it back on schedule but at this time it appears to be behind schedule.

Mr. Reynolds: Is there any way that we can indicate in future reports that maybe in the status it could say what percentage it should be by now. If it's at 30% and it should be at 90% that's a concern to me. What is the indication to say this is problematic? Why do you make it red?

Ms. Alston: Because it appears to be behind schedule based on the delivery date. We're trying to let you know when there's an issue with schedule or budget and that's what the red is for. Once it's addressed or corrected that red will come off.

Mr. Cumbers: Some of these dates have changed and you'll see in the subsequent report the status of the 2015 Capital Improvement Program, and you'll see that for various reasons we've had to make changes or adjust the schedules for various projects due to unforeseen conditions. I'll be explaining those and I will give you an update on projects. They are being worked on.

Mr. Kubat: My second observation is that when I looked at some of the CMAR projects they are coming in at a higher cost than the other projects. Part of the reason we went to CMAR is to try and be really efficient about the way we build and I'm just curious if that's a correct observation and maybe there's a report on CMAR coming so that will answer some of the questions.

Mr. Cumbers: Yes sir that will be on our next agenda.

3.05 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIASON.

Ms. Edwards: I do not have a report.

3.06 UPDATE ON MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS.

Mr. Cumbers presented 2015 Capital Improvement (CIP) Major Project Updates to committee. He stated there are four new schools in construction due to be done in the 2018-2019 school year. There is one new school in construction due to be done in 2019-2020 school year. There are nineteen schools with classroom additions due to be done in the 2018-2019 school year and five to be completed in the 2019-2020 school year. There are 14 replacement schools all planning to be open by 2022 and five phased replacement schools due to be done by 2021.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.06 UPDATE ON MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS. (continued)

Mr. Cumbers: There are over 150 capital projects going on now and that includes everything from HVAC replacements, roof replacements, asphalt remove and replace, asphalt repair and coat, as well as, numerous other small projects like recoating of play surfaces at various schools, but unfortunately we are not doing everything that needs to be done.

Mr. Kubat: You said the Boulder City field was replaced with synthetic turf.

Mr. Cumbers: The football field.

Mr. Kubat: We've had this discussion on synthetic turf in general but I didn't think we made a policy decision to move in that direction exclusively. Is that the standard for football fields now?

Mr. Cumbers: It has been and it is still under constant review. There are 2 synthetic fields being installed. One at Sandy Valley; Sandy Valley is being installed as synthetic because of the lack of water. Boulder City is getting synthetic fields because it is undergoing constant use and there's not enough time for a grass field to recover. We have to make decisions as we go but we have not made the decision to unilaterally replace all the fields with synthetic turf.

3.08 PLANNING AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS.

Rick Baldwin presented the 2016-2017 School Year Elementary "Hot Spot" Map and the 2017-2018 School Year Elementary "Hot Spot" Map, and the 2018-2019 School Year Elementary "Hot Spot" Maps. He explained that the schools marked red are at 125+% capacity, the yellow ones are 110% - 124.99%, the white ones are 90% to 110%, and the blue ones are below 90% capacity. We are adding over 11,000 seats for the next school year.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: It does not appear that you are altering the hot spot map as these schools come online. All the coloring stays the same year to year.

Mr. Baldwin: That is correct, I'm using as the base that 2018-19, otherwise I'm second guessing what the school board and AZAC would recommend and what the board will approve.

More discussion on the "hot spot" map.

Mr. Kubat: But I know in the past the AZAC process creates all kinds of dilemmas for parents and students as they are rezoned to different schools and therefore I would think that as a policy, if you have the space available, that you would try to do additions within the worst hit districts as opposed to adjacent districts and then have to rezone. You are depending upon rezoning to alleviate these zoning issues I would think you could alleviate some of them by putting the additions within the zone that is the worst hit. So I'm not sure how you answer that or if there is an answer to that. This is the current way you are doing it but it seems a little bit counterintuitive.

Ms. Edwards: This is my area so let me just say that the new school will most likely provide relief to Rogers and Marion Earl and in subsequent years you'll see the red one that goes down from the row gets an addition next year and then two years later Jydstrup gets an addition. So every single one of those schools is being addressed by this plan. I have no concerns because I know these

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 PLANNING AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS. (continued)
schools and I know each one is going to get some relief one way or the other, either an addition or a new school.

Some discussion continued on planning and enrollment.

Mr. Philpott: So we're only adding 18 rooms to Decker ES but there's development coming, shouldn't you be putting 22 rooms there?

Mr. Baldwin: We are adding 18 rooms. They currently have 14 portables and two rooms that are divided and so the reason that is important is that a lot of these prototypes were built using either 1994 or 1996 prototypes. If you are familiar with those, they were built with 12 rooms inside that building with about 1100 square feet and they're intended to be divided if those schools needed to. A lot of those schools could make up that relief by dividing those rooms to have two 600 square foot rooms. For classroom equity, we as a district do not, and this is part of our direction from the superintendent when we went into this project, is that we with building the 900 square foot rooms at the new schools is to not require any schools to divide those rooms. In addition to portables that's how a lot of schools are making up their capacity.

Mr. Philpott: We've had discussions in the past that sometimes the developers are not forthcoming with you in trying to keep you in the loop. And I know when I drive around town I didn't know that was coming up or this was coming up, how that's impacting your numbers on a daily basis?

Mr. Baldwin: We extensively track every current project that's under construction as well as anything that's currently on the books within the entities that's filed and try to anticipate what that future growth is going to look like.

Ms. Douglass: Are you also looking at, like this year we received 50 of the students that were taken from our community and were going to the Somerset Academies, 50 of them have come back this year. Are you also tracking how many additional students we have getting coming back that are in our area but they are coming back from charters?

Mr. Baldwin: We track all of that. We are constantly tracking student movement.

Ms. Douglass: Has one of the new schools limited their enrollment to 700-750 students?

Mr. Cumbers: We have a presentation specifically on that.

Ms. Douglas: So when you get to that, what I want to know if why we have such overcrowding at other schools and we're limiting enrollment for one school in particular and a few that are having modifications made and are limited a few of their enrollments. So why would we give someone 700 when I'm at 850 so I'm over and I know I'm going to be over next year. So I just want to know about equity and fairness and why do we have schools in red hot zones and limit enrollment?

Mr. Cumbers: I'll get to that in more detail. The simple answer is that we can't build anything we want to build anywhere we want to build it. The jurisdiction has to grant us entitlements in order to build within their jurisdiction.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 PLANNING AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS. (continued)

Ms. Douglass: So you're saying the land itself is not big enough to accommodate?

Mr. Cumbers: No I'm not saying that at all.

Ms. Earl: You had to agree to that before you could build it, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Cumbers: Yes, in order to get entitlements. I'll explain it in some detail in the next presentation.

Ms. Douglass: That is so wrong. There is no equity.

Mr. Baldwin provided a map of the charter schools in Las Vegas valley showing current and planned charter schools. Mr. Baldwin presented the "2018-2019 School Year Projected Middle School Hot Spot Map Middle School Recommend Projects". He reported that three middle schools will become dedicated magnet schools.

Some discussion on the middle school "hot spot" map.

Mr. Baldwin presented the "2018-2019 School Year Projected High School "Hot Spot" Map with Recommended Projects". The current need is for 4 high schools.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: So the school you're recommending on Skye Canyon Park, would it alleviate the surrounding 4 high schools or just in the Arbor View district?

Mr. Baldwin: It would help Arbor View, Centennial, Shadow Ridge, we're talking six years from now so it's hard to say what it may look like for providing opportunities for Legacy. Currently I would say yes.

Mr. Lazaroff: What is the condition code of Basic High School?

Mr. Baldwin: I don't know.

Mr Lazaroff: It looks pretty run down.

Ms. Alston: It's had a lot of work done.

Mr. Baldwin: Let me just point out we do include again the anticipated number of high school students in this case from active residential developments and while we aren't making any recommendation for Liberty High School we are expecting an additional 522 high school students, the majority of that is the Inspirada Master Planned Community. While it's currently not discussed, that's a future area of concern.

Mr. Philpott: Back on virtual academies, I've had friends take their kids to school in virtual academies for a couple years and then bring them back. Do you have any numbers on that?

Mr. Baldwin: It's difficult tracking students that come back to us because what we track is what the registrar in the school puts in the system, there are certain codes and what we found is that based

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.08 PLANNING AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS. (continued)
on schools, based on students, based on registrars it's subjective. They may not input the information correctly or may not get the information relayed to them correctly.

Mr. Philpott: Do we see virtual academies growing?

Mr. Baldwin: We hear that there's growth. We as a district also offer a virtual academy and that it is growing. There's actually a lot of schools that use our virtual academies to supplement their programs.

Mr. Reynolds: It looks like the areas of concern on this map are largely being taken care of in the high school map save for Rancho. Can you update us on what's going to happen to Rancho?

Mr. Baldwin: Rancho HS and actually previously you had mentioned Cashman MS, they are both magnet schools. It's difficult to relate but they are kind of self-implemented situations. They could reduce the number of magnet students to reach capacity but they choose to over-enroll. They are highly successful and highly sought after programs.

Mr. Reynolds: Do they get additional Title 1 funding because they are overcrowded?

Mr. Baldwin: No, but the district reorganization with the per pupil funding situation is that they do now received funding per pupil, does impact that.

- 3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 3.

Mr. Cumbers: The next presentation constitutes the 2015 capital improvement projects that make up revision 3. Mr. Cumbers reviewed the 2015 CIP Revision and the guiding principles that were reviewed and approved by the BOST on June 21, 2017. Mr. Cumbers presented the updated full needs for years 2015-2025 which is a total of \$10.149 billion. Mr. Cumbers reviewed the status on the new elementary schools, new classroom additions for 2021-2021 thorough 2022-2023, the replacement schools for 2020-2021 through 2022-2023 and the phased replacement schools for 2018-2019 through 2021-2022.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: Are these decisions consistent with the overall plan that we have already approved and these are just the specifics of how we're accomplishing that plan?

Mr. Cumbers: Yes, and I might point out that it's critical that you understand that the plan is largely biased towards adding capacity in the form of additions to schools and new schools throughout the valley. Our critical need is creeping up on us and we're using our funds like our GST funds, the funds for asphalt are coming from our GST fund. We're only addressing the worst of the worst. We are having critical needs in this area and I'm deeply concerned about the allocation of funds for modernization and equity and replacement of equipment at schools that are aging out.

We're focused primarily on electrical, mechanical, plumbing, and roofs, those things that have the potential to close a school and interrupt classroom instruction.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 3. (continued)

Mr. Cumbers reviewed the summaries for the new middle school in Mountain's Edge that has an estimated completion date of 2020-2021, a new high school at Mountain's Edge with a completion date of 2021-2022, and a new high school in the northwest with a completion date of 2023-2024. Mr. Cumbers reviewed the available funding to address modernization/life cycle/equity needs which is 19.5% of the need. He stated we are in crisis mode. We really need to seek more funding for the school district for these projects, for maintenance of the facilities that we currently have. Comparison of Proposed Revision 3 to Revise Full Needs was reviewed.

Mr. Kubat: Just to clarify the \$10.1 billion is that before or after Revision 2 funds?

Ms. Alston: The \$8.5 billion that was presented in Revision 2 has now grown to \$10.1 billion and the reason is for the most part the expected cost of the same work. We know the cost to do work has increased so the cost estimate I presented to you a few months ago showing you what we were experiencing and what we saw and what we were going to develop into this plan, that's the effect of that.

Mr. Cumbers reviewed the "Proposed effect to guiding principles" and the "Yearly funding allocation of \$4.1 billion by category".

Mr. Halsey: You've got the six decisions. You're saying number six is the one that includes the modernization number?

Mr. Cumbers: Number 6 is the approval of the recommendation to allocate funds in this way. This is what we see based on the guiding principles that we've been given. However, it's your prerogative to modify this recommendation like the BOST did with their approval of Revision 2, 1 and the original.

Mr. Halsey: They modified our modified.

Mr. Cumbers: They did indeed, and that's why we called it B-BOT. It was option B, I think you chose option C. They chose option B and modified that.

Mr. Halsey: So now we don't have options we have decisions on 1-6.

Mr. Cumbers: They are the siting of specific projects, specific locations as driven by the data that Mr. Baldwin presented.

Mr. Halsey: So do you have a suggestion other than 1-6 here that you're saying that these proposals follow the guidelines and you're thinking that the guidelines contain too much?

Mr. Cumbers: We're constrained by the amount of money overall that we have and the guidelines with the bias towards the development of capacity and meeting the needs for new classrooms, equity, creating classrooms that are not portables, so that we have create a modern learning environment for all of those students. We have to keep it in balance with the ability to keep the buildings that we have operational. We're between a rock and a hard place.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 3. (continued)

Mr. Kubat: The policy has been made now that we want to provide 9-month school for all students in Clark County. That's a major change that happened a few years ago. This reflects that policy. Secondly it reflects the policy that every student should have a permanent seat as opposed to a temporary portable. True?

Mr. Cumbers: Both are true.

Mr. Kubat: Can anyone answer when the schools no longer went year round?

Mr. Wagner: So this year 2017-2018 school year we were able to remove all elementary schools from the year round calendar. Previously in 2016-2017 school year we had 15 schools that were still operating year round.

Ms. Earl: I know that the 98 bond was premised on the notion that all elementary schools would go year round, how were we able to just ignore that? Am I wrong?

Ms. Alson: That is what the 98 was, it's not the 2015.

Ms. Earl: So basically we can ignore that now that that bond is complete? Taxpayers were told that if we approve this bond it's on the premise that elementary schools go year round to utilize the funds to the fullest.

Mr. Kubat: That's sort of based on my question. If we experience another accelerated period of growth like we did that generated that decision, the trustees could go back to say we can't meet all these needs on a 9-month calendar anymore so we need to go back to year round. So what would happen to all of these numbers and projections of need if we were to do that? If we went back to year round would we still have that tremendous amount of unfunded need for the schools?

Mr. Cumbers: The way that the school district has mitigated the problem of overcrowding or being over-capacity is with a 12 month schedule, and portable classrooms. I'm not in a position to answer your question which I think is if we went to 12 month schools now, what effect would that have on our need for capacity?

Mr. Kubat: Need for capacity and therefore money potentially available for additional modernization.

Mr. Cumbers: I understand. We could research that and bring that back to you.

Ms. Earl: I think he was just contemplating elementary schools as far as the 12 month.

Mr. Cumbers: We could fashion a response to that question.

Mr. Kubat: I know it's timely relative to your request for recommendations on Revision 3 and when you need an approval from the BOST. But you are asking without options. We are being given a series of decisions that make some assumptions as you said. The assumption that is not written here is a 9 month calendar for all. I just know that being on the committee 21 years that I've been on the BOC that we've had those changes in policies which dramatically impacts our need for

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 3. (continued)
seats in various areas. I wanted to put it out there to see whether there was any concern from other members on the BOC.

Mr. Lazaroff: I agree with you. I think we need to reiterate what our assumptions are in this plan. There's assumptions there such as 9-month schools versus 12-month schools. There's so much pressure put on the district, on your division essentially to cater and make things work without money and I think that's unreasonable. Particularly when legislatures legislate they dictate certain things but they don't give you the money to do it. Second of all, can you tell which of the six decisions require new land that we don't have secured yet on items 2-5?

Mr. Cumbers: The only projects that we have that we don't have the land secured are the projects near Sam Boyd Stadium which we are working on with the county and, the northwest high school site is not finalized. We don't have entitlements or title to that property and we're still working with the BLM on the elementary site in Mountain's Edge.

Ms. Monette: The only one that applies to the recommendation is number 5. The other 2 do not apply to the recommendation.

Mr. Lazaroff: Can we be more specific as to which ones and what our solution is whether BLM tradeoffs that we are recommending?

Mr. Cumbers: The BLM site which is the elementary school site in Mountain's Edge that application's been filed long ago and is in Washington. We expect to have the lease perhaps by July 1st. The high school site in the northwest that's in progress with the county is not finalized. I expect to have that well in advance of when we project delivering the school. The process begins with a forecast of where we need the school and then it's a long way to get to final delivery. And that includes the acquisition of the site.

Mr., Lazaroff: By purchase or by trade with the BLM?

Mr. Cumbers: That's BLM property so it will be at a nominal cost. The Sam Boyd Stadium site would be a purchase from the county.

Ms. Monette: El Capitan Way and Mountain's Edge is the elementary school that he's referring to. Broadbent Blvd. and East Russell that's the other piece that's TBD that would be a purchase from the county.

Mr. Halsey: So we still have six decisions on the table does anyone have any recommendations to adopt them or make any alterations to them?

Ms. Monette: But again this particular slide with the elementary school and the land are not part of the recommendations because these were previously approved projects. So in the recommendations that we are asking you to make, number five is the only one where the land is not secured.

Mr. Reynolds: I'm considering making the following motion. There's six recommendations pending before us, I would like to in addition move that we recommend that the BOST identify and consider

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 3. (continued)
what effect moving schools to a year-round program rather than a 9 month program would have on the district's need to increase capacity thus freeing up funds for making some modernizations. So I'd like to make the motion to add that recommendation to the list of recommendations.

Ms. Earl: Do you mean just elementary school year-round?

Mr. Reynolds: No. They can determine on their side what levels it's going to be but to recommend to them that they identify and consider moving schools from a 9-month to a 1-year, or 12 month program, what that's going to do to their capacity concerns.

Mr. Halsey: Restate the recommendation.

Mr. Reynolds: I recommend that the BOST identify and consider what effect moving schools to a year-round program rather than a 9-month program would have on the District's need to increase capacity thus freeing up funds for modernization.

Motion for a recommendation that the Board of School Trustees identify and consider what effect moving schools to a year round program rather than a 9 month program would have on the Districts' need for increased capacity, thus freeing up funds for modernization.

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Reynolds: My second motion with that additional recommendation I would recommend we approve the recommendations we have been given in this presentation that's now 1-7. I created that 7th recommendation now I'm moving to approve all seven to be forwarded to the trustees.

Motion for approval of the seven 2015 CIP Revision 3 Decisions are:

1. *Recommend classroom additions for 2020-2021 SY through 2022-2023 SY.*
2. *Recommend replacement schools for 200-2021 SY through 2022-2023 SY.*
3. *Recommend siting of new middle school in Mountain's Edge.*
4. *Recommend siting of new comprehensive high school in Mountain's Edge.*
5. *Recommend siting of new comprehensive high school in the Northwest.*
6. *Recommend approval of CIP Revision 3 allocation of funds.*
7. *Recommend that the Board of School Trustees identify and consider what effect moving schools to a year round program rather than a 9 month program would have on the Districts' need for increased capacity, thus freeing up funds for modernization.*

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

- 3.10 PROPOSED NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF CHAPATA DRIVE AND CASADY HOLLOW AVENUE.

Mr. Cumbers: This presentation is on an elementary school that was previously approved on Chapata Drive and Casady Hollow Avenue. Mr. Cumbers provided a map showing where property is. The land has been dedicated as a school site for many years and has been used as a park for the last 8-9 years by virtue of an interlocal agreement between CCSD and the City of Henderson

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.10 PROPOSED NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF CHAPATA DRIVE AND CASADY HOLLOW AVENUE. (continued)

This site is owned by CCSD. The community has grown up all around it. It does not have good access to get to. Mr. Cumbers went through the project approval timeline and pointed out that in January 2017 the first neighborhood meeting was held. CCSD submitted the traffic analysis and entitlement application to COH. They were not happy with a school housing 849 students on that site. From February – November 2017 CCSD worked with Tate Snyder Kimsey (TSK) Architects to respond to a series of conditions provided by the COH, including redesigning the school to accommodate a student capacity of 719 students. In February 2018, COH Planning Commission approved the development of the elementary school subject to a number of conditions including reduction of school size to 719 students. The cost to redesign the school to accommodate 719 students is \$146,072. The COH agrees to prepare an interlocal agreement with CCSD to formalize the City of Henderson's in kind contributions towards certain off-site improvements in an amount not less than \$146,072. CCSD Policy 7122 states that substantial changes to prototype design, development of custom designs for new schools, must be reviewed by the BOC and approved by the Superintendent and the BOST prior to any financial expenditure. Discussion regarding traffic and number of students that the school will serve.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Kubat: Is there another school site in that area that would serve the overcrowding in the adjacent attendance zones?

Mr., Cumbers: Yes. We're going to need both sites. Development still continues in that immediate area.

Mr. Halsey: The agenda says presentation and discussion. It doesn't say action, we cannot take action under this agenda item. That doesn't mean we can't take action on a future agenda item.

Mr. Lazaroff: For a review there has to be some kind of outcome from us which would be a recommendation. My opinion of this whole thing is that we are being held hostage as it was stated, we're not solving the ultimate problem of alleviating overloads in some of the surrounding schools and we're built for failure. We know we're going to need more school space because we're living it out. If you're looking for a recommendation, my recommendation would be to reject the whole thing, counter it back to the City of Henderson and find another solution or a tradeoff with land from the city and come back to us. They say they are pro-education, but we need to dig in our heels finally and say no. What is the timing to bring this to the BOST?

Mr. Cumbers: As soon as possible.

Ms. Monette: It would be appreciated to have some sort of recommendation we could move forward with today, simply because our schedule, we are bringing this item to the BOST June 6th, and our next BOC meeting isn't until June 21st, so the item will have already been reviewed at that point. And now to your point about possible action like Blake said, we purposely interpreted the policy as best we could knowing that we couldn't say for possible action because the policy doesn't call for action.

Mr. Cumbers: Perhaps one of the committee members could summarize your position or thoughts at the BOST meeting when they consider the subject.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.10 PROPOSED NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF CHAPATA DRIVE AND CASADY HOLLOW AVENUE. (continued)

Ms. Earl: I think Gene did a pretty good job I think perhaps he can do it again?

Mr. Lazaroff: I would think that their proposal to us is unreasonable and it doesn't solve the problem of alleviating the overloading dilemma we are faced with at surrounding schools and it's a waste of money to do what we're doing knowing that it is going to fail.

Mr. Halsey: I think Blake's suggestion is appropriate if we could have one or two members there to state our opinion.

Mr. Reynolds: I want it clear that I suggested a potential lawsuit if the City of Henderson doesn't approve it for those reasons. Secondly, I would be concerned about the basis for limiting it to 719, who gets excluded if it's 719? It seems to me that you're tightening the circle of your zone and I'd be very interested as to why they are tightening that circle.

Motion was approved that as a BOC we request our chairman or vice chairman to attend the next BOST meeting to communicate the discussion that we've had today about this particular school and the concerns that we have expressed here collectively.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Earl

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Earl: What date is that meeting?

Ms. Monnette: We will have to get back to you on the date because now I'm hearing that June 6th is a work session, but now I'm understanding that we may not be able to bring this item to a work session, this needs to be brought to a regular board meeting which might be June 14th. So we will get back to you on that date.

Mr. Kubat: It's still before our next meeting.

Ms. Monnette: You are correct. It's still before the next time you guys meet as a committee.

Ms. Earl: Anyone in the public can go and sign up for this meeting.

Ms. Douglass: If it's not until June 14th, when is our next meeting?

Ms. Monette: June 21st.

3.11 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. No changes.

3.12 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS. No comment.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

4.01 COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATION.

Mr. Cumbers: I just added this as a standing item to the agenda so that we may have a dialog and I can tell you about some things like the location for our next meeting we're planning it at Rex Bell Elementary School. That's where we had our meeting long ago when we were starting the program and we met in the multi-purpose room and then the school was demolished and replaced so I just wanted to make that announcement. I had no other major items to talk about but I wanted you to know that I added this as a standing item on the agenda for some dialog and to report to you general information and things that are going on with our staff and our projects, things like that.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Reynolds: Maybe it would be beneficial to say "and possible action" right there.

Mr. Halsey: Which one?

Mr. Reynolds: 4.01 so he could take a recommendation like this directly to the board.

Mr., Cumbers: I don't know that can be appropriate because some of these things come up that the public is not aware, but I just wanted to have the opportunity from time to time to make announcements to the BOC.

Mr. Lazaroff: Is it possible to go back to the Agenda Planning for a second or not?

Mr. Halsey: Well, we've already went passed it.

Mr. Lazaroff: I know we did but we went passed it fairly quickly before I had a chance to go through all the pieces. I just had a question. I want to open 3.12 for a second if I could.

Mr. Halsey: So what do you have?

Mr. Lazaroff: So we have some of these things at the end of Motions and Taskings and there was the discussion that I know last time I asked about last time regarding overall student safety and building enhancements and so on and I asked for it at our next meeting but it's down here 'to be determined'. Is there anymore determination as to when we would have that discussion?

Mr. Cumbers: I considered it for this meeting but we had so much to do, and so much time that I just went and put it on the next agenda. We're not intending to do a presentation to you on that subject.

Mr. Halsey: And that would be covered under your questions to him so we didn't have to go back.

5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

6.0 ADJOURN: 2:46 p.m.

Motion: Earl

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous