

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 21, 2015

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bowler, Richard	Philpott, Steve
Davis, Al	Reynolds, Jacob
Kubat, Charles	Tate, Cameron
Lavelle, Eleissa	
Lazaroff, Gene	
Lopez, George	

Members Absent

Bruins, David
Earl, Debbie
Haldeman, Joyce
Halsey, Jim
Hawkins, Frank

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.

Steve Philpott, Second Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

1.03 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt and accept the May 21, 2015, agenda.

Motion: Davis

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Ms. Sandy Miller spoke on the older schools that are in disrepair and requested the members consider a percentage of the budget go towards repairs for these older schools going forward. She also commented on the inequities in the District. She also spoke about Las Vegas Academy and its needs regarding insulation and drainage problems.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

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

Motion: Kubat

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

3.02 LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.

Mr. McIntosh stated Ms. Haldeman was at the Legislative Session in Carson City and did not have anything to provide.

3.03 REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

None.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Executive Summary Level – Projects in Progress Status Reports. Ms. Alston provided information regarding requests she received from the BOC members to make changes to the 1998 Capital Improvement Program Reports from the previous BOC meeting presentation. These changes included the requested information on concerns and issues on timelines, cost overruns, and a comment line for explanations. She stated she will provide the full program reports at a future date.

Mr. Kubat questioned why some of the projects are behind schedule and if there is an explanation why this is occurring. Mr. Cumbers responded that there are a large number of projects in the queue and that these particular ones are the last ones being worked on. He suggested he could provide more accurate information at the next meeting. Ms. Alston reported that the second group of schools has either a scope-of-work and/or budget issues.

Mr. Kubat mentioned some of the schools have issues regarding the cooling towers and air handling units relative to summer temperatures and if these particular schools are going on a year-round schedule, then it would be helpful to know which schools are going to be addressed first and for staff to know how to address moving forward with these types of school issues and suggested to move more quickly than anticipated if it affects the ability of the school to handle the load for the summer months. Mr. Cumbers commented that this doesn't appear to be the case for the 2015-2016 school year.

Executive Summary Report. Mr. Reynolds asked Ms. Alston if members have questions or concerns about any particular school(s), if she is the contact person. Ms. Alston responded she is the contact person and her phone number is on the e-mail she sends to all the BOC members that includes all the reports for the BOC meeting.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. (continued)

Ms. Lavelle stated her concern regarding schools with scope or delay issues that may trigger a claim of some kind that may exceed the actual anticipated cost of what a scope change should be and asked Ms. Alston if there is some way to track those as well.

Full Report of Projects In Progress (Budget Impact Increase or Decrease column).

Ms. Alston referred to the “Unassigned Funds for Emergency Capital Needs” that were approved funds for emergency needs. Both balances for the CIP Revision 18 and the 2-year contingency plan show the balances for each of these funds including the potential impacts.

Mr. Lazaroff asked if there is an update on the Refund Agreements. Ms. Alston responded there have not been any new reports since the last one that was provided but would be able to provide Mr. Lazaroff with another report. Mr. Lazaroff requested a new one be provided.

3.05 PROTOTYPE AND SITE SELECTION.

Mr. Cumbers presented two slide presentations on the, “2015 Capital Improvement Plan” focusing on the following:

- *New School Site and Prototype Selections*
 - CCSD Capital Projects Presented to the Nevada 78th Legislature
 - Twelve New and Two Replacement School Sites Presented to the Nevada 78th Legislature
 - Site Selections for 12 new schools, four replacement schools, and 43 school additions
 - Process for Recommending New Schools, Replacement Schools, and School Additions
 - Prototype Selections- How were the prototypes selected for the first six new schools?
 - Three Prototypes: (Analyzed by McKinstry)
 - Duncan ES Design by SH Architecture
Site Locations: Arville & Mesa Verde, Maule & Grand Canyon
 - Stuckey ES Design by DCC Architecture
Site Locations: Chartan & Pioneer, Lamb & Kell
 - Wallin ES Design by Pugsley Simpson Coulter Architecture
Site Locations: Antelope Ridge and Galleria & Dave Wood
 - Two Replacement Schools – Custom Design by Tate Snyder Kimsey Architecture
 - Rex Bell ES
 - Lincoln ES

3.05 PROTOTYPE AND SITE SELECTION. (continued)

There was major discussion and questions regarding the prototype schools and the site selections.

Mr. Kubat mentioned that Mr. Philpott had asked in past meetings if future schools can be standardized with same components such as HVAC systems, cooling towers, etc. because over time it would be a great advantage to the school district in terms of ordering and stock piling parts etc. Mr. Cumbers responded that they will not be the same for the 12 new and two replacement schools, but is being considered in the future and hoping to address in working with the Maintenance Department. to improve the future schools. Mr. Davis mentioned that he is not in agreement to standardize because it creates a monopoly concept for contractors/manufacturers.

Mr. Kubat commented that Tate Snyder Kimsey Architects is designing the replacement schools and stated that we're ready to revisit the architecture/engineer selection process and that maybe more firms can be included as we move forward. Mr. Cumbers responded a new Request For Qualifications (RFQ) process is in development for new architects/engineers to submit their qualifications.

Mr. Lazaroff asked if Maule/Grand Canyon (Howard Hughes) and Beltrada/Via Italia (Inspirada Builders) are the only two sites that have issues with acquiring land. Mr. Cumbers responded that was correct. Only Maule/Grand Canyon will have a cost to the District. Mr. Lazaroff also asked if there is a written procedure on describing how we arrive at Refund Agreements and if so, are there changes from the previous procedures. He commented that the developers are not sharing the cost with the District in terms of building homes and are using other people's money (OPM). Mr. Cumbers said he has researched it and found examples of some agreements and if requested he could provide information at a future meeting. He said he will seek out Mr. Lazaroff's help to see if we can negotiate terms that are more favorable to the District on future Refund Agreements. But in terms of changes, Mr. Cumbers replied the Utility companies draft the agreements.

Mr. Philpott commented on the concerns of this committee on past mistakes on issues such as costs, design, leases and easements and stated that we need to be more proactive and make sure to address all of these issues in a timely manner to avoid future mistakes.

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

Mr. Cumbers presented a second slide presentation and provided hard copies to everyone on the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan focusing on the following:

- *Guiding Principles*
 - Initial Phase of the 2015 Capital Improvement Planning Process
 - Many Revisions to Follow (Annual Updates)
 - Presentations to BOC and BOST throughout 2014
 - 2015 Situation Assessment – History of Enrollment

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. (continued)

- ES Capacity vs. Enrollment
- Elementary Classrooms Required
- Portable Classrooms
- Year-Round Elementary Schools
- CCSD 1998 CIP Spending by Fiscal Year
- Senate Bills 119 and 207
- 2015 – 2025 Capital Improvement Plan: Major Challenges / Issues

There was major discussion and questions regarding the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan’s “Guiding Principles.”

Mr. Kubat commented that it is important that in the evaluation of each of these sites to make sure that there’s room for classroom additions. He also commented that people in the community are very concerned in terms of equity regarding replacement of schools, so he hopes these schools are clearly identified early on in the process – how many and where these schools will be placed.

Mr. Davis commented that the 1998 Bond went outside the city and the inter-city schools were left behind. He stated that lower income families and those kids should not be treated any different than anybody else and that “Equity” is the number one issue in this bond and hopes this will be taken into consideration moving forward.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he would like to see more information on the status of the inter-city schools as compared to the new schools being built in the suburbs.

Mr. Davis stated that site visits are very important to this committee and he feels that it needs to be done quarterly. He suggested visiting a new school, an inter-city school, and/or an older school. He also stated that understanding the facility condition index of these schools and the process is hugely important to this entire process and for everybody on this board to understand it and how it varies with discussed improvements. Mr. Reynolds was in total agreement and stated he would like to be more involved and would like to know what constitutes an improvement and how much it changes the school’s position on the “Needs List.”

Mr. Cumbers responded that there is an effort going on regarding assessments of schools and improvement of the whole system, including training and inspecting of the schools and turned the floor over to Ms. Alston to explain in more detail about assessments.

Ms. Alston reminded the members about the Hazard Impact Study Report (HIP) Committee that had been created. In the report, there were suggestions for District staff on how to improve our assessment methods and the frequency of those assessments. Ms. Alston stated that since then, we have now made these changes and are in the process of beginning that process and is happening right now. The data will be updated and will be coming forward to the BOC members with the list of these changes on equity and replacements.

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

Trustee Garvey discussed Assembly Bill 394 (AB 394) "Break Up of The District" bill or deconsolidation, which may lower our bonding rate if it actually happens. Secondly, she stated that on AB 394, as the Board of School Trustees go forward with the 12 initial sites and that there was a caveat to that, and if AB394 passes, the Board has the right to rescind their vote on those schools because there will be a lot of legal implications as to the break-up of the District – who is responsible for paying off and monitoring those bonds and are we going to be reimbursed for any of the buildings taken over by other entities. As far as the Achievement District, she questioned what would happen if they will be taking over schools within our District that will be turned over to Charter Management Organization and they can demand capital improvements to be paid from that Bond. As of right now, there is going to be a study done for AB 394, but no matter the outcome, the legislators are breaking up the District anyway. Trustee Garvey continued stating this committee needs to be a big part of the process moving forward with this new Capital Program since there was no public input and the BOC needs to be representing the community which is a vital part of the process.

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

Meeting Construction Schedule Deadlines, 4/17/14. Mr. Philpott commented his question had been answered. The CCTV is actually more of a security feature closed circuit cameras inside the buildings and doesn't get information into the classrooms. Mr. Davis made a motion to remove this item from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Davis Second: Lazaroff Vote: Unanimous

Funding of Future Land Acquisitions/Off-Site Improvements. Mr. Lazaroff stated this item was removed from the list and he would like it to be placed back on the list.

Criteria for Educational and Functional Requirements. Mr. Lazaroff provided clarification for this item and stated this was requested and made within the same month as he proposed it and made a three-page document on it. Mr. Cumbers stated he would research it.

Evaluation of the Four Prototypes. Mr. Kubat stated this information has been provided to him and made a motion to remove this item but with a caveat that the prototypes have the ability to be expanded or to accommodate these programs for changes and would like information brought back to the committee with ideas on how accommodating they are with these changes.

Motion: Kubat Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous

3.08 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.
(continued)

Organizational Structure. Mr. Lazaroff commented that there have been so many changes that this is a dead issue right now. Mr. Davis made a motion to remove this item from the list.

Mr. Reynolds commented on school site visits and stated he would like to see a school that is not on the high needs list because its rankings have dropped due to minor improvements. Mr. Blake Cumbers stated he would take care of this.

Ms. Lavelle commented that she recalls having meetings at the school site and she agreed it was helpful because they were in the environment.

Motion: Davis Second: Reynolds Vote: Unanimous

Past Performances of the Construction Manager-at-Risk Contracting Method.
Mr. Davis made a motion to remove this item from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Davis Second: Reynolds Vote: Unanimous

3.09 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Ms. Lavelle asked if there was a way the long list of Motions and Taskings could be put on an agenda so they can be taken care of. Mr. Philpott agreed and requested that staff be advised that within the next six months as soon as the legislative session is over, they be prepared to meet and discuss cutting the Motions and Taskings in half and also be prepared to give the BOC dates.

Mr. Kubat mentioned the concept of the BOC aiding the Trustees in defining what a responsible bidder is as discussed before in a previous meeting and would like to know how to best move forward with this. Trustee Edwards responded that we need to know what the guidelines that exist are and what is legally possible. She stated that this is definitely something the Board has expressed – that they want to make sure that Nevada Families are employed first, that we try to keep our resources circulating within our own community, and that we have quality and safe schools. Mr. Kubat stated he would like advice from his fellow members or from the Trustees in determining what would be the most expeditious and useful way to proceed. Trustee Garvey responded that is something the Board is going to ask when the 10-Year Capital Plan goes before the Board because it does need to be in place before we start entering into contracts. She did agree there needs to be some action on this.

Ms. Lavelle made a motion for items on the May 21, 2015, Motions and Taskings, page 1 of 5, second block, under RFPs and Contracts, be addressed at the next meeting and be reshaped in such a way that various issues are covered. Mr. Cumbers commented that he sent a memo to Mr. McIntosh on what exactly was done in response to the new law.

3.09 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS. (continued)

The prevailing wage language was removed from the advertisements that we do. He stated there is no project number from the labor commissioner in the advertisements. He said there's no mention of the prevailing wage related to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) in our agreements. Mr. Cumbers stated that as a courtesy, previously, CCSD attached the NRSs that were related to prevailing wage and the reporting requirements and said that is no longer done.

Motion: Lavelle

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Speaker: Sandy Miller spoke on her concerns regarding the need for schools in certain areas, school security in schools, and classroom sizes. She commented that North Las Vegas does not have a Career and Technical Academy school. She stated her concern on the lack of school security and how it affects the children's safety. She stated she is very concerned about the classroom sizes and how it affects children's educational needs. Ms. Miller also commented on home developers and stated that the school district needs to make them more responsible in the community's growth and needs.

5. ADJOURN: 1:25 p.m.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous