

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.01 APPROVAL OF MINUTES. (cont.)

Ms. Earl: I just have one question on the solar panel piece. I know that there was a huge discussion at the board. Was there any direction from this body as far as recommendations or anything further than just the questions and answers that were given? Was there any action taken on this?

Mr. Lazaroff: I don't believe it was an action item.

Trustee Garvey: So then I can go back to the board and let them know that that we just asked these questions but there was no action item.

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIASON REPRESENTATIVES.

None.

3.03 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE ELECTION OF THE CHAIR, FIRST VICE CHAIR and SECOND VICE CHAIR.

Ms. Lavelle: We can open nominations for chair.

Mr. Halsey: I'd like to nominate Eleissa for chair.

Motion to approve Eleissa as chair of committee.

Motion: Halsey

Second: Goynes

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Lavelle: For first Vice Chair, nominations are open.

Ms. Earl: I nominate Jim Halsey, First Vice Chair.

Motion to approve Jim Haley for First Vice Chair.

Motion: Earl

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

Nominations are open for Second Vice Chair.

Mr. Halsey: I'd like to nominate Byron Goynes.

Motion to approve Byron Goynes as Second Vice Chair.

Motion: Halsey

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

None.

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

Trustee Garvey: The board approved the transgender policy. In that policy there is the possibility for transgender individuals to use the bathroom, locker room, or overnight room of their gender

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.05 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES. (cont.)

identity. Also, until we have further analysis there may be a correlation, there were many parents who said they'd be taking their children out of our district, yesterday's enrollment numbers are down from last year at this same time. We will continue tracking that because that impacts what you do, but also our revenue. It appears that the City of Henderson (COH) is considering a zoning resolution that would impact how our schools are built as far as capacity. They are saying they don't want any more than 500 students in elementary school, middle school would cap at 1000 and high school would cap at 2000.

QUESTIONS:

Trustee Garvey: Do we have any ball park figures of what area we have in Henderson?

Ms. Perri: We actually only have 92 acres in Henderson. Most of it is Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land.

Ms. Earl: I assume you're having the Legal Department looking into whether they can be delegated to do such a thing?

Trustee Garvey: I think they have the ability. They did it with Chapata. I'm hoping at this point that it's just a conversation and that they're missing integral information and making decisions that possibly they wouldn't make if we can provide them with better information.

Ms. Charlton: How is the land acclimated to the district? Is it either a pass through from the city or is it direct from the BLM and does that have any impact on zoning restrictions when it comes to building?

Mr. Cumbers: It's different in every case. Some of the land is purchased, some of the land is given to us through a process with BLM.

Ms. Charlton: Is permitting done through the city or is that separately through the District?

Mr. Cumbers: Construction permitting?

Ms. Charlton: Yes.

Mr. Cumbers: We have our own building department in the District by statute so we can approve our plans and inspect the schools as they are built. However, we do need entitlements within every jurisdiction in order to build the facility.

Mr. Reynolds: Is this just a proposed city regulation?

Mr. Cumbers: It's an ordinance.

Mr. Reynolds: I'm assuming this is post our discussion with the mayor about the one example we had if you were going to leave it as an outlier?

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.05 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES. (cont.)

Mr. Cumbers: This is not related to Chapata and Cassady but I think it's fair to say that it grew out of that conversation.

Mr. Reynolds: So, it is not targeted to buildings in general, this is targeted directly at schools?

Mr. Kubat: How are we going to communicate all of these things to the city before they take action if they take action then we're kind of stuck.

Trustee Garvey: I just had a brief conversation with Superintendent Jara last night about this and he is going to bring it to the Board.

Mr. Neal: Their intent is to bring it to the first council meeting in September. From Operations we did reply indicating that reducing the size of these schools to a random number would have impact well beyond what they would envision. We are going to take it to the Board for further discussion on how we address this.

Mr. Kubat: We've talked about smaller schools for years. It's a desire. Is there going to be some meeting before the meeting in September?

Trustee Garvey: I haven't had a chance to meet with Superintendent Jara. I know they are looking at doing out some scenarios to show the ripple effect of this. I'm not even sure what their justification is.

Mr. Kubat: So is there specific steps that our staff is going to take to prepare these scenarios so that our Superintendent and our Trustees can have an intelligent discussion about it?

Trustee Garvey: Superintendent Jara said that it is important that the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) at least has knowledge of this. I will take back anything you want communicated.

Mr. Reynolds: I'm assuming there is some sort of grandfather clause?

Mr. Neal: The phrasing of it was 'schools to be built'. There was no specific grandfather clause.

Mr. Reynolds: Are we required to say that they ratcheted themselves up on the needs list now because they need more schools therefore we have to build? I don't think we have the duty to build there.

Trustee Garvey: You are the trust keepers of that bond money as far as advisement to your Board. It will need to be a conversation among this committee to how do you best use that.

Ms. Lavelle: How many schools are anticipated to be built in Henderson?

Mr. Cumbers: There are three high school additions approved and Chapata and Cassady. The Board has already approved all the projects and will exhaust all the funds from the 2015 Capital Improvement Program. As well as all the funds for replacement schools. So there is no more money for new schools under the 2015 Capital Improvement Program. Our objective as a Board has always been is that equity is a very high priority. It's how we treat everybody in the valley, all of

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.05 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES. (cont.)

our schools. So on one hand I have a natural reaction as sort of a retaliatory kind of discussion of well then they don't get new schools or they don't get the new additions but that's not our role. Our role is to look at this fairly. We can't make our recommendations operationally on how we're going to necessarily meet that need of the extra students whether it's double session or year-round. I don't think that's our decision. Our decision is how we spend funds equitably between jurisdictions based on need. It's never been based on an arbitrary decision by one jurisdiction to limit the number of students at the school. I think we'll have to look at how many dollars are spent in any one jurisdiction if this becomes a reality so that we can try to be fair and equitable about how schools are built.

More discussion took place.

Mr. Lazaroff: Is it possible to get a copy of the proposed ordinance for the next meeting?

Mr. Cumbers: Sure.

Ms. Charlton: Just one last question for the new members that may not have the history would it be possible for staff to do a briefing that gives the history? I've heard some issues with traffic and some other agreements and I'm sure if it's standard that the municipality actually does some of the improvements or alleviate some of the construction costs. Could there be a briefing overall for the new members that don't have this background?

Ms. Lavelle: I think that's a great idea and I think we should add this to the Motions and Taskings.

More discussion took place.

3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD COST ANALYSIS CONTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD

Mr. Cumbers: Years ago when we were just starting the 2015 Capital Improvement Program it was common knowledge that we had the ability to use two different methods of construction delivery either Design-Bid-Build or Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) and at the direction of the Board we were asked to develop a comparison of the two methods of delivery to see how they would compare one to the other. We had three prototypes at the time that also underwent a lot of discussion and ultimately an increase in the size of the prototypes that we had. The original three prototypes were designed for 725 students and they have increased in size to 850 students. The reason for that change was because of the change of half-day kindergarten to full-day kindergarten, changes that required more space and more schools. So in order to satisfy the Board and fulfill the requirements they had to compare the 2 methods of delivery we assigned on the 3 different prototypes to be built one using CMAR and the other project using the same prototype to be built using design-bid-build. With that I'll turn it over to Jeff Wagner who is the Director of Design and Construction, and Mr. Justin Peterson who we engaged to do a third party analysis of the work that was done.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD COST ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD (cont.)

Mr. Wagner: We're going to take you through the presentation. I'll note that this is a presentation based solely on costs. We've isolated that portion of the project. For this particular evaluation there were 6 new schools open for the 2017-2018 school year. These schools were the same design on different sites. I'll let Justin explain his process and how he went about ensuring the monies were allocated in the right categories. Mr. Peterson: I'm Justin Peterson, President of O'Connor Construction Management, Inc. Our firm was hired to do this cost comparison. We went through a few steps to arrive at our findings. We were provided data sets from the School District, most significantly the Schedule of Values. The Schedule of Values are a break-down of line items that contain detailed costs for a particular project. We were also provided Change Order logs, Allowance logs, and Contingency logs. We took that information and migrated it from PDFs into Excel, then we sorted the cost categories into the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) divisions. After that, we started to separate the dollars into building costs, onsite improvements, onsite utilities and off sites. Upon completion of that we thought it would be a good idea to meet with different general contractors who were involved in these projects. We reached out to all of them and were able to meet with 3 of the 4. We went through our findings and our spreadsheets giving them the chance to add any additional input. We felt that it was a pretty thorough process. The aggregate across the 6 projects was an additional cost for CMAR at 5.7%.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Lazaroff: Can you clarify who was responsible to do conceptual designs? The geo-tech, sub street testing, all that other stuff?

Mr. Wagner: I can certainly get you the information regarding geo-tech. The architects for each project are noted.

Mr. Halsey: Certain projects were contracted and had issues and that drove up the costs. I know on Josh Stevens the electrical contractor had issues and they had to bring in a different one to help finish the job. Is that something you see in your numbers?

Mr. Peterson: That would be difficult for us to ascertain.

Mr. Halsey: Because on this particular one on CMAR it seems there's money that was given back. There was one on the Mathis school but on Josh Stevens it doesn't seem like they used every bit of it?

Mr. Wagner: We exhausted the contingency on Josh Stevens.

Mr. Halsey: Was that related to that contractor?

Mr. Wagner: It was related to a number of issues. I'd be happy to meet with you to over them individually or bring a report back to the committee. It's not as simple as one issue that caused the contingency to be exhausted.

Some discussion continued.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD COST ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD (cont.)

Mr. Kubat: Consistent with Trustee Child's question of performance dates and so on. While it's not a part of the cost to you, can you tell us whether one method or the other better hit the dates in the contract?

Mr. Wagner: In general the schedule was better controlled on CMAR projects. They are typically more of a partner in the process.

Mr. Kubat: But we don't know. We're just making general statements.

Mr. Wagner: I could certainly bring back specifics to you.

Mr. Kubat: One of things that's intriguing here and clearly 5.7% as an average cost to the District to do CMAR projects. If you look purely at construction costs of the building, it's something I'd say on first look here do we really want to pay the 5% for what reasons? If we're getting comparable schools, the same design, for less money per seat then you'd think maybe it's our fiduciary responsibility that we would go for lesser costs solutions. There's other reasons why you use CMAR. I was trying to introduce schedule as one of those and there are probably others. You may wish to elaborate at some point. Part of our role is to potentially recommend to the Trustees and to the staff about the use of CMAR as a general approach or as an occasional approach. So based on this, just cost only it's sort of saying that we're not sure we're getting the most for our dollar. Therefore I would offer that it's premature to make any kind of recommendations based on this report because there are a whole lot of other factors. This is a great start and I know it took a lot of work to get here. I applaud the effort in getting us baseline information to us and to the Trustees. But I hope there is a way that we can go further than this to have additional information before we can make a recommendation.

Mr. Wagner: There's a distinct difference between cost and value. We were asked to look at cost analysis which is a very objective process and we brought in the best person we felt could do that objective analysis. A value analysis is more subjective. We welcome the opportunity to present our opinion, educated opinion, but opinion none the less on the value, the pros and cons. From staff's standpoint both delivery methods have their value. There are times when it's best suited for the school district to select a CMAR contract, very difficult projects, projects where we're replacing a school on an existing campus and students are still in the building. Those are the projects that we need a partner throughout the process that has the same goal. Other times when we have built a prototype school multiple times, we understand it very well, the site conditions aren't extreme, it's in the best interest of the District to hard bid the projects. This presentation does not address those hard bids as Mr. Kubat has indicated. Staff would be more than happy to do an analysis of the pros and cons and bring back some of the specifics you asked for to the committee.

Some discussion continued.

Trustee Garvey: Trustee Edwards had also asked for an item for the Board concerning this so I will let her know that unfortunately it was not presented to you as an action item to have a recommendation but it does sound like there's consensus among the committee that you would also like to have a presentation on value?

Ms. Lavelle: Yes. Pros and cons on the value of each project.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.07 2018 ARCHITECTURAL SELECTION LIST

Mr. Cumbers: Once again we presented a list to the BOC previously and you might recall, for those of you who have been members of the committee for a while, that when we started the 2015 Capital Improvement Program we had about half a dozen architects that were on our list and were frequently being used for projects. In order to ramp up and have the talent that we needed we asked the design community to submit proposals to be qualified architects for our projects. We grew our list from 6 to 18 architectural firms. We've gone through that process again and we've outlined for you in this item the process as it was conducted with the proposals from the architectural firms. The result was the architects listed on pages 2 and 3. With that I'll entertain any questions you may have at this time then I would ask for your approval of this list of architects.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Kubat: I note that all of the people doing the evaluations are staff. None of these folks are architects I assume.

Mr. Wagner: A number of people on my staff are registered, including myself.

Mr. Kubat: But on the evaluation group?

Mr. Wagner: Ibrahim Kako is an architect. Nat Shupe is not an architect but has worked at architectural firms for 20+ years.

Mr. Kubat: Has the evaluation process changed any this time from last time?

Mr. Wagner: No. The same process. The committee was selected for each various discipline. They did their evaluations independently then came together to form a consensus score. The only difference between this round and the last round is the last round we accepted every architect that submitted primarily to grow that field and to give opportunity to every architect that was interested. We were able to give every architect on that list work. This time the response was overwhelming. If they scored below 75 they were not offered a spot with us.

Mr. Lazaroff: A question we've dealt with over the years on the list and ability to do work is, are we going simply down the list and assigning the next project to the next person on that list under that category or is there a ranking involved?

Mr. Wagner: They are not assigned in round-robin fashion. We look at the requirements of the project and select the architect best suited for that project.

Trustee Garvey: I was one of the people that pushed to make sure that we're looking at a pipe line that we are spreading work around especially when we were in the depths of the recession. I recognize a lot of these companies as local companies but are there any outside companies?

Mr. Cumbers: Some of these are big companies that have offices elsewhere but all of them have an office here locally.

Trustee Garvey: But that's my concern, I'm not that familiar with Cunningham Group but I think that they are not a real big player here.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.07 2018 ARCHITECTURAL SELECTION LIST (cont.)

Mr. Cumbers: That group has a big office here and they do a lot of work in hospitality.

Ms. Lavelle: Do I hear a motion for approval of the list?

Motion for approval of the Architectural Selection List

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

3.08 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES.

Mr. Cumbers: We have a short presentation for you to give you an update on projects. You can see that we have four new schools that were recently competed. That's Ortwein, Ellis, Divich, and Barber Elementary Schools (ES). Then we have two schools under construction, one at Tompkins and Conquistador and one at Vegas Valley and Hollywood. Chapata Drive and Casady Hollow we're in negotiations for the inter-local agreement so it has not started construction.

Then at South El Capitan Way and Mountains Edge Parkway I'm happy to report that the ES for that site will be under way shortly. We have the lease soon, maybe Linda could speak to that a little bit what the status is for that ground.

Ms. Perri: I just found out that their attorney sent it to the planning department for their final comment so they hope to have it to us next week.

Mr. Cumbers: So we'll get that under way shortly. And then Broadbent and East Russell we're working with the county on the acquisition of ten acres of land that's south and a little bit east of Sam Boyd Stadium that's part of their acreage over there.

Ms. Perri: We're doing the parcel map and should have that done in six to eight months. We're meeting with the county next week.

Mr. Cumbers: And then Mountain's Edge and South Buffalo is for the 2020 school year. Cactus Avenue and South Buffalo is in planning for the 2021 school year. Skye Canyon Park Drive and Log Cabin Way is in planning for the 2023 school year.

This is the classroom additions. We've shown you all of the additions for this school year. For Craig ES we expect occupancy there on September 4 and Vegas Verdes on October 30. The delivery of this product at this particular time constitutes 574 classrooms, about half a million square feet of space, and it's the most ambitious part of the whole program. Once we get past this, scheduling becomes a lot easier for the next school year, Jeff's anticipating substantial completion in May or early June of all of those projects so we'll be under much less pressure with regard to our internal departments in order to staff the school and start up technology integration and things like that. So this was a pretty ambitious piece. We did that intentionally knowing the risks. We wanted to spend the money as quickly as we possibly could because prices are going up and we wanted to get as many of the kids out of portables and in to classrooms as quickly as possible. We have 5 classroom additions for 2019. We have classroom additions for 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023. These were recently approved by the Board of School Trustees (BOST).

With regard to replacement schools, this is a challenging part of the program because some of them are dependent on others and we're using swing schools in some cases. Right now everything is on schedule.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES. (cont.) QUESTIONS:

Trustee Garvey: I had a question about J.D. Smith Middle School, this particular item was at a Board meeting and during that meeting it was the Board's wish that J.D. Smith be fast tracked as meeting its original completion date of 2019. At that time we were told that design had been completed, is that not the case?

Mr. Cumbers: The design has not been the issue. The issue has been the City of North Las Vegas.

Trustee Garvey: So I'm not sure why it's not in the planning stage because the Superintendent and myself have had a meeting for other things with the City of North Las Vegas and they have continually said they will make it happen that they will make sure those things are done to get that school up and running. I know this is one of our schools that literally has a swamp cooler to cool a portion of that school.

Mr. Cumbers: That's why it has an FCI of .94.

Trustee Garvey: So I'm not sure why the Board has not been told of any issues or problems.

Mr. Cumbers: I don't know that that's the case we've been updating right along.

Trustee Garvey: I guess for me if there's an issue with a city we need to know because the Board is getting one message but yet there's a different message being relayed to this committee, so the continuity of communication doesn't seem like it's the same.

Mr. Cumbers: Linda would you like to speak to some of the issues that we faced with North Las Vegas as it related to the J.D. Smith project?

Ms. Perri: Well there's been quite a few obviously because the building was designated as a historical building. We had to go through the Historical Preservation Society, federal, and state to get that released. We're in the process of doing that now. Also, the park was paid with a federal grant initially when it was built so we had to get that released with the Federal Park Service. And then we did have the agreement drafted with the City to allow us access to the park site so we could go ahead and demo the park and keep the school intact, however, the Jefferson Yard was a big sticky point. Everything has been approved so we're in the process of transferring the property over to the City for the Jefferson Yard. Right now we're ready to get on the property September 4.

Trustee Garvey: When were we supposed to start originally? Was it July?

Mr. Cumbers: It was March.

Trustee Garvey: So it could actually be done maybe, a mid-year opening.

Mr. Cumbers: That would be a disaster.

Trustee Garvey: Well it was done in the southwest part of the valley.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES. (cont.)

Mr. Wagner: It takes a minimum of eighteen months to build a new school. My office was asked to analyze drop dead dates. We got to March and realized there was going to be an issue with the City. At this point there is no feasible way.

Trustee Garvey: So for me those kind of communications need to come back to the Board because the Board gave a directive and it appears that maybe for reasons not relayed, that it just physically can't be done, but it appears that the staff is just saying we're just going to do what we're going to do.

Mr. Cumbers: Wait a minute.

Ms. Lavelle: Let me bring this back to order just a second. I have a concern that appears to have been raised, that there might be information coming to this committee that may not be the same as what is going to the BOST. I'm assuming that the same people who are making presentations to this committee are making presentations to the BOST. We're not in a position to do any informational type of report. I don't know what the process is to make sure we are getting the same information. Perhaps when this information goes to the BOST and the Trustees raise a question it might then come back here for discussion. Maybe there are particular questions that Board members have about items in this presentation. But I want to make sure that the Trustees questions are answered but I don't know the proper forum. I don't know if it's here or it might very well be the Trustees meeting so long as we are getting the same information as the Trustees, so that the flow of questions come back so it's not being discussed here in a different way then it's discussed there, or be discussed here and not be discussed there.

This is a presentation. There are good questions being asked on this presentation. To the extent that we need to take any action about that I am hoping that when the presentation is made to the Trustees that the Trustees will direct our attention specifically to the problems that have been raised in your meeting and that we can discuss things.

Mr. Neal: I just want to be clear Trustee Garvey we are here to address your concern. The staff is working as quickly as possible. You do recall that the Jefferson Yard put us at a halt for a while. Working as quickly as possible, working towards a school's fast opening. Disregarding the Board's directive is not something that we do, so I don't want you to leave with that impression. Understanding that we may not be able to get there and I think to the dialogue that we just had the questions are different because the scope of what an individual Trustee might ask us about is different then what is occurring here.

More discussion continued.

Mr. Cumbers: These are the phased replacement schools. Boulder City High School is wrapping up. Twin Lakes has been demolished except for the admin offices and multi-purpose room. So it's in construction. Sandy Valley we are in design for the elementary school. Southeast Career and Technical Academy there are changes in regard to scheduling.

Mr. Halsey: Blake on that last slide on the Sandy Valley project was there any plans to build a high school there? I thought there was a phase 3.

Mr. Cumbers: That is phase 3. It has not been funded, has not been voted on by the Board of School Trustees.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.08 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES. (cont.)
Mr. Halsey: That's something I'm going to look at for an agenda item.

More discussion continued.

- 3.09 DISCUSSION OF OVERALL STUDENT SAFETY AND BUILDING ENHANCEMENTS.
Mr. Cumbers: We put this item on the agenda for discussion at the request of Mr. Kubat. There's no presentation associated with it. I think there's a conference coming up that's going to take place I believe next week that I may attend. It's about measures that could be implemented to affect student safety in schools.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Kubat: I did read the report. I did note that there were some recommendations on building improvements specifically for single point of entry and the idea of a secured vestibule. So I think that's a start. I don't know how we might recommend that other aspects of this report be incorporated in our process but it does sound like those are two good places to begin. Certainly the subject is broader than just a building or just an entrance. From our point of view in terms of building design and construction funds that's at least a point that we could begin at.

Mr. Cumbers: We've had numerous requests from our schools to implement some site funded projects that they've requested and we've administered those projects for that very purpose, installing a gate. In fact one came up last week at Monaco and Mr. Neal went out and looked at Monaco just to lay his eyes on the site and where that gate may be installed and he noticed that not far from the main entrance there was a door on the exterior of the school propped open with a piece of wood and nobody there watching it. Security measures are only as good as the people that are implementing it. If there is a total disregard for access to the schools a gate at the front of the school is not going to help it. Not that it isn't a good idea to have a single point of entry. To date we have not had specific direction for any specific design element that we need to include in each and every school. I think there will be some direction coming forward at some point.

Mr. Neal: I did read the report and for a body like this just like when talking to the Board, one of the things I discussed with the people with this group as well as others is that when we start talking about across an entire enterprise or across something as large as the Clark County School District (CCSD) one of the things is to understand which threats we are trying to mitigate, where we are willing to accept risk. I know that's an uncomfortable conversation especially when we are talking about children. There are some realities of risk that we're accepting right now. The key is to make sure you understand what risk you are accepting. So how our schools are set up, what threats actually exist in the valley and our vulnerabilities to them because these schools are all different. Some of them have a controlled vestibule at the front of the school already exists we just have to do something else where some don't have anything at all depending on when that school was built. The key for you and for the BOST is to be able to make those decisions because we're still resource restrained, make the decision to move the needle as much as we possibly can on safety and be able to articulate that to your constituents. So that's why I'm recommending a vulnerability assessment and there's going to have to be some funding that goes along with that for something this big but at the end of that what you don't end up with are a bunch of projects where some schools get some, some don't. And you don't end up any farther down the road on safety. A lot of things we can do to change and increase the safety might actually be procedural. I don't want us to

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.09 DISCUSSION OF OVERALL STUDENT SAFETY AND BUILDING ENHANCEMENTS. (cont.)
fall into the trap of thinking that we need to build fortresses. And based on some of the things that were in that report might not even help because the report clearly stated that the majority of the instances and it was focused on one type of event, active shooters. The threat was already inside the school. I think we need to take a deliberate approach to measuring out what we are actually trying to mitigate and make sure what we are doing is doing just that.

Ms. Lavelle: I just have a comment about this in terms of where this goes on what this committee's role is and I think it's a discussion that will obviously impact our function in overseeing costs but its' primarily directed by Trustees. I guess it goes both directions but who's taking the laboring war on this at this point? I'm assuming it's the Trustees.

Trustee Garvey: Right now the governor's office has been driving the conversation with input from the different districts. Almost everything has a fiscal impact. It hasn't come yet as any mandates to us. I think when it gets to that point definitely a piece of the process should be okay now the Trustees would like input on these recommendations from the BOC as to do you think these are fiscally sound decisions to make as a district in all of our schools. Does it have equity for all of our schools? You look at the situation we may find ourselves in Henderson where existing schools that go over the capacity of what that ordinance is going to be put in place have portables on them. If we move those children out of portables we might have to move them completely somewhere else. But do we keep them in a portable that's easily shot through, kicked through, whatever.

Ms. Lavelle: So the process is being taken up by the governor's office. Presumably the Trustees are taking a proactive approach as is staff to come up with their own comments and recommendations.

Trustee Garvey: From the guidance coming up with our own recommendations and plan I would voice a need for this committee to have those pieces that are capital improvements or design.

Some discussion continued.

- 3.10 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.

Ms. Lavelle: Anything to be removed from Motions and Taskings?

Mr. Kubat: Since you held it over for me I think that I would like to modify this as opposed to taking it off or is that not appropriate?

Ms. Lavelle: It can be modified, sure.

Mr. Kubat: While we have had a beginning discussion of building safety enhancements and so on I think we should modify that to say we'd like to revisit this issue when there's an overall threat assessment available.

Motion to modify this and come back to it after we have a threat assessment.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Halsey

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Lavelle: Anything to be added?

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.10 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. (cont.)

Mr. Kubat: One discussion had to do with the timing and meeting deadlines and so on for various programs but I think the second one was this larger evaluation of the value of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build. I don't know that there's a specific time that we can request on that I think it's a continuing item of interest to this committee to be able to recommend something to the BOST.

Ms. Lavelle: So are you adding to the Motions and Taskings, are you asking for a report then on this value. Well it might be two different things. It might be one item of continuing review of the timing of completion delays, incompleteness is that the part we are talking about as distinct from an evaluation or a discussion or a presentation of the pros and cons of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build.

Mr. Halsey: We had a specific request from a Trustee to at least look at the question of the deadlines on projects.

Ms. Lavelle: So let's put that as a Motions and Taskings to get a presentation on that. And then we can decide if we want to keep that as a regular item.

Ms. Charlton: Do we want to expand that conversation to much more than just scheduling. I think Jeff Wagner mentioned it's more of a quality, it's a much broader conversation especially in this environment that we're heading into which is a very strange construction process.

Ms. Lavelle: I agree. It needs to be two different items. So that they are both on there.

Mr. Kubat: What we're saying is let's have a session where you could come back to us about scheduling and deadlines and how that's been accommodated and so on. The second topic is the value of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build and that includes some scheduling issues and quality issues, and so on but that's a more comprehensive look at it. I don't think we can assign a time for that but it's a continuing concern.

Ms. Lavelle: Let's do the Motions and Taskings first. The presentation on pros and cons of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build, value that you perceive in one process vs. the other. That's a presentation that will include in respect to these particular items that you have looked at, schools that we've looked at, how scheduling was affected as well as other things.

Motion: Presentation on pros and cons of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build

Motion: Halsey

Second: Lavelle

Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Garvey: Please make it an action item so that you can give a recommendation.

Ms. Lavelle: It will be on Motions and Taskings as a presentation and action item.

Ms. Charlton: Are we just looking at the ones that have been displayed or are you also looking forward? I'm assuming that the District obviously realizes the constraints that we are heading into with this construction environment. I don't know if you're just looking backward or if you're looking forward as well?

Mr. Cumbers: The essence of the presentation is how do we make a decision to use one over the other and the reality is that we discuss that all the time. What's an appropriate project to use this method of delivery for and we have several under consideration right now that we could bring

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.10 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. (cont.)
forward as examples so that you would have a better perspective of what we're thinking about every day. This would kind of be a repeat of a presentation that we've done previously on CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build.

Ms. Lavelle: I'm assuming that what you've done already is going to be in general. It's not going to be the exclusive basis of the discussion but certainly you have some hard data from this analysis that will be incorporated in the larger discussion of value generally, CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build.

Mr. Cumbers: As well as some specific examples of projects that are forthcoming where one method of delivery might be more applicable or appropriate than the other.

Motion: Presentation on pros and cons of CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build to including value, quality satisfaction, delivery and cost controls.

Motion: Halsey

Second: Lavelle

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Lavelle: Separately, because I don't want to let this go, we have the question of schedule slippage, delays in the construction projects and consequent costs that was raised in the comment section. Mr. Kubat is that going to be as a Motions and Taskings or do you want that as an agenda item?

Mr. Kubat: Well I don't know again if it's something that we can establish that we can put on the next agenda. I think it's a Motions and Taskings as this is information that's been requested. It's relevant to what we do so I would request that staff come back with that.

Ms. Charlton: And the corresponding fiscal impact back to the District and challenges that presents for them in scheduling slippage.

Ms. Lavelle: And to me that's an action item, as well maybe?

Mr. Kubat: Well it's a Motions and Taskings request of staff. I so move that we put that on our Motions and Taskings list.

Motion: To place on the motions and tasking list a report/presentation regarding the delay in construction delivery, to include fiscal impact back to the District and challenges.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Halsey

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Kubat: I move that we invite Henderson to discuss their ordinance.

Motion: Invite City of Henderson to BOC meeting to discuss their ordinance.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Jacobs

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Charlton: I would like to abstain because I asked for a report from staff, first, before that happened. I don't feel like I have enough information on the background.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.11 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Mr. Jacobs: I'd like an agenda item to discuss and possible action on the recommendation to complete Phase 3 of the Sandy Valley School upgrades.

Motion: Discuss and possible action on the recommendation to complete Phase 3 of the Sandy Valley School upgrades.

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Halsey

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Lavelle: I'm going to propose on the next agenda that we discuss the vote of Henderson City Council and whether or not it approved this ordinance with a copy of the ordinance if it's passed to be provided as part of the agenda packet so that we can discuss whatever they did. When is the Trustees meeting? Is it the third? So you'll be discussing this before the vote or after the vote?

Ms. Garvey: I don't know, it's not on the agenda now.

Mr. Kubat: At the same time as you call for that agenda item and the ordinance and so on. I would like to have some review of what the staff communicated to the City of Henderson about the impacts.

Mr. Cumbers: It was a very brief response indicating that the standard that we have for new schools in terms of the number of students is for Clark County, not for a specific municipality.

Mr. Kubat: Not the past response but any upcoming response.

Mr. Cumbers: We defer that to the Board for their action.

Ms. Lavelle: I guess what you're saying is that any information between today that is communicated between the school district and whoever it might be and the City of Henderson and whoever that might be would also be provided to us excluding presumably anything that is protected by attorney-client privilege.

Trustee Garvey: The board could have possible opportunity for discussion at our work session which is that first Wednesday in September.

Mr. Reynolds: I assume your government relations people are working on this as well. They've come and presented to us previously I would like if that could be presented to us that would be great. I would request that government relations are be placed as an agenda item.

Motion: Discussion with the City of Henderson, Clark County School District's Facilities Division and Community and Government Relations Departments pertaining to the City of Henderson's Ordinance.

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Halsey

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Charlton: I would like to abstain until I get a report.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

4.01 COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATION.

Mr. Cumbers: I have just one item that I wanted to mention. The Trustee touched on it earlier and that was the passage of a gender diverse policy for the school district then there was a mention of how much it might cost to modify facilities for gender diverse students and I might note that in the policy the school district passed requires no specific modification to any of our buildings as related to gender diversity. There wasn't the changing of signs on restrooms or anything like that or the addition of any specific type of facilities to accommodate gender diverse so the policy makes no reference to any physical change to the facilities.

5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None

6.0 ADJOURN.

Motion: Motion to adjourn meeting?

Motion: Halsey

Second: Lazaroff

Vote Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 2:07.