

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 15, 2014

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Davis, Al	Hawkins, Frank
Bowler, Richard	Lazaroff, Gene
Bruins, David	Lopez, George
Earl, Debbie	Philpott, Steve
Haldeman, Joyce	Tate, Cameron
Halsey, Jim	

Members Absent

Kubat, Charles
Lavelle, Eleissa
Reynolds, Jacob

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Capital Program Office at 799-8710.

1.01 ROLL CALL.

Jim Halsey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

1.02 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt the Agenda for May 15, 2014.

Motion: Davis Second: Bruins Vote: Unanimous
Frank Hawkins not in attendance.

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for April 17, 2014.

Motion: Davis Second: Philpott Vote: Unanimous
Frank Hawkins not in attendance.

3.02 FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – PORTABLE CLASSROOMS.

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent of Community & Government Relations; Jim McIntosh, Chief Financial Officer of the Business and Finance Division; and

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – PORTABLE CLASSROOMS (continued).

Rick Baldwin, Director of Demographics, Zoning, and Geographic Information Systems Department, provided copies of a PowerPoint presentation “Portables in the Clark County School District.”

Ms. Haldeman stated that this is the second presentation in a series of issues and explained that the presentation and discussion from last month on available seats was delivered to the Board of School Trustees.

Mr. McIntosh stated that this presentation will address last month’s questions on the ability to phase out the use of portables, the number of seats required to phase out portables, portable inventory, and how does the District deal with aging portables.

Mr. McIntosh reviewed the costs of new portables and for moving a portable; number of portables; the size, age, and uses of portables; and options to reduce the use of portables.

In the process of the presentation on Page 6, Mr. McIntosh corrected an amount of the cost to add a permanent addition to a building is \$4 to 5 million.

Mr. McIntosh reviewed a number of reasons where there may be too many portables on a site; confirmed that a new double-wide portable that equals two classrooms costs \$130,000; and reviewed the programs that will impact capacity.

Following an explanation on student/teacher ratios, Frank Hawkins asked staff to provide the average student/teacher ratio for this year and if the classrooms were filled.

Ms. Haldeman stated that early childhood education is important to the Nevada State Legislature and stated the Legislature provided \$8 million in grant funds for the purchase of portables.

Mr. Hawkins stated that buildings are more efficient today than years ago and questioned what the specifications are for the new portables and if they are rated for sound and insulation. Rory Lorenzo, Director of Portables – Special Projects, explained the portables have to meet a minimum square foot requirement for classroom space, be code compliant, and be certified by the State of Nevada Manufactured Housing Division. The new portables have to meet the same sound and insulation requirements as a normal classroom.

Gene Lazaroff questioned if federal specification/schedules are used to procure the portables or is the manufacturing performed privately and procured through advertisement. Mr. McIntosh stated that staff would get back with a response.

Mr. McIntosh explained that when a school determines the need for another full-day kindergarten classroom, a portable is brought in to make room for a third, fourth, or fifth grade class in order for the kindergarten students to remain within the school building.

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – PORTABLE CLASSROOMS (continued).

Steve Philpott expressed his concern that when enough kindergarten students enroll to take over another classroom within the school, the room that they are placed in may not be conducive for these young students.

Mr. McIntosh stated that Mr. Philpott's concerns are positive impacts and changes to the District. The schools were not built to accommodate these types of changes; hence, portables are an effective use for additional capacity.

Mr. Philpott also expressed concern that the instruction may degrade within the computer and/or science labs due to the large number of students within the school. Mr. Lorenzo explained that portables can be used to augment the computer lab education at certain schools.

Mr. McIntosh stated that the District will be purchasing over 60 portables utilizing the grant funds. Three portables a week are being sited and placed on a regular basis to provide capacity for these students in a lower class size.

Mr. McIntosh explained that it would take 40 elementary schools, land availability in specific areas, and rezoning to accommodate the number of students within portables. That would not guarantee that portables would be phased out. "Strategic Planning Area 4" was illustrated as an example where land is not available and where two elementary schools each have 20 portables at their sites.

Mr. McIntosh provided a list of positives on the use of portables and stated the District needs a policy to address the older portables and when they would require replacement.

Mr. Philpott questioned the delivered cost for each of the cinder block classrooms compared to the portable they replaced at Fremont and Knudson Middle Schools.

Mr. Hawkins requested a list of schools that have ten or more portables.

Mr. Lazaroff questioned if the District has discussed with sister organization/post secondary institutions who have, in the past, built technology centers on school campuses where they may be interested in building out from their campuses. Mr. Lazaroff also questioned if there has been or will there be consideration given to space utilization studies of existing facilities on whether they are being efficiently used, such as the schools that are overcrowded.

Ms. Haldeman explained that an official space utilization study will not be conducted; however, the Instruction Unit ensures that classrooms are being utilized. Mr. McIntosh also explained that utilization maps, on how space is utilized, are kept in Mr. Baldwin's offices.

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – PORTABLE CLASSROOMS (continued).

Mr. Hawkins questioned if the District has considered leasing back a school that someone else has built. Mr. Hawkins also asked what requires the District to hurry and buy land just because there is a proposed development or can the District wait until the area is fully populated.

Ms. Haldeman and Mr. McIntosh explained that a future discussion will cover alternative suggestions, such as, lease/buy back, donated land by way of developers, charter schools, and alternative methods for financing.

Al Davis questioned what the funding source is that pays for the portables and the staff to install them. Mr. McIntosh explained that the District receives a portion of the Governmental Services Tax. The District actually receives two components, a general fund operating component of the Governmental Services Tax, and a capital component of the Governmental Services Tax. Historically, the District utilizes the Governmental Services Tax to fund the Special Projects/Portables crew, and the purchase and movement of portables. Many of the portables that are being purchased now are obtained through the State grant funds.

To determine the efficiency of the portables, Mr. Hawkins requested staff e-mail the specifications of the portables that are being purchased and suggest a policy be created to determine when portables should be added to a school.

Mr. Hawkins questioned how the District determines when a portable is too old and needs to be retired. Mr. Lorenzo explained that in the past, we would have structural engineers and maintenance personnel determine if the portable could be moved; if not, the portable would be “red-tagged” to identify it as not to be moved. The portable would then remain at its present location or it would be demolished.

Mr. Hawkins questioned how the District decides, based on the population data, a school needs to be built in a certain location. Mr. McIntosh explained that Mr. Baldwin’s office determines that information based upon the data and “Hot Spot Maps.”

Mr. McIntosh explained that there is a project near Lake Las Vegas that will add over 1,000 properties on an annual basis for the next 12 years. The developers have set aside five land-use sites for elementary schools. The District does not have the resources to build schools at this time.

Mr. Hawkins questioned if it would be possible for the Legislature to require developers to donate and build a school. Ms. Haldeman explained that this idea is not new and stated that at the end of the 1988 building program, when there was a limited amount of money remaining, Green Valley was growing fast. The City of Henderson, in one of their council meetings, identified 13 parcels that they were going to donate to the District. The City of Henderson wanted the District to commit to building all 13 schools within Green Valley.

FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAMS – PORTABLE CLASSROOMS (continued).

The District has to make their decisions where to build schools based upon the maps and where schools are needed. You have to be careful that a policy is not crafted by thinking you are taking care of the outlying areas and end up harming the other areas.

In the 1990s, Ms. Haldeman stated that in lieu of impact fees, the District settled on the real estate transfer tax. For every piece of real estate in Clark County that is bought or sold, a portion of that tax comes to the District. This was more equitable for the District and it didn't restrict the District from using monies. For example, if Summerlin had an impact fee that was added into the price of the home to pay for a school, they could make a case that someone living outside of Summerlin could not attend that specific school. Real estate transfer tax allows the District to utilize the funds for any location.

3.03 ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.

Jeremy Hauser, Associate Superintendent of the Operational Services Division, provided a PowerPoint presentation "Operational Services Division (OSD), Maintenance and Operations," and explained that this presentation will explore the changes that have been made in Maintenance and Operations.

Mr. Hauser introduced Carlos Morales, Director of Operational Services Division; Abby Berhe, Operational Manager of the Maintenance Department, who is the single point of contact for approximately 15 schools, for cleanliness, grounds, and maintenance repairs; and Greg Peterson, Supervisor of a Regional Zone, provides for the maintenance repairs for approximately 90 schools.

Mr. Hauser provided a list of departments that are under his responsibility and explained the purpose of the Ombudsman's office. Maintenance and Operations focuses on the service work that occurs within the schools, such as cleanliness, repair, upkeep of grounds, etc. Mr. Hauser explained that the building aspect remains under Business and Finance.

Mr. Hauser stated that he was brought in as part of a systems and organization change. The reputation of Maintenance and Operations from our customers (principals and teachers) was not the greatest. They tended to believe the workers were lazy, unresponsive, distracted, were not meeting the customers' needs, and work had to be redone.

Mr. Hauser explained how he needed to reorganize the departments within the existing budget to improve the service to the sites, rebuild the reputation, and increase the amount of services without additional funds.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE (continued).

Mr. Hauser reviewed the Operational Services Division goals, explained the role and responsibilities of the Operations Managers (replaced three job descriptions), and summarized the efficiencies of the four regional zones. Mr. Hauser stated that as a result of the efficiencies and not having any overtime, management has been able to reinvest the approximate \$1 million that was spent in overtime the previous year.

Mr. Hauser summarized the functions of the Mobile Maintenance Vans (size of semi-trucks) that will park at a site for up to two weeks and the crews will focus on the priority three and four work orders, and summarized the duties and benefits of the Building Managers (replacing a custodian and building engineer) at high schools. One of the goals is to place a full-time gardener at the high schools based on the needs of the principal.

Mr. Hauser provided quotes from satisfied customers/principals and explained that high school principals have not had any issues related to maintenance and operations for the last six months.

Mr. Hauser stated that the vehicles have all been fitted with GPS tracking devices which have resulted in increased employee accountability.

Ms. Berhe and Mr. Peterson summarized their responsibilities and improvements within the Department.

Mr. Hauser stated that his office is receptive to any donations and will work with the individuals/companies who would like to donate product or services to the schools.

David Bruins recommended that the District participate in the bidding process with other entities for commodities, such as, plumbing supplies, fasteners, piping, etc.

Mr. Hauser explained the minimum qualifications for the Operations Manager and that their primary role is being a liaison and ensures quality of work. They inspect the bathrooms, building cleanliness, and grounds.

In response to a question from Gene Lazaroff on the job description for an assistant superintendent position that is posted on the District Web site, Mr. McIntosh explained that this position is a reclassified position that replaces the associate superintendent. The assistant superintendent position will be responsible for the Facilities Department in the organization and will report to the Chief Financial Officer.

Mr. Hauser stated the budget for the Maintenance and Operations Department is approximately \$44 million. When repairs exceed the available funds available or exceed maintenance repairs, these items are taken to the Capital Planning Group meeting to see if other funds are available to make the repairs. Mr. Hauser also explained how his department handles communications with principals who may want something out of the normal District standards.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE (continued).

Mr. Hauser explained the various measures, such as, attendance and timeliness, where employees are held accountable. Mr. Hauser also provided examples of priority worker orders. Frank Hawkins requested that staff provide a list of examples for each priority.

Mr. Hauser also explained the experience and qualifications needed to become a building manager.

3.04 DEFERRED MAINTENANCE.

Jim McIntosh attended the Council of Great City Schools conference, an organization of large urban school districts, including the Clark County School District. One of the main topics at this conference was deferred maintenance. Mr. McIntosh stated that another conference will be held in October where a deferred maintenance report will be complete, and could report back to this committee at that time.

Mr. McIntosh informed the committee that school districts across the nation are all facing the same issue that this District is facing. As we went through the recession to keep cuts away from the classroom, cuts were made to the Facilities Department as this is one of the largest departments in the general operating fund and in particular preventative maintenance. The lack of funding, aging infrastructure, and cuts to preventative programs to extend the life of major systems has created the need for a group of school and facility superintendents to put this report together. They feel that facilities and capital expenditures are just as important as instructional expenditures. Mr. McIntosh stated that it would be a paradigm shift for the school boards to make decisions that it is just as important to fix the roof as it is to hire ten teachers.

Mr. McIntosh stated that the District is looking to restore the preventative maintenance programs with 18 positions in the next budget cycle. As funding levels begin to return, it is incumbent upon the District to make the case to the Board of School Trustees and to the State of Nevada that we are facing aging infrastructures and the need for funding is great.

When the District starts building schools again, Frank Hawkins suggested that the District have someone with some history and knowledge about maintenance in order to build schools that can sustain low-maintenance costs.

Mr. McIntosh explained that based on efficiency studies, utility usage, and utilization, three of the four prototypes that were built in 2010 will be used to build elementary schools for the future building program.

3.05 SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG.

Trustee Linda Young introduced Stephanie Carcia-Vause. Ms. Carcia-Vause is the project director for Southern Nevada Strong, and the Community Development and Services Director for the City of Henderson.

Ms. Carcia-Vause provided copies of information that included a pamphlet “Southern Nevada Strong, regional plan at-a-glance,” “Share Your Vision!,” “SNS White Paper: Supporting the Education Imperative: The Role of Community Development – Draft 11/7/13,” and “Get Involved Today.”

Following a short video promoting Southern Nevada, addressing issues resulting from the recession, and promoting many amenities to build a stronger Southern Nevada, Ms. Carcia-Vause explained that through the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition application for a federal grant, we were one out of 29 communities across the country to receive a federal grant to work on sustainable communities.

The \$3.5 million grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and another \$1.5 million in in-kind time will assist to better connect transportation with jobs and housing that will lead to a healthier community and can support education.

Southern Nevada Strong is a collaborative effort in its third year and will continue their public outreach. Ms. Carcia-Vause referred members to the flyer, “Get Involved Today,” and invited members to share their thoughts by attending opportunity open houses along Boulder Highway, downtown North Las Vegas, Las Vegas Medical District, and the Maryland Parkway corridor.

3.06 REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

None.

3.07 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Ruby Alston stated that a Facility Condition Index report is included in the reports provided today.

Jim McIntosh stated that the revenue updates to the bond fund are included as well.

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

Trustee Linda Young confirmed members received the Pledge of Achievement and stated that as trustees they have their strategic imperatives, and thanked the committee members for their service.

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

None.

3.10 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Motion was approved for staff to provide a follow-on presentation by the Maintenance Department on their performance measures and a periodic presentation semi-annually on how it is progressing because it does affect the capital funds.

*Motion: Lazaroff Second: Hawkins Vote: Unanimous
Al Davis, Joyce Haldeman, and George Lopez not in attendance*

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

5. ADJOURN: 2 p.m.

*Motion: Hawkins Second: Tate Vote: Unanimous
Al Davis, Joyce Haldeman, and George Lopez not in attendance*