

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

FACILITIES WORK SESSION

Monday, January 29, 2007

1:07 p.m.

Roll Call:	<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Member Absent</u>
	Ruth Johnson, President	Larry Mason, Member
	Terri Janison, Vice President	
	Mary Beth Scow, Clerk	
	Shirley Barber, Member	
	Sheila R. Moulton, Member	
	Carolyn Edwards, Member	

Dr. Walt Rulffes, Superintendent of Schools

Also present were: Mary-Anne Miller, Board Counsel, District Attorney's Office; Paul Gerner, Associate Superintendent, Facilities Division; Frederick Smith, Director IV, Construction Management Department; Kathy Foster, Chief of Staff, Superintendent's Office; Charlene Green, Deputy Superintendent, Student Support Services Division; Kevin Kemner, Architect, Tate, Snyder, Kimsey Architects, Ltd.; Cindy Krohn, Executive Assistant, Board Office; Lisa Chrapcynski, Administrative Secretary II, Board Office; and Stephanie Gatlin, Transcriber/Recording Secretary, Board Office.

ADOPT AGENDA

Adopt agenda.

Motion: Scow Second: Edwards Vote: Unanimous

PUBLIC HEARINGS/RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

STATUS OF 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Presentation and discussion on the 1998 Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Smith gave a brief PowerPoint® presentation and update of the 1998 Capital Improvement Program, and some of the topics he discussed were: new school construction and completion status; replacement schools; phased replacement schools; additions, modernizations; the status of expenditure of funds; change orders; and problems and challenges.

Mrs. Moulton asked what percentage of the total rehab was the \$243.9 million that was remaining.

Mr. Gerner responded that the total rehab figure started at \$847 million, so the \$243.9 million would be about one-third of the apportionment for the ten-year period of the rehab fund.

STATUS OF 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (continued)

Mrs. Moulton asked whether the district would assign or pay off the programs by the time of the next bond with the one-third rehab money remaining.

Mr. Gerner responded that he was working on how to stretch out the available funds through 2010.

Mrs. Moulton expressed concern regarding building climate for subcontractors and whether there would be any improvement in that area.

Mr. Gerner stated that he expected the situation to get worse before it gets better.

APPROVE 2008 BOND PLANNING

Approval of the 2008 Bond Planning, as recommended in Reference B.

Mrs. Johnson asked Dr. Rulfes to describe the kinds of decisions the Board should be considering during this meeting in regard to the building permit.

Dr. Rulfes responded they would include the following issues: nine-month versus twelve-month calendars, size of schools, increased demand on dollars regarding land versus remodeling, enrollment projections, and full-day kindergarten.

Mr. Gerner presented an informational update on the 2008 bond plan, including the following topics: a brief recap of the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) meeting of Thursday, January 25, 2007, and the deferred action on Revision 12; a projected timeline; issues for future discussion; updated information from one year ago; identifying the perfect school; and recommendations.

Mrs. Johnson expressed concern with the relationship between trying to get the class size conducive to the student-teacher ratio knowing there may not be enough funding available.

Mr. Kemner responded that modular expansion was reevaluated for that purpose. He explained the difference between modulars and portable classrooms.

Mrs. Johnson questioned whether lecture-hall style classrooms in high schools had been evaluated.

Mr. Kemner responded every level of school would have different challenges and would be dealt with accordingly through the design team.

Trustee Edwards stated she felt that smaller class sizes and student-teacher ratios were more important in the lower grades, and she questioned whether modulars or a kit of parts, in terms of mixing and matching buildings in order to accommodate them, would be most cost effective.

Mr. Kemner stated that technology enhances teacher effectiveness but does not solve other issues, such as student-teacher ratio.

Mrs. Johnson reiterated the proposals to staff should include flexibility in classroom delivery; lighting, air quality, acoustics, and space issues in terms of the classroom quality; and maintaining larger size footprints and smaller schools.

APPROVE 2008 BOND PLANNING (continued)

Mr. Kemner included in those recommended proposals the following: maintaining classroom size, but to build more classrooms at the ratio of 5 to 22 with 900 square feet per classroom.

Mrs. Moulton stated she appreciated the idea to rethink modulars.

Mr. Gerner continued with his presentation, discussing updated enrollment projections.

BOARD MEMBER LEAVES MEETING

Mrs. Barber left the Board meeting at 3:02 p.m.

APPROVE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—REVISION 12

Approval of the 1998 Capital Improvement Plan—Revision 12, as recommended in Reference A.

Mr. Gerner discussed Revision 12 and the two program adjustments associated thereto consisting of reducing the number of additional elementary schools from 14 to 11 or less based on projections, and rescheduling the last high school into the next program.

Mrs. Moulton questioned whether these adjustments fell under the philosophy of 100 percent of elementary schools year round.

Mr. Gerner responded that all schools that could be would be operated year round.

Mrs. Johnson asked how many high schools in the east would open between now and the end of the next bond program.

Mr. Gerner responded there would only be one.

Mrs. Johnson expressed concern that one high school would not meet the growth in the area and asked about rezoning.

Trustee Edwards asked whether the last high school that was to be rescheduled would go into the next bond, and she asked where the funds that would have paid for that high school would go.

Mr. Gerner responded that under Revision 12, a large majority of the funds for that last high school would get reprogrammed into the Career and Technical Academy (CTA) program.

Mrs. Johnson asked for clarification regarding why the budget was miscalculated.

Mr. Gerner explained the fundamental error that had been made early on regarding CTAs and seat calculations. He recommended that the district recognize that the need for the high school, based on projections, does not fall until the subsequent year.

Mrs. Johnson asked what the date was when Mr. Gerner advised the Board that the CTA program was going to cost more than originally budgeted.

Mr. Gerner responded he had not advised the Board yet.

APPROVE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—REVISION 12 (continued)

Mrs. Johnson stated advising the Board of revisions would have been more appropriate before the suggestion of cutting a high school from a program.

Mrs. Moulton expressed concern with not having enough middle schools in addition to taking away one high school.

Mrs. Scow questioned whether delaying the one high school for a year would affect the configuration of what was promised as far as number of schools and seats.

Mr. Gerner responded if the recommendations were followed under Revision 12, the district would have 101 schools delivered out of 88 and 11 replacement schools that had never been considered at the original bond program, thereby exceeding the promise, including seats.

Trustee Edwards questioned where the remaining funds were going from the reduction in the high schools as the district moved from 14 high schools to 11.

Mr. Gerner responded the entire amount of reprogramming goes into various areas, such as the CTA program and for additional cost escalations.

Trustee Edwards stated she would like to see, before the 2008 election, encouragement for modernization so that the remainder of the funds would be applied towards the areas that are older and have the most need.

Mr. Gerner spoke next about future projections up to 2018. He stated the district would grow two-thirds from its current size.

Trustee Edwards questioned if communities in other counties that are being built on CCSD's border were taken into consideration in Mr. Gerner's projections.

Mr. Gerner responded it was not an exact science, but there was an attempt to take it into consideration. He stated the district would be working on a policy that would be developed to try and work with developers. He stated that at Coyote Springs they would provide the school, CCSD would provide the staffing for it and would basically be renting space on a per-seat basis.

Mrs. Scow asked if there was a state law that did not allow the district to rent facilities for instructional use.

Mr. Gerner responded that state law allows it, as long as it was an annual lease.

Mrs. Johnson stated for the record that, should the population projections change, and the schools were not required towards the end of the 10-year bond program, that the district should have a number of oversight protocols in place that would guarantee that taxpayers were not funding schools that were not actually needed.

Mrs. Scow stated that the Board of School Trustees should receive all of the information regarding the prototype projections so as to be able to put it in better context and to make a more informed decision.

APPROVE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—REVISION 12 (continued)

Mrs. Moulton stated reduction in class size should be paramount, and she also stated the bond needed to include a large rehab and replacement component. She agreed with receiving all the information regarding the prototypes and agreed that year-round versus nine-month calendars needed to be further discussed.

Mrs. Janison asked if elementary schools were built with the notion of full-day kindergarten, but they were not utilized, could those rooms be utilized for other purposes.

Mr. Gerner responded that there were a couple of approaches to that scenario, but he was most inclined to encourage the designers to support full-day kindergarten.

Mrs. Janison then asked Mr. Gerner why smaller elementary schools with smaller classrooms were not as important in the prototypes as middle and high schools.

Mr. Gerner responded they were more expensive in design.

Trustee Edwards asked whether the district was going with the same four architects, or would it be open for change.

Mr. Gerner responded the architectural selection had already been completed.

Trustee Edwards then asked to what extent these total projected costs incorporated land costs.

Mr. Gerner responded that these were total program costs.

Trustee Edwards stated there were areas where there were 1,000 students located in less than one square mile, and she asked at what point it would be cost effective to build two schools on a campus or to build up instead of out.

Mr. Gerner responded that about a year ago a study had been performed on that, and the breakpoint at the time was \$1 million an acre which would make it more feasible to build up at that time. He stated that eminent domain would be used as a last resort. He then continued with his presentation, briefly speaking on the following topics: the perfect smaller schools would cost double; the cost and effect of returning to a nine-month schedule; suggested approach to design the best affordable school; next bond rehab/modernization program; and other issues with unknown final costs.

Trustee Edwards suggested incorporating an allocation of time for the district in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding joint use of facilities for transportation, food service, and pools.

Mrs. Janison stated student achievement should be the ultimate goal.

APPROVE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—REVISION 12 (continued)

Mrs. Johnson stated the following were important to consider: full-day kindergarten and the ability of a school to run a half-day program; she did not want to see an increase in the number of students on a school site; doubling the size of cafeterias to alleviate time constraints imposed on students and health concerns by parents; to have more indoor large spaces for activities and to meet the goals of the wellness program; to have no great rooms without walls and to be able to have all space be flexible to be used for a classroom, if needed; and to see a change in the prototype to accommodate modular classrooms.

Mrs. Moulton indicated the following suggestions were her priorities: smaller class sizes and no increase in students; offer full-day kindergarten or, at a minimum, elongating the school day by at least one hour; teachers in all classrooms; increased great room or cafeteria to reflect the thought that the school is the center of the community; and to go back to the MGT of America audit and demand legislation for developers to providing land, infrastructures to the district, or help the district with community centers.

Trustee Edwards stated she did not think land being given to the district by developers was reasonable, but she stated the small developers should be assessed a fee to help pay for the infrastructure of schools. She agreed with larger cafeterias and bathrooms for high schools. She also agreed with giving an option of full-day or half-day kindergarten. She suggested looking at the option of renting facilities for schools or buying an existing building to convert into a school.

Mrs. Johnson stated she did not agree with renting a facility, but she did agree with looking into buying an existing building.

Mrs. Janison suggested enlarging the cafeteria area at the high school level and utilizing that room for other purposes, such as a lecture hall, when not in use.

Motion to approve an option of full-day kindergarten with the continuation of a partial, half-day kindergarten program; to determine classroom size through the recommendation of the Perfect School Committee; to not increase school enrollment capacity; to explore the potential of increasing cafeteria size; and explore a two-part question for the November 2008 bond.

Motion: Scow Second: Moulton

Mrs. Janison expressed concern regarding class size and graduation rates of middle and high schools being left out of the discussion, and she asked that they be included in the motion.

Mrs. Scow stated her intention was not to leave them out, but just that the emphasis should be on elementary schools.

Trustee Edwards asked when a school approached enrollment of 4,000 students, and modulars were brought on site to accommodate them, would there be a way to design a plumbing component outside the high school to accommodate additional bathrooms for the modulars.

Mrs. Johnson suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to include consideration of, along with the cafeteria size, the exploration of building into the prototype the ability to make modular additions with greater adaptability for future modular use, and to look at the best balance between student achievement versus taxpayer resources.

APPROVE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN—REVISION 12 (continued)

The maker of the motion and the second agreed to Mrs. Johnson's suggestion.

Ms. Green stated that children with disabilities needs to be considered during the development of the prototype, not when the building is completed.

Vote on Mrs. Scow's motion was unanimous.

Mrs. Barber was not present for the vote.

Mrs. Johnson stated the Board would like to see Mr. Gerner's instructions before they are given to the architects.

Trustee Edwards stated her assumption was that daylighting and acoustics would be looked at also in terms of the perfect school report.

Mrs. Scow expressed appreciation for the perfect school research that was done.

Mr. Gerner stated the timeline process would be such that before it gets back to the Board by late summer, it would have been looked at by cabinet and BOC.

Motion that the first 15 percent up front would include a designation of life cycle costs that the prototype provides.

Motion: Scow

Mr. Gerner suggested that the motion include that a life cycle cost analysis fee be inherent in decisions about what those in the next generation prototypes would cover.

Second: Janison

Mrs. Moulton cautioned that the district needs to balance between representing the taxpayers and what the extras in construction would do in helping educate children.

Vote on Mrs. Scow's motion was unanimous.

Mrs. Barber was not present for the vote.

ADJOURN: 4:30 p.m.

Motion: Janison Second: Scow Vote: Unanimous

Mrs. Barber was not present for the vote.