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 June 18, 2015, agenda.

Motion: Bowler  Second: Reynolds  Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for May 21, 2015, agenda.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Bowler  Vote: Unanimous

3.02 LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.

Joyce Haldeman spoke in depth on the legislative session and the many bills that were introduced but focused on the four important ones because of the impact they have on this committee and the
Clark County School District (CCSD). The first bill she discussed was SB 119 which passed early on in the legislative session that extended the bonds for another ten years and will generate about $4 billion for the CCSD to use so that we can continue our building program. This bill exempted the District from payment of prevailing wages on school construction projects. Ms. Haldeman stated that immediately after this bill was passed, SB 207 passed which included payment of prevailing wage on school construction projects, that is, did not include provisions to restrict the use of prevailing wage.

The third bill she discussed was AB 172 amended on the floor so that it reintroduced the requirement for prevailing wage at the 90 percent level of the prevailing wage to satisfy the Nevada Labor Commissioner, and that bill became law.

The fourth bill Ms. Haldeman discussed was AB 394, the bill that creates a committee to deconsolidate the Clark County School District. This bill also had a lot of action on the last day of the legislative session. She mentioned that in 2005, there was a huge study about splitting up the School District and included the pros and the cons. Ms. Haldeman spoke about discussions that had taken place by Clark County School District staff – if the District is in fact going to be split up, then it was decided that it needed to be done in a way that was thoughtful, and carefully done so that there was no harm done to our students, to 18,000 teachers, and to families of our District. Ms. Haldeman stated that testimony was provided to the legislative session on this AB 394 bill, and repeatedly addressed the need for this bill to go back to the next legislative session for discussion and approval if it was going to move forward. She said the bill passed and none of the reiterations required it to go back to the next legislative session.

Ms. Haldeman discussed the concerns of the make-up of the committee that would make the decisions about how the planning and implementation would take place. The concern was addressed if this committee would have someone with knowledge of legal and contractual law because of all the CCSD legal obligations. Another concern was how the decisions would take place if the District were divided into smaller entities and about who owned the debt on geographical locations.

Ms. Haldeman stated the importance of this Bond Oversight Committee to monitor the AB 394 Bill because the AB 394 committee will have an impact on the decisions and recommendations this BOC will make. The requirements for the AB 394 committee are that there will be nine members appointed; four assemblymen, four senators, and the ninth member will be appointed by the governor; all of them will be from southern Nevada. The Assembly Speaker of the House will appoint two members and the Assembly Minority Leader will appoint two members. The Senate Majority and Minority Leaders will each appoint two members.

Ms. Haldeman suggested that the BOC as a group make recommendations to the Board of School Trustees (BOST) as far as a priority list of what’s more important to address such as; 1) making sure that we have a seat for every student that moves into the Las Vegas valley, or, 2) the condition of the existing schools. She continued to suggest that we should establish baseline decisions that both BOC & BOST can refer to over the next 10 years so that we have a document that is written and that is adopted and can always use as a baseline for decisions that we make.
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Mr. Kubat suggested Mr. Cumbers, staff, and the BOC develop a plan within the next six-to-nine months. Ms. Haldeman agreed that we cannot sit around and wait to see what happens with AB 394.

Mr. McIntosh stated one of the goals from District staff is to determine and prioritize what’s important for us as a County – how to direct these dollars. We plan to hold public input meetings over the summer to get a sense of what the Public wants and how they would like to see these dollars spent, either on new schools or rehab/modernization of existing schools. Once we have that information which we will address as “The Guiding Principles of the Bond Program”, we plan to present it to this committee and would like to get a recommendation from this committee, then take it to the BOST for approval. Mr. McIntosh stated that this is our plan over the next few months.

3.03 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

None.

3.04 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Executive Summary Level – Projects in Progress Status Reports.

Mr. Kubat mentioned his previous request from the last meeting regarding explanations with more detail for scope changes and reasons why projects are behind schedule that staff had stated would be provided (Report Reference 3.04 [E]). Mr. Cumbers responded that all projects are assigned to project managers (PMs) and all of the projects in the first block of this report were expecting proposals from various engineering firms. Mr. Cumber continued with the second block of the report with Silverado High School and stated that this project has not made any progress because staff hasn’t been able to find as-built drawings. Mr. Cumbers also explained that the Ronzone ES and Wynn ES have had scope changes because of the number of classrooms added (43 to 53) from the previous design to the current design.

Mr. Cumbers stated that the West Prep ES project had a CAF approved for $3 million to fund the increase in the number of classrooms. Ms. Alston stated she would like to discuss the process for the approved CAF for the West Prep ES at the next meeting and would explain how the budget was affected, then ask this committee for input on how this committee would like to see the results on this report on the Summary Level in the future. Mr. Cumbers added that staff would include this as an agenda item for discussion, no action, on the next BOC meeting agenda.

3.05 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND CONTRACTS.

Mr. Cumbers presented a one-page document to the BOC members summarizing the process by which the current projects have been moving forward based on SB 119 which excluded prevailing wage. He stated we were, for a period of time, not required to obtain a public works project number from the Nevada Labor Commissioner, nor include conditions related to certified payroll per the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS). However, the law changed again and based on SB 207
3.05 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND CONTRACTS. (continued)

bill which did not exempt us from the prevailing wage laws, a large number of projects need to be rebid under the new legal guidelines and will need to be approved by the BOST on July 16, 2015.

Mr. Kubat needed clarification on prevailing wage contract requirements based on dollar amounts for on-going projects. Mr. Cumbers responded and clarified that any project $250,000 and over would need to be considered a prevailing wage project.

3.06 STATUS AND PROCESS OF REFUND AGREEMENTS.

Mr. Cumbers presented a one-page document summarizing the definition of Refund Agreements and the Status and Process of these agreements between utility companies and the Clark County School District. He stated that in the past, the utility companies were needing line extensions so they could provide the water, electrical, and sewer for new CCSD developments. The utility companies would provide the District with their form agreements (or proposals) between them and the CCSD. These agreements stated that the District would be refunded for the cost that was paid over the actual costs when adjacent users connected to the utility. However, the utility companies had placed deadlines on the District to receive these refunds and when the new developments didn’t come in, then the refunds expired and the District was not due these refunds.

Mr. Kubat made a suggestion that moving forward with our projects that District staff make sure we have longer terms in all of these agreements.

Mr. Lazaroff discussed in depth about previous presentations and recommendations by The Working Group to the BOC to revisit, rewrite, and obtain some leverage in addressing this serious issue regarding refund agreements and deadlines. In summary, based on a chart that he had at the time of the presentation, he addressed the fact that only one entity, the City of Henderson, was the only entity looking out for the best interest of the District. They had a 20-year window for deadlines for these agreements, but the other four entities had a 10-year window; they were only looking out for their best interests. He continued by explaining there were discussions with the four entities regarding changing their process to be more favorable to the District, but without leverage, the District had no standing in negotiating with these entities and were at a disadvantage. Mr. Lazaroff suggested maybe utilizing the NRS to devise a strategy to address all these issues to the District’s advantage.

3.07 MODIFICATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPACE ALLOCATIONS.

Mr. Cumbers discussed his 2015 Capital Improvement Plan, Elementary School Space Allocation slide presentation in detail for the BOC’s recommendation to present to the Board of School Trustees on June 25, 2015, for approval for the new design adding additional classrooms – from 43 to 53 classrooms. He started out discussing the following:

2015 CIP Situation Assessment
- History of Enrollment – Entire District
  - 2015-2016 – Projected Enrollment is 327,377 Students
• New Educational Requirements – Capacity Effects
• Elementary School Capacity vs. Enrollment
• Portable Classrooms – Entire District
• Year-Round Elementary Schools
  ➢ 2013-2014 – Three ESs
  ➢ 2014-2015 – 10 ESs
  ➢ 2015-2016 – 12 ESs
• The Major Challenges
• Elementary Schools Classrooms Required
  ➢ Current – 43 Classrooms
  ➢ Needed – 53 Classrooms
• Forecasted Delivery of Projects
  ➢ 2016 – Two School Additions
  ➢ 2017 – New Schools
    ✓ Galleria and Dave Wood – Wallin Prototype
    ✓ Lamb and Kell – Stuckey Prototype
    ✓ Arville and Mesa Verde – Duncan Prototype
    ✓ Maule and Grand Canyon – Duncan Prototype
    ✓ Chartan and Pioneer – Stuckey Prototype
    ✓ Antelope Ridge – Wallin Prototype
  ➢ 2017 – Replacement Schools
    ✓ Lincoln ES
    ✓ Rex Bell ES
  ➢ 2018 – New Schools
    ✓ Ford and Riley
    ✓ Beltrada and Pioneer
    ✓ Dean Martin & I-15
    ✓ Chapata and Casady
    ✓ Farm and Jensen
    ✓ Spencer and Pyle
• Wallin ES Prototype with 53 Classrooms
• Stuckey ES Prototype with 53 Classrooms
• Duncan ES Prototype with 53 Classrooms
• Lincoln ES and Bell ES Replacement Schools with 53 Classrooms
• Wynn ES and Ronzone ES Classroom Additions with 53 Classrooms

Mr. Cumbers stated specifically the recommendation the District is requesting from this committee – to recommend that we build these twelve new schools, two replacement schools, and two new additions to the 53 classroom prototype design model.

Mr. McIntosh commented for clarification that he would like this committee’s recommendation to build these 12 to 14 new schools to the new 53 teaching station standard as opposed to the 43 teaching station standard which will go to the BOST for final approval.
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Mr. Reynolds made a motion to make this recommendation to the Board of School Trustees that they pursue this plan.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Haldeman  Vote: Unanimous  Motion Passes

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

Trustee Young acknowledged Joyce Haldeman, Nicole North, and Frank Stevens for their hard work on the legislative session. She stated they did an outstanding job.

Trustee Young voiced her appreciation of the Bond Oversight Committee and stated she will be listening very closely to the committee’s comments and recommendations. She continued by stating that the committee’s expertise is valued. Trustee Young stated that she acknowledges the committee’s leadership in their respective areas and is grateful that this committee continues to be champions for good education, public education, and for the students.

Trustee Young commented on AB 448, the Achievement School District. She stated that based on the law, it says that we are supposed to have one school district per county.

Trustee Young commented she is an advocate of public education. She stated that as a Trustee, she is adamantly against the breakup of the School District. She stated her concerns on the breaking up of the school district into four precincts and what the future of public schools and growth will be. She continued stating her concerns for the poor communities, the “have’s and the have nots.” Trustee Young also stated she is concerned with student achievement, teacher salaries, and issues regarding resources and strategies for the District. She commented the BOST will be looking to this committee for help and welcomed anyone to feel free to talk to each of the board members about this breakup.

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

Mr. Reynolds made a motion to remove his portion of the Capital Improvement Program Reports item dated 3/19/15, from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Kubat  Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Kubat made a motion to remove his portion of the Capital Improvement Program Reports item dated 3/19/15, from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Kubat  Second: Reynolds  Vote: Unanimous
3.09 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. (continued)

Mr. Kubat made a motion to remove his portion of the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan item dated 3/19/15, from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Kubat  Second: Bruins  Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Reynolds made a motion regarding the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan item, for staff to provide a schedule for a future tour at the next Bond Oversight Committee meeting.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Kubat  Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Reynolds made a motion to remove the first three items from the RFPs and Contracts item dated 5/21/15 and 3/19/15, from the Motions and Taskings.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Kubat  Vote: Unanimous

3.10 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Jim Halsey stated that the next BOC meeting agenda will include the item for Election of Executive Committee and will be taking place at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Kubat made a motion that on the next Bond Oversight Committee meeting, an item be placed on the agenda for staff to bring forward a draft for discussion of the planning objectives, Guiding Principles, for the upcoming 2015 Capital Improvement Plan.

Motion: Kubat  Second: Reynolds  Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Lazaroff made a motion to add the acquisition of the land for the Maule and Grand Canyon property in Summerlin on the next Bond Oversight Committee meeting agenda.

Motion: Lazaroff  Second: Reynolds  Vote: Unanimous

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

5. ADJOURN: 1:47 p.m.

Motion: Reynolds  Second: Bruins  Vote: Unanimous