

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SOUTHEAST CAREER AND TECHNICAL ACADEMY
5710 MOUNTAIN VISTA STREET, LAS VEGAS, NV 89120

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 2016

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bowler, Richard	Lopez, George
Earl, Debbie	Philpott, Steve
Halsey, Jim	Reynolds, Jacob
Kubat, Charles	Tate, Cameron
Lazaroff, Gene	White, Eva

Members Absent

Bruins, David
Davis, Al
Lavelle, Lisa
Munford, Harvey

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 11:42 a.m. He introduced Kerry Pope, Principal and Ryan Cordia, Assistant Principal from Southeast Career and Technical Academy (SECTA).

1.03 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt and accept the January 21, 2016, agenda.

Motion: Lazaroff

Second: Philpott

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Nick Montoya, 1st Speaker – Mr. Montoya introduced himself as City Administrator for the City of Mesquite, Nevada. He stated that he was addressing the tasking from Mr. Reynolds from a previous meeting regarding what the City of Mesquite is doing to assist with the cost for a new gymnasium – Mr. Montoya stated that the City of Mesquite is waving all fees – plans, inspections, and any other fees associated with the City of Mesquite. Mr. Montoya stated that the Power District will be paying for a new transformer and the labor to install it as they did at the Moapa Valley High School. He said that the Virgin Valley Water District does not have adequate information from the CCSD to commit at this time but are very supportive for a new gymnasium.

Jaydel Wilson, Assistant Principal, Virgin Valley HS, 2nd Speaker – Mr. Wilson addressed several issues such as:

- Majority of students participating in sport activities having to share one gym for daily practices and the safety and equity issues because of it;

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. (continued)

- Bleachers are too close to the court making it unsafe for students, staff, and the community;
- The CCSD please address the needs of the people of Mesquite.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for the November 19, 2015, agenda.

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Tate

Vote: Unanimous

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Kubat reported he met with Mr. Cumbers and Mr. Wagner and discussed the architect/engineer selection process.

3.03 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. None.

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

Trustee Young reported she is on the Technical Advisory Committee for AB 394 and stated she and Superintendent Pat Skorkowsky from CCSD are on the committee and said that she has been at every meeting. Trustee Young stated she would have Cindy from the Board Office send Blake and Grace the website link for meeting dates and agendas and so they can receive all of the backup information and what the committees are being tasked to do. Mr. Cumbers stated that he would forward the website information to all the BOC members.

Trustee Young continued with a quick update on the committee's plans:

There is a meeting on January 27 & 29, at the Grant Sawyer Building, at 8:00 a.m. She stated that the task force is broken up into entities, and her area is District C. She said a compiled survey form was distributed and completed asking people everywhere what their thoughts are, how much they know, and what they think about the break-up of the District. After this, Trustee Young said the committee would have a report by various entities. She concluded by stating that the focus is on the students.

Trustee Young commented on AB 394: She stated that it has been her experience (from Dayton, Ohio) that breaking-up a District has resulted in funding for public schools being taken away and given to various other entities in the surrounding cities and charter schools, and has created certain groups of students clustered in an inter-city environment.

Trustee Young's final comment was that the District had reached a settlement on a new teacher's contract.

3.05 2015 ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SELECTION LISTS.

Mr. Jeff Wagner, Director, Construction Management, introduced himself to the committee stating that for many years he has been an architect for private practice as well as tenured professor at CSN and stated he has a great passion for education and architecture.

Mr. Wagner presented the committee with a presentation on the 2015 Architect Selection Process and explained it as follows:

Request For Qualification (RFQ)

- Released September 28, 2015
- Advertised in the Las Vegas Review Journal on September 30, 2015
- CCSD reached out to all firms listed on the AIA Las Vegas website with educational design experience via e-mail
- CCSD reached out to all firms currently doing work with CCSD

RFQ Response

- 25 firms physically picked up the RFQ from CCSD
- 19 firms submitted RFQ packages to CCSD for review
- 18 packages were found to be responsive and in compliance with CCSD Regulation 7211

RFQ Review

- A team of 4 CCSD employees was convened to review the RFQ packages
- Each reviewer independently reviewed each proposal based on the following criteria:
- Proposed Team 20pts
- Proposed Organizational Chart 10pts
- Resumes of Key Personnel 30pts
- Review of 5 submitted Clark County projects 10pts
- Review of example projects submitted 20pts
- Job experience and role of Key Personnel 10pts
- Total 100pts

RFQ Review

Firms were categorized based on capacity to accomplish work as demonstrated by annual value of work.

- Category I Up to \$150,000,000 in construction value
- Category II Up to \$75,000,000 in construction value
- Category III Up to \$40,000,000 in construction value

Category I Up to \$150,000,000.00

Firm	Individual Reviews				Total	Average
PSCA	89	87	89	100	365	91.25
Gensler	92	85	90	78	345	86.25
TSKA	77	84	87	76	324	81
PGAL	67	59	69	100	295	73.75
KGA	67	61	62	80	270	67.5

Category II Up to \$75,000,000.00

Ethos 3	77	81	79	100	337	84.25
SH	69	87	93	80	329	82.25
CSD	65	82	88	80	315	78.75

3.05 2015 ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SELECTION LISTS. (continued)

LGA	75	55	57	98	285	71.25
Lee & Sakahara	56	69	71	80	276	69
ATA	61	33	36	98	228	57
<i>Category III Up to \$40,000,000.00</i>						
GMRA	58	63	70	98	289	72.25
APTUS	72	57	58	100	287	71.75
NAA	55	64	66	95	280	70
Assemblage	74	44	46	76	240	60
GGW	59	37	40	80	216	54
YBA	50	21	24	70	165	41.25
RBA	48	25	30	52	155	38.75

Selection of Firms for Projects

- Following the review and compilation of the list, a brief design charrette was conducted to select architectural firms for the 14-room elementary school classroom additions and the 22-room elementary school classrooms.
- Four firms not currently engaged in work with CCSD were selected to submit preliminary design concepts for review. (Two firms for each scope-of-work)
- Ethos Three and PGAL were selected to engage in a design charrette for the 14-room additions.
- Gensler and Carpenter Sellers Del Gatto were selected to engage in a design charrette for the 22-room additions.
- Each firm was given a \$5,000.00 stipend for their submission.

14 Room Additions

- A panel of 3 CCSD employees reviewed the submissions for the 14-room additions. Ethos Three's submission was selected, and the intent is to engage Ethos Three for this scope-of-work pending the Board of School Trustees' approval.

22 Room Additions

- A panel of 3 CCSD employees reviewed the submissions for the 22-room additions. Gensler's submission was selected, and the intent is to engage Gensler for this scope-of-work pending the Board of School Trustees' approval.

Questions

Mr. Philpott asked how many elementary school additions are we working on. Ms. Alston responded that Option B that was approved by the Board, there were 54 approved additions and in Revision 1, 18 sites will be selected. Mr. Philpott asked how many will be 14 classrooms and how many will be 22 classrooms. Ms. Alston responded that this information has not been determined.

Mr. Philpott asked if the new elementary schools will be built to meet or exceed the energy savings and if the architectural contracts will include using the standard or "best practice" in building our new prototypes and not like the previous prototypes in the 1998 Bond Program which had serious issues. Mr. Wagner responded with a yes and that the contracts have not been issued yet. Mr. Cumbers also responded that these new schools have been improved tremendously with HVAC, lighting, and with 2012 building codes. Mr. Philpott made it clear that he hopes that these new buildings in this new funding program need to be energy efficient with NEMA motor standards.

3.05 2015 ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SELECTION LISTS. (continued)

Mr. Kubat commented that he is very pleased with the CCSD – that it has a new list of architectural firms that qualified on the RFQ that are on the architect list. He stated he hopes this is a broader process that will let the entire architect community with experience and qualifications participate. He continued by stating that as this program is developing for these new prototypes including the school additions, that the opportunity is given to other firms on a continuing basis. Mr. Kubat also wanted this committee to know that on the previous meeting with Mr. Cumbers and Mr. Wagner, it was clarified that all the selected firms have an active office in the State of Nevada.

Mr. Lazaroff asked if commissioning is incorporated for our school projects. Mr. Wagner responded that all projects are commissioned either by in-house staff or a hired third party.

There was more discussion including:

- Life cycle costs, budgets, and maintenance costs in the design process.
- Value-engineering on eight elementary schools that are moving forward, and the value of the process and some of the assumptions that were made based on anecdotal evidence that weren't correct, but some evidence was correct, and currently working with schools' budgets that were set initially and that they stay within those budgets.
- Architects are not assigned on a round-robin basis.

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, FACILITIES DEPARTMENT START-UP STAFFING.

Mr. Cumbers started out with his 13-page slide presentation to give the committee an overview of the needs for the 2015 CIP Human Resources Requirements and Office Space Expansion. He stated that Senate Bills 119 and 207 were approved with the 2015 CIP program and with all the projects getting underway, the Facilities Division has to start-up staffing as he indicated in his following presentation:

Why We're Here

- A request to authorize adding 22 employees to the Facilities Department to support the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan, and;
- A request to authorize funding to create new office space for the present, new, and future Facilities Department employees at a cost of \$5,555,690.
- The new Facilities Department employees requested will be funded by the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan and there will be no impact on the General Budget.
- Funding for the new office space requested will come from the Governmental Services Tax Fund and will have no impact on the General Budget.

Human Resources Requirements and Office Space Expansion

- CCSD Facilities Division staffing has been in a "ramp-down" mode since 2009.
- At the highest level of staffing during the 1998 Capital Improvement Plan, there were over 400 full-time positions funded.
- Current office space is not sufficient to support the number of staff and projects coming on-line as well as the consolidation of the Facilities Division functions with the Maintenance and Operation functions.
- Proposed office space will accommodate up to 125 full-time positions and allow the Facilities Division to expand should there be a need.

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, FACILITIES DEPARTMENT START-UP STAFFING.
(continued)

Start-up Plan, 2015 Capital Improvement Staffing

<u>Department</u>	<u>Current Staff</u>	<u>Start-up Staff</u>	<u>Total Staff</u>
Facilities Division	21	12	33
Building Dept.	14	6	20
Real Property	5	2	7
Facilities & Bond Fund	5	2	7
Total Start-up Plan Only	45	22	67
Demographics, Zoning, & Gis			
TOTAL STAFF	57	22	79

*Start-up FTEs will be using existing job descriptions—previously ramped-down from 2009-2014. No new job descriptions/classifications are requested.

Current Office Space (map)

Current Office Space

- 16,500 square feet on two levels in one building
- Departments
 - Facilities Division
 - Facilities and Bond Fund Financial Management
 - Construction Management
 - Contracts, Procurement, and Compliance
 - Real Property Management
 - Building Department (Inspections)
 - Demographics, Zoning, and GIS
- 57 Employees
- All work space is utilized

Facilities Service Center Building (map)

Current Usage of Facilities Service Center Space (map)

Proposed Parking Improvements to Facilities Service Center (map)

Proposed Tenant Proposed Parking Improvements – Facilities Service Center (map)

Proposed Tenant Improvements – Facilities Service Center (map, Work space for up to 125 employees)

Tenant Improvements to Facilities Service Center – Summary of Estimated Expenses

<u>Item</u>	<u>Expense</u>
Design Fees	435,200
Construction Expense	4,470,490
Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment	650,000
TOTAL	\$5,555,690*

*To be funded from the Governmental Services Tax Fund

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, FACILITIES DEPARTMENT START-UP STAFFING.
(continued)

Next Steps

- Additions to the Facilities Division staff and supporting departments' staff as necessary to administer the 2015 Capital Improvement Program start-up projects, to be funded by the 2015 Capital Improvement Program.
- Relocation of the Facilities Division staff and supporting departments to the Facilities Service Center by constructing tenant improvements to provide space for additional staff with room for future expansion as needed, at an estimated cost of \$5.5 million, to be funded from the Governmental Services Tax Fund.

Questions

3.07 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RECREATIONAL AND PUBLIC PURPOSE LEASE
PROCESS.

Mr. Halsey introduced the two speakers from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Ms. Kasey Prestwich, and Ms. Dorothy Dickey.

Ms. Linda Perri started off by briefing the committee with some background on how the CCSD acquires property from the BLM and explained it has been done for a number of years. She stated that currently the District has acquired 1,700 acres from the BLM that have been developed with schools and/or facilities, and have approximately 800 acres under lease and patented, and an additional 300 acres pending leases for future school leases. Ms. Perri stated that it is an extensive process to acquire land from the BLM.

Ms. Dickey presented the BOC with a 43-page slide presentation and explained in summary the processes for applying for a lease based on the Recreation & Public Purposes Act (R&PP) for a public school or school facility lease applicable to Nevada regulations, rules, or steps, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The following are some of the slides used in the presentation:

- Recreation & Public Purposes Act (R&PP), [slides 1-5]
- Different District schools/properties on BLM land (slides 6-11)
- Application Process
- Joint Letter Submission & Sample Letter (slides 13 & 14)
- Lease Pre-Application
- Submit Application
- NEPA Process – Reviewing Specialists include: archaeologist, environmental, wildlife biologists, botanist, fire management, recreation, wild horse and burro, hydrologist, geologist, and/or other. (slides 18-24)
- Notify rights-of-way holders
- Inspect property
- Send legal description review
- Prepare NORA (Notice of Realty Action) [slides 28 & 29]
- Final ESA Inspection
- Prepare Offer Packet (slides 31 & 32)
- Once the Documents are Signed, The Lease is Yours (slide 33)
- School sites (slides 34-38)

3.07 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RECREATIONAL AND PUBLIC PURPOSE LEASE PROCESS. (continued)

- After Lease Issuance
- Patenting
- Questions

Mr. Lazaroff asked (1) if the process is being streamlined, and also, (2) if the CCSD is being held to the five-year period deadline. Ms. Vanessa Heiss, BLM Manager, (1) responded that they are in the process of reinitiating a new NEPA and reanalyzing the boundary and once completed, it will streamline the depth of NEPA. The process is being looked at with a shorter version for streamlining to expedite the process. (2) Ms. Heiss stated that the District has not been held to the deadline, but has been allowed to stretch the limits and add fences around the property to keep the dust and garbage out. She stated at this time, the BLM is not going out to inspect the property that hasn't been developed. She continued to say that when the time comes up for renewal, they are questioning everyone why it has not been developed and why the land is being held up. However, she stated they have an extensive backlog of applications and have been directed to get those cleaned up.

Mr. Lazaroff asked if the District applies and is granted land, can another jurisdiction over-ride authority and be assigned to another entity. Ms. Heiss responded that if the School District has not developed the lease within five years and if another government agency has intent for that land, then yes, the lease can be terminated and be opened to another applicant.

Ms. White asked regarding the process to acquire land from the BLM, about how much time would it take if everything flows smoothly, to finalize a lease from start to finish. Ms. Dickey responded generally, it takes about two-three years depending on variables.

3.08 SCHOOL SITES WITHIN SKYE CANYON.

Ms. Linda Perri began her presentation by stating that this is a unique item that she is presenting today, and stated that she would like to continue bringing forward to this committee with future projects such as this major project with master development communities and work together with that community to establish school sites within that community. Her main interest was to find out from the BOC how many school sites should the District have within Skye Canyon, and also, the District wants to ensure that the school sites are in developmental condition to save on unnecessary costs to the District.

Ms. Perri provided the actual map that was approved from the City of Las Vegas under their developmental agreement on March 2, 2015 (the map not stamped "Draft"). This community has approximately 9,000 residential units and approximately 1,700 acres. It is located at U.S. 95 & Skye Canyon Parkway in the NW section of the Las Vegas Valley. The community is bisected by U.S. 95.

Ms. Perri stated that all schools, elementary, middle, and high schools are at capacity or over capacity. The development agreement approved by the City in April 2015, per the development agreement, the developer was to set aside three school sites – one high school and two elementary school sites. The site on the east side of US 95, the District negotiated with the

3.08 SCHOOL SITES WITHIN SKYE CANYON. (continued)

developer back and forth to determine whether it would be either an elementary school or middle school and the developer agreed to have the District make that determination.

Ms. Perri stated that currently the District is working with its own attorneys and the developer's attorneys for a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the school District and the developer and has been working with them for many months. The District is working on the terms to determine what the developer needs to provide to the District and what the District is willing to accept. In the agreement, the District wants the developer to construct the master utility improvements, the off-site improvements and stubbed to each school, and it could be within six months of conveyance of the site. Once the site is conveyed over to the District, the District would like to have those improvements directly to the school before actually building the school. Also, the MOA has to be approved by the Board of School Trustees (BOST). Ms. Perri said engineers are currently working on an exhibit to pick each topographical condition of each one of the three school sites.

The developer recently gave the District a proposal to amend the Land Use Plan – which is the “DRAFT” map agreement. It makes changes on the east side of the development and this proposal will add an active adult community within that area which removes the elementary/middle school option. The conversion is currently in discussion to determine whether or not it will impact whether the District needs to have that additional site within that community. Another additional proposal realigns Sheep Mountain Parkway which has an additional impact and is still in discussion with the City of Las Vegas.

Ms. Perri continued discussing the different factors within the Skye Canyon community with different changes to the plans. She stated that this was an informational item only – Mr. McIntosh wanted to keep this committee informed and involved and wanted this committee to convey their feedback so that when the MOA is presented to the BOST for approval, the information has already been shared and will have more transparency.

Mr. Reynolds asked what the logic is in not having a middle school in this area. Mr. Rick Baldwin, Demographics and Zoning Director, responded that there is already a fairly new middle school zoned in this area that is not at capacity, and that is Escobedo MS.

Mr. Kubat asked what the District is asking for from this committee at this time in regards to this item – whether it is comments, discussion, recommendation, positive or negative feedback – and Ms. Perri responded all of the above. She stated the big contention is whether we need one or two elementary schools and one high school, depending on what the yield calculations are at the end. Ms. Perri stated that the District would like to have three school sites – two elementary schools and one high school.

Mr. Philpott commented he highly objects to having an elementary school site next to the active adult area. He stated he would like a future elementary school site away from that community. He said that it sounds like this piece of property for the high school has issues with it. He asked if we had the same issues at the previous high school site, and if not, he stated we should have the developer reimburse the District to make it equal. Ms. Perri responded that both high school sites were challenging: (1) with grading and topography; (2) with Nevada Energy's power lines.

3.08 SCHOOL SITES WITHIN SKYE CANYON. (continued)

Mr. Halsey asked if Real Property and the District are satisfied with the locations of these sites that were suggested. Ms. Perri responded that the District is negotiating the best possible agreement in collaboration with different District departments such as Construction Management, Facilities and Bond Fund Financial Management, and Demographics and Zoning.

Mr. Lazaroff commented that he isn't in favor of what is being proposed for these sites and stated "it doesn't smell good."

Mr. Kubat commented he agrees that this high school site is not in the best interest of the District.

Ms. White commented that changes to the elementary schools mandated by the legislation require 21-24/1 ratio – that is 21-24 kids per 1 teacher requiring more rooms and more teachers. She stated that it is now mandatory to change Kindergarten from half-day to full-day Kindergarten. Ms. White stated that the active adult community will probably not want children crossing in their property and parents will not want their kids walking through that property either. She said these issues should be taken into consideration before any decisions are finalized.

Mr. Kubat suggested that the District consider purchasing additional land in the location that it feels it needs it, in some way in conjunction with the developer at a price that is way below market value with some equitable arrangement that would satisfy the District's needs where the kids are and give the developer some return on the land.

Mr. Lazaroff suggested going back to the drawing board and giving this project a second look and come up with an equitable solution that is mutually beneficial to both parties, to the kids, and to the community we serve.

3.09 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. None.

3.10 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Mr. Kubat stated he would like to have an update on the Hot Spots in a future agenda item.

Mr. Cumbers responded that it would be presented on the February 18, 2016, BOC meeting by Mr. Rick Baldwin. He also stated that he will have Ms. Alston present another presentation on the Facility Condition Index (FCI), because in March, this committee will be presented with projects that are in rank order in terms of FCI and will have information on the amount of money that is available to the District by cash flow. This committee will be informed on how limited funding is by period over the fiscal year(s), how much money and how many projects can be addressed on the needed renovations based upon their FCI.

4.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Ms. Thornley, parent, spoke again on getting a new gym for their Virgin Valley High School in Mesquite. She stated she had the documentation where Virgin Valley HS gym was approved on

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. (continued)

the 1998 Bond Fund list of potential projects “approved to be done.” She said it was never done. She stated it was also on the list of 12 projects that did not pass. Ms. Thornley stated the Trustees did not tell them that it was approved back in 1998.

Mr. McAllister, Assistant Principal, SECTA, would like this committee to consider recommending to the BOST to approve the additional buildings needed at SECTA to eliminate 60 portable classrooms.

5.0 ADJOURN: 2:34 p.m.

Motion: Lazaroff

Second: Earl

Vote: Unanimous