

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, MARCH 19, 2015

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Bruins, David
Haldeman, Joyce
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.

Jim Halsey, 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 March 19, 2015, agenda with an amendment from the District to relocate 3.08 and 3.09 after 3.04 which would make 3.07 the last item on the agenda.

Motion: Kubat Second: Reynolds Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

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

Motion: Kubat Second: Philpott Vote: Unanimous

3.02 LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.

Jim McIntosh stated Joyce 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.

Charles Kubat stated he did not have a report, but wanted everyone to remember that we have Liaison groups that are available to work with staff now that we have a new program and it's important to involve the Bond Oversight Committee on the very early-on deliberations maybe by fine-tuning the prototype direction or the site selection is a big one and would encourage staff to take advantage of reaction and feedback from this group and the liaison process as quickly as possible.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Jim McIntosh stated that we now have a bond program called the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan and would like to get some structures in place because of the direction from the Joint Bond Oversight Committee and Board of School Trustees meeting on March 12, 2015, what those structures look like and how we expect the communication to work. Jim McIntosh stated because of the 1998 Bond Program experience, one of the components is the monthly status reports prepared by Ruby Alston. He requested time to go over these reports by having Ruby interpret the reports by explaining what they mean and what they look like and how the dollars are spent and that the members are comfortable interpreting these reports on how the dollars are spent. Ruby explained several different reports in summary-level detail as listed below:

- 1998 Capital Improvement Building Program Reports: Financial Status Report
- 1998 Capital Improvement Program – Summary Status of Current Estimates & Expenditures
- 1998 Capital Improvement Program – Report of Revenues & Expenditures
- 1998 Capital Improvement Program – Projects in Progress Status Reports
- School Facility Assessment History

Suggestions from members for inclusions or explanations on future detail-level reports on the following concerns/issues:

- timelines
- cost over-runs
- maybe a "comment" line for explanation

3.08 COMMUNICATION PLAN.

Jim McIntosh, Chief Financial Officer, discussed on-going communications from CCSD staff and the development of a communication plan with solid structures in place to the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) and the Board of School Trustees (BOST) on what

3.08 COMMUNICATION PLAN (continued).

sort of communication will be provided, how we will be providing it, the frequency of the communication, how often should the BOC be making recommendations to the BOST, and what level of detail is the expectation you would like to see. Also, discussion on in-depth use of the BOC Liaison and the expectation the liaison will be communicating information back to the BOST.

Trustee Garvey discussed different styles for different Board liaisons in communicating information back to the Board from the BOC meetings. Trustee Garvey also discussed options for communicating information back to the Board depending on what level the committee members want -- interpretation, conversation, or formal.

Gene Lazaroff asked Trustee Garvey if the Trustees review the BOC Minutes. Trustee Garvey responded she didn't know. She said she thinks they may skim through them and rely on the liaison to filter that information to the Trustees. Gene continued to state that a lot of information included in the Minutes that are not responded to. He continued by saying that he highly recommends that the Trustees review the Minutes.

Lisa Lavelle stated that communication works both ways. Communication with the Trustees is critical. Lisa asked if there is some mechanism by which the Trustees can communicate to the BOC and what particular things they want to have some input on.

Trustee Garvey stated that the Board wants good-clear communication between them and the BOC through staff and everyone at the table needs to think about how to protect dollars, community, and Nevada families. She continued to state that maybe there should be a standing board item where if there is any communication that the Trustees want delivered to BOC then it comes as an action item and then becomes an action for staff to do. Trustee Garvey suggested using *specific words* that everyone agrees on to alert staff, board, or committee that you want something done.

Charles Kubat discussed the past recommendations process that was discussed with Trustee Garvey a few years ago and was agreed upon, that if the BOC members wanted something specifically on the Trustees' agenda – it needed to get passed as a *formal resolution or recommendation vote* and that it has worked well since then because it was very clear.

Trustee Garvey added that she will go back to her colleagues to maybe change that first standing item on their agenda.

Lisa Lavelle questioned in what form is this information going to be communicated, either through minutes item, formal writing, or verbal communication? She further asked how this information is going to be transmitted. She suggested having something in writing that is a written recommendation based upon what everyone agrees on and formulated in a way that it can be read back by the Secretary so that the message is clear.

3.08 COMMUNICATION PLAN (continued).

Jim McIntosh responded stating that it would be through his communication to the Trustees from the BOC members when they want an item on the Board agenda for discussion and or/action.

Jacob Reynolds agreed with Lisa to have an agenda action item, but would also like to have questions back to the BOC members from the Board.

Jim Halsey stated that it would be a requirement to go through the Liaison Trustee back to the Board and Mr. McIntosh would be responsible to make sure the BOC item is on the Board agenda.

After a lengthy discussion, a motion was approved to have a standing agenda item placed on the BOC agenda to include communication directed to the Board of School Trustees.

Motion: Kobat Second: Lavelle Vote: Unanimous

After more discussion, a motion was made that the recommendation to the Board be made in a form of a couple of sentences such as here's the Board's recommendation, here's the vote on the recommendation -- if the Board has a unanimous reason for making the recommendation, that it be made.

Motion: Lavelle Second: Kubat Vote: Motion Withdrawn

Trustee Garvey suggested the BOC members experiment on Chuck's motion and approval on how the process works because recommendations will need to be made on Mr. McIntosh's agenda item.

Mr. McIntosh discussed the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan and stated that it was going to be discussed at the March 26, 2015, board meeting and that the Board would be voting on this topic. At this time, he wanted to have a general discussion so that he could provide the Board with a recommendation from this committee. He continued stating that the District is moving forward and executing with the traditional language on RFPs & contracts with *no changes* – the only change is that the District is *now exempt* from having to pay prevailing wage as implied by the law.

Jacob Reynolds stated he would like to have a current RFP to review.

Jim McIntosh responded that he would provide.

Mr. Jim McIntosh discussed the statute that governs Public Works for contracts over \$100K on capital projects where there are already exemptions in place, but explained that the school districts were just added to these exemptions.

3.08 COMMUNICATION PLAN (continued).

Charles Kubat questioned if this committee has the ability legally in the interests of what the Trustees have asked, for Trustees upon the BOC recommendation or without it, to define “responsible bidder” as being someone located in the state of Nevada, someone that has some level of training for employees with Nevada licenses, to include all items we are concerned about independent of any question about paying prevailing wage?

Trustee Garvey responded that if this committee feels that if it is something that can be done – if it’s permissible and lawful, then these are the elements that the committee should recommend that they would like to see adhered to.

After lengthy discussion on current contracts and RFPs, Richard Bowler made a motion that the current RFP process be evaluated and given enough time to do so, but at this time go forward with the current contracts using the current RFP with whatever documents that might be involved and for those that timing requires them to go forward, with the understanding that CCSD Staff come back to the BOC with a recommendation with the changes that need to be made in the RFP process and with the documents involved.

Motion: Bowler Second: Earl Vote: Yeas: Three Neas: Six
Motion: Fails

After lengthy discussion on “responsible bidder”, Charles Kubat made a motion that the committee communicate to the Trustees what they would like – to further define and help Trustees define “responsible bidder” to the extent that is legally possible to include various items including Nevada families, and quality of construction, and service.

Motion: Kubat Second: Cameron Vote: Yeas: Seven Neas: Two
Motion: Passes

3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

Jim McIntosh discussed that at the beginning of the legislative session a bill was produced to put forward Senate Bill 119 that would allow legislative authority to give the District authorization to Bond against its tax rate over a 10-year period. The District in the interim came up with a two-year plan as to what the District could do from a capital perspective if it was provided with two years before going to the Board. The District determined what that bonding structure would look like over a two-year period. It represented approximately \$850 million. The legislators wanted the District to be very specific on what the District would do and where it would go if passed. As a component of that plan, 12 new schools were included in this plan, two replacement schools, two phased replacement schools, life-cycle replacements, and technology projects. Ultimately, the District was given a 10-year bond program estimated at approximately \$4.1 billion. The District’s next step is to build a 10-year facility master plan as to how

3.09 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (continued).

to program the budgets for everything that's included over a 10-year period. The reality is that the District will be building much more than 12 new schools. There is a list of these 12 new schools we will start building immediately. Jim McIntosh requested the committee's authority to move forward specifically on these projects until we can get a 10-year master plan in place so that we can take it to the *Board of School Trustees* to get *their authority* to start on these 12 new schools immediately.

Charles Kubat stated that he would be uncomfortable all of a sudden endorsing a list of schools that the committee has not discussed or have not seen any background information on such as hot spot analysis, availability of sites, or anything else – if these are the best sites or best places. He feels personally uncomfortable making this instant recommendation to the Board.

Jacob Reynolds asked where in the building process stage the District is at right now.

Jim McIntosh responded the District has already begun the feasibility studies on these sites, including architectural and engineering studies. There has not been any bids done on construction for the school sites. We are determining as to what prototypes to use on each one of these sites.

Jim McIntosh clarified that the District is requesting recommendation from the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) to approve *to move forward on construction on these 12 new schools plus two replacement schools*, as we concurrently work on a 10-year facilities master plan and that there will be many more projects in the next two years.

There was lengthy discussion on which prototypes were selected and what sites were selected for each. At this time, Jim McIntosh introduced the *new Assistant Superintendent of Facilities, Blake Cumbers*, to the committee. Jim stated Mr. Cumbers would address the five selected prototypes. Mr. Cumbers stated there were studies done on the following sites:

Wallin Prototype – *Galleria/Dave Wood*

Wallin Prototype – *Antelope Ridge*

Stuckey Prototype – *Lamb/Kell Lane*

Stuckey Prototype – *Tartan/Pioneer*

Duncan Prototype – *Arville/Mesa*

Charles Kubat made a motion that we recommend these sites for the District to move forward from a-site feasibility and building feasibility point of view and for future information to come back to the BOC before final recommendation on specific prototypes or specific sites based on further information.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Lavelle

Vote: Unanimous

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

Trustee Garvey stated that everybody needs to get the communicating process in line on how it needs to progress through the system. She said she would be communicating it back to her fellow trustees to help support it and also help support staff to be able to do that. She said communication from this Board as to what they need for support and any communication from staff in what they need in support needs to be communicated so that everybody is well informed on everything.

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

Gene Lazaroff addressed his concerns with regard to:

Refund Agreements – he stated the BOC did not get any comment or feedback on the process of Standard Operating Procedures of Writing and he would like to see a date placed on it.

Maintenance Department Performance Measures – he stated the BOC did not get any performance measures at all and that it needs to be looked at.

Criteria for Educational and Functional Requirements – He stated he would like to get a date for a facility and what is expected to be under a facility including storage and things like that.

Funding of Future Land Acquisitions/Off-Site Improvements – He stated he would like to address this on how we will acquire the land in the future whether it is going to be donated, or purchased, or traded with BLM and/or other property owners.

3.07 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Debbie Earl made a motion to have a presentation on why specifically those prototypes were chosen for those specific sites.

Motion: Earl *Second: Reynolds* *Vote: Unanimous*

Richard Bowler made a motion to have a presentation on the process of change orders.

Motion: Bowler *Second: Reynolds* *Vote: Unanimous*

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Speaker: Sam King appreciated speaking to the committee on all these issues. She stated she loves the English Language and playing by the rules. As a tax payer, she appreciates how the committee is looking at how it's going to build schools. She said she knows that there is a need to build schools and she looks forward to listening to more of this.

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (continued).

She thanked the committee for allowing her to speak to the committee. Lastly, she stated she still supports prevailing wage.

5. ADJOURN: 2:28 p.m.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous