

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, FEBRUARY 18, 2016

11:30 a.m.

---

**Members Present**

Bowler, Richard	Munford, Harvey
Davis, Al	Philpott, Steve
Halsey, Jim	Reynolds, Jacob
Kubat, Charles	White, Eva
Lazaroff, Gene	

**Members Absent**

Bruins, David
Earl, Debbie
Lavelle, Lisa
Lopez, George
Tate, Cameron

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.

1.03 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

*Motion was approved to adopt and accept the February 18, 2016, agenda.*

*Motion: Lazaroff*

*Second: Reynolds*

*Vote: Unanimous*

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

*Jodi Thornley, 1<sup>st</sup> Speaker* – Ms. Thornley clarified her previous statement at the January 21, 2016, BOC meeting. She stated she mistakenly commented on the 1998 Bond Fund money and that the Trustees had told them at graduation that they would be put back on the list for a new gym; however, she meant to say that it was the 2008 Revision List with left over funds. She stated that this gym is very important to the students because sports are what this school has to offer them, giving them the incentive to stay in school and graduate even though they may not go to college. She requested this committee consider recommending to staff to include the addition of a new gymnasium at Virgin Valley HS in the future list of additions, and consider the needs and inequalities of their students.

*Brynlin Thornley, 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker* – Ms. Thornley is a high school student at Virgin Valley HS and she stated she has never been able to attend a sport event at her high school gym because it does not have wheel chair accessibility for a person as herself and is unsafe for anyone that requires wheel chair accessibility. She requested fair treatment with regards to facilities, electives offered, technical programs, and enough staff to ensure an appropriate education.

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. (continued)

*Nick Montoya, 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker* – Mr. Montoya introduced himself as City Administrator for the City of Mesquite, Nevada. He stated that the City of Mesquite’s facility’s scheduling in accommodating the CCSD Virgin Valley HS sport teams is becoming a nightmare. He would like this committee to vote to move forward to the Board of School Trustees (BOST) for next month to propose a new gymnasium at the Virgin Valley property. He stated there’s a lot of community support.

*Bob Sweeten, 4<sup>th</sup> Speaker* – Mr. Sweeten introduced himself as a city attorney and that he was here on behalf of the mayor to answer any questions this committee may have on Virgin Valley gym petition. He said he was here to remind this committee that the City of Mesquite’s athletic participation is much higher, percentage wise, than most rural schools. He also commented that at graduation, it is held outside due to their small gym not having the space to accommodate everyone, and is very hot for families and staff sitting outside on the bleachers. He stated the City is willing to do a lot and whatever it takes for Virgin Valley to get a new gym, even waive permitting fees.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

*Motion for approval of the Minutes for the January 21, 2016, agenda.*

Mr. Kubat disagreed on a reported statement regarding agenda item 3.08 on *School Sites Within Skye Canyon*, (“Mr. Kubat commented he agrees that this high school site is not in the best interest of the District.”) He said he did not remember making that strong statement and would like it double checked and clarified. To clarify and correct the comment from Mr. Kubat; he actually commented that probably from the District’s point of view, it may not be the best site for a high school and maybe from the communities’ point of view relative to kids getting access to the school.

*Motion: Davis*

*Second: Kubat*

*Vote: Unanimous*

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Davis, construction representative, reported that he attended a Safety Commission Meeting asked by the vice-chair per Governor Sandoval, who is looking into new school construction and how to save money. At the meeting, he gave a short testimony on information he received from Mr. McIntosh and Mr. Cumbers at these BOC meetings on how to save money in school construction cost and how to get it to the next level. He stated that some ideas he reported on were from Mr. Lazaroff and the sub-committee.

Mr. Kubat reported on Skye Canyon’s proposed school sites. He stated he visited the sites and met with the representatives for Skye Canyon and took a look at the proposed elementary and high school sites and received an update on what discussions they’ve had with staff in the last 2-3 weeks. Mr. Kubat stated he can share information he acquired to this committee if the need arises.

3.03 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. None.

### 3.04 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIAISON.

Trustee Young reported on what the Trustees will be doing this year is a program called "Board Walk", a health and wellness program. She discussed Maslow's hierarchy of needs that talks about the various needs that students or anyone needs to have to self-actualize. She explained that Abraham Maslow was an educational psychologist and his hierarchy of needs included the following:

1. Physiological Needs – take care of the physical, have clean water, have a good-sleep environment
2. Safety Needs – feeling safe wherever you are
3. Community Needs – you have to feel like you belong to a community
4. Esteem Needs – to feel good about yourself and your surroundings
5. Self-Actualization Needs – that you can become all that you can become

Trustee Young stated the Trustees are doing this program called the "Board Walk" and she invited everyone to participate if they liked. She said it would take place on Saturday, April 16, at Hyde Park, at 9:00 a.m. and are walking from there to Springs Preserve. Trustee Young stated it is critically important that students, families, and communities be aware of these needs because it affects academic achievement and student success.

Trustee Young reported on the meeting she attended on the AB 394 with the Technical Advisory Committee. She stated there were several presentations including the following:

- Anderson Morris, PhD, and Senior Scholar and Co-director of Youth Development of Child Trend – concerning the role of communities in schools
- Julie Rusendoff, Interim Executive Director of *Parents Across America* – Overview of the *Local School Counsel Model*
- Paula Playak – Utah School Community Counsel
- Patrick Trogaven, Deputy Executive Director of State Public Charter Schools Authority – Overview of the Community Involvement on Charter Schools
- Deanna Durich, Deputy Superintendent for Educational Effectiveness and Family Engagement – Nevada Department of Education, Office of Parental Involvement and Family Engagement and the Advisory Counsel on Parental Involvement and Family Engagement

Trustee Young spoke about the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting that will be held on March 28, 2016, and the topic of discussion will be on how to get parents more involved and engaged with what we do in our schools in educational programs.

Trustee Young spoke about Mr. Mike Barton's presentation on our Victory Schools and our needs assessments. She also spoke on the final presentation that was presented at that meeting and that it pertained to parent involvement and engagement in the Clark County School District.

### 3.05 HOT SPOTS UPDATE.

Mr. Blake Cumbers began by introducing the next three presentations by staff and explained why they are being presented. He stated one of these presentations is on the Motions and Taskings and said he hopes it will satisfy the committee. He said these presentations are all about the school sitings – how we site schools and how we site projects, and are all about foundational information for the next BOC meetings to come. He stated he hopes to be able to recommend or agree upon a recommendation to the BOST on these projects. Mr. Cumbers continued by naming the first presentation and said Mr. Rick Baldwin would be the presenter on the Hot Spot Maps and how they are created; the 2<sup>nd</sup> presentation presented by Ms. Ruby Alston is on future renovation projects and the data on the Facility Condition Index (FCI); and the 3<sup>rd</sup> presentation is being presented by Mr. Jeff Wagner on how the trending costs of new elementary schools will be estimated. He stated this sets the foundation of information to this committee for the next meetings to come and hopes to prepare recommendations on these projects to the BOST.

Mr. Baldwin presented the 12-page presentation on Hot Spots Update. He discussed the Clark County School District's school siting methodology based on the following factors:

- $E+E3+SY / \text{Capacity} = \text{Projected percentage of capacity}$   
school **enrollment** + number of **pre-kindergarten** students (not included in state calculations), + the expected district-wide average **student yield**; then dividing this sum by the schools' program capacity. To maintain consistency and classroom equity annually, the following are not included in the capacity calculation:
  - Rooms that are designed for special use, such as offices or teacher workrooms, libraries and multi-purpose rooms, and portable classrooms
- Enrollments – are extracted from the Infinite Campus Student Information System
- District-wide Average Student Yields – an annual district-wide calculation to estimate additional students anticipated from new single-family and multi-family residential development projects
- Development Tracking – residential developments are tracked in three main categories: (1) active developments, (2) planned developments, and (3) hibernation projects – previously started projects but put on hold due to recession (future potential)
- Ranking – all students currently enrolled in each school are counted and are divided by the school's percent capacity then sorted in descending order from the highest to the lowest and assigned a ranking
- Land Assessment – once the school's space needs list has been established, each available and appropriately sized site in the CCSD land inventory is evaluated by proximity of highest need schools. Potential school sites are assessed by the rank and number of schools highest on the needs list in which a new school could possibly provide enrollment relief
- Additions – bringing older schools to classroom equity with the modern building designs 14, 18, or 22-room building, additions may be considered at schools which rank high on the needs list without available land for new school relief. The total number of classrooms per school should not exceed 55 rooms
- Conceptual Maps – planning maps are generated as a feasibility study for enrollment relief impacts of area schools and may be used by traffic engineers for traffic studies and transportation needs

### 3.05 HOT SPOTS UPDATE. (continued)

- *Questions*

Mr. Kubat commented on his request on the Motions and Taskings, that his request was for actual updates on the hot spots. He stated he wasn't sure if this list is satisfying to meet this request. He asked that Hot Spots Update remain on the Motions and Taskings for further evaluation.

Mr. Baldwin explained that the Hot Spot map is only updated once a year – at the beginning of the school year after student enrollment count, and the recalculation of the school's capacity. He stated that the map in this presentation, page 7 of 12, was the development tracking August 2015.

Mr. Kubat suggested rather than provide Hot Spot updates only once every year, he would like this committee be made aware of changes over the course of the year.

Mr. Cumbers responded that moving forward with the 2017, 2018, and 2019 groups of projects, their locations will be presented on the current Hot Spots maps.

Mr. Kubat referred back to the Development Tracking-Example map, page 7 of 12, in particular the Skye Canyon development and stated that based on the conversation with the representatives and his recent visit to this site that there have been changes to this site and tentative maps are underway. He said these changes are not showing on this map. He said it is very important to take into account not just the final map, but the tentative map as well, because it is usually the same as a final map.

Mr. Lazaroff asked if staff was able to resolve the issue with Skye Canyon or are still in negotiations with them on difference between the District and the developer as to how they calculate on their matrix and our matrix on the need for schools based on student population. Mr. Lazaroff stated that based on the original plan, the development went from 70 acres to 50 acres.

Mr. Baldwin responded that the developer used the District's calculation and data.

Mr. Philpott asked if the total number of classrooms should not exceed 55 classrooms, why the District cannot stop counting the rooms out of circulation for different programs that are state mandated and exclude from the 55 classroom count.

Mr. Baldwin responded that this is out of the District's capability – these programs are part of the school's curriculum.

### 3.06 FUTURE RENOVATION PROJECTS BASED ON THE FACILITY CONDITION INDEX.

Ms. Alston presented a 21-page slide presentation on the Future Renovation Projects Based on the Facility Condition Index, and the Current Condition of District Facilities Update. She discussed the following slides:

### 3.06 FUTURE RENOVATION PROJECTS BASED ON THE FACILITY CONDITION INDEX. (continued)

- Current District School Facilities – CCSD holds approximately \$7 billion in facility and land assets since 1913-1955 through the 1998 Capital Improvement Program with a total of 329 school facilities
- Current School Facility Inventory – The breakdown of elementary, middle/Jr. high, high school/career, technical academy, special/alternative schools total 329
- Aging Schools Require Investment – Today 166 or 50% of schools are over 20 years old, and in five years, 204 or 62% of schools will be over 20 years old
- Aging Schools Require Investment – Description of a report from the Council of Great City Schools and the conclusion is that consideration should be taken for utilizing current technology and integrating technology platforms to enable enhanced facility planning at all levels
- What is Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) – Involves a team of one or more specialists inspecting each system in a building to document the condition such as the mechanical, electrical, plumbing and architectural elements in a building
  - The condition is based on any deficiencies noted, the lack of routine maintenance, and the remaining useful life of the system
  - Data from the FCA is captured in the Facility Condition Database (FCD) and maintained. Using this information predicts when system repairs and replacements will be required.
  - Summing up the condition of each system can give you the overall facility condition, allowing you to target the proper level of investment required to maintain the facility.
  - Additional assessments such as educational adequacy studies can be conducted and data captured in the FCD.
    - ✓ Visually obvious condition examples from J.D. Smith and Fremont MS, and Lincoln ES
    - ✓ Visually of sometimes not so obvious system condition examples from Ruth Fyfe ES and Dean L. Petersen ES
  - Facility Condition Assessment – Increased frequency and thoroughness of assessments utilizing our Building Department’s certified inspection staff, and with Oms, FSRs, and maintenance shops. Increased data management & data integration with the maintenance management system.
  - Major building systems included in the assessment and FCI calculation:
    - ✓ HVAC – Useful life 15-25 years
    - ✓ Plumbing – Useful life 20-30 years
    - ✓ Roof – Useful life 15-20 years
    - ✓ Electrical – Useful life 20-30 years
    - ✓ Low voltage (LAN/WAN/Security/Fire Alarm) – Useful life 15-20 years
    - ✓ Classroom upgrade/major modernization – Useful life 10-20/20-35 years
  - What is Facility Condition Index – It is an industry-standard index that measures the relative condition of a facility by considering the cost of deferred maintenance and repairs as well as the value of the facility.

### 3.06 FUTURE RENOVATION PROJECTS BASED ON THE FACILITY CONDITION INDEX. (continued)

- It is calculated by performing a thorough assessment of the facility and data is entered in the FCD and the FCI is a formula or “ratio” used to quantify the major systems replacement needs verses the cost of replacement.
- The predictive data is used to assign a FCI score to each school. The FCI is used to alert the District to facility failures that have the greatest potential to halt or impede teaching and learning.
- Schools meeting the replacement criteria based on 5-year FCI  
There were 11 schools listed of which two are currently in progress (Bell & Lincoln)
- Schools meeting the replacement criteria for phased replacement  
There were five schools listed of which two are currently in progress (Boulder City and Sandy Valley)
- 2015 Capital Improvement Program – Board of School Trustees approved Option B on September 24, 2015. The full needs total is \$8.345 billion and Option B total is \$4.100 billion.
- Available Funding to Address – Modernization/Life Cycle/Equity Needs
  - ✓ The available funding for this category equals 23% of the need, and only \$1.1 billion of the \$4.7 billion need can be funded (\$3.6 billion cannot be funded)

Ms. Alston clarified that on the next BOC meeting, she will have a full list of what is the highest priority of all our 329 schools, what the Bridge List was, and where we are currently. She stated that someone will have to draw the line or make decisions on where the funding will be spent based on the priorities needs list.

### 3.07 TRENDING COSTS OF NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. Jeff Wagner presented a 13-page presentation on Trending Cost of Elementary School Construction based on the 2015 Capital Improvement Program with the following slides:

- Schools in Design – Currently there are six schools in design and two replacement schools.
- Construction Cost Escalation – This slide demonstrated the construction cost escalation from 2003 to 2016, at approximately 54% escalation.
- Nevada Construction Labor Force – In June 2006, employment peaked at 146,600. As of December 2015, employment was at 69,700 – declining 54.5%.
- 2010 CCSD ES Cost – The average total cost was approximately \$17,765,497, and cost per square feet (sq. ft.) was \$163.79, and in 2016 the average cost was \$196.57 per sq. ft.
- 2017 CCSD ES Cost – CCSD intends to build eight elementary schools for the 2017-18 school year. Based on the value-engineering exercises prior to December 2015, the average total cost was estimated at \$31,416,121.13; cost per sq. ft. was \$245.97.
- CCSD New ES Cost, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2015
  - District staff identified cost over-runs exceeding escalated construction cost during the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2015.

### 3.07 TRENDING COSTS OF NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. (continued)

- Decisive action was taken to identify specific high-cost items – 73 items were identified; consequently, the current schools under design were revised to implement strategies appropriate for each site.
- Example of Value-Engineering Items – Epoxy floor coating (cost \$12.00 per sq. ft.) verses porcelain tile (cost \$27.50 per sq. ft.)
- 2017 CCSD ES Cost – Cost estimates incorporating value-engineering strategies. Estimates for the four remaining schools are pending at this time. The average total cost is approximately \$27,271,475.75 at a building cost of \$203.73 per sq. ft.

Mr. Wagner apologized for an error on slide 12, page 12 of 13 on the Chartan and Pioneer ES Prototype – the 2010 Cost is listed at \$179.06 and should have been \$152.12. The rest of the information is correct – the escalation to 2016 is \$186.18 and is at a current estimate cost of \$207.27.

#### *Questions*

Mr. Kubat asked if there has been some attempt to try to get a certain consistency of some of the systems, more from the Maintenance point-of-view, to be predictive in obtaining replacement parts and asked if this is what is being done. Mr. Wagner responded it is being done and that staff has generated a standard to share with the design professionals and they apply it to each individual case.

Mr. Kubat commented that this is very positive and that the example on the epoxy floor coating was a very positive example. He said that it might be interesting for this committee, at some point, be presented with more cost-saving examples like this one.

Mr. Lazaroff commented on the new schools and touched on a previous discussion regarding the District soliciting to outside entities exercising naming rights to reduce the cost of construction for some of our new schools. He stated that he thought it was going to be presented to the Naming Committee and asked Trustee Young if there was a follow-up. Trustee Young responded that there was a meeting to discuss the policy of the naming process as a whole. She said there was some discussion and probably could be brought up to the Naming Committee again. She stated they tended to move toward educators or people in the community that have contributed, irrespective of their financial or capacity status. Trustee Young stated that it wasn't given the strong consideration that this committee thought.

Mr. Lazaroff asked regarding the Maule and Grand Canyon site – if the developer was responsible for the outside costs. He stated that he thought the developer had agreed they would provide the infrastructure up to the parcel and that there would be no outside costs to the District. Mr. Cumbers agreed, but he referred the question to Ms. Linda Perri from Real Property. Ms. Perri responded that the developer is bringing the infrastructure to the site, to the property line and putting the curb together. But she stated that the District is traditionally responsible for any other outside costs from the County such as flashers and cross walks unless we have an agreement with the County for refund agreements.



3.07 TRENDING COSTS OF NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. (continued)

Mr. Philpott asked regarding the new CCSD standard for using epoxy floor tile for existing schools for repairing purposes. Mr. Cumbers responded this new standard will only be used in new renovations to existing schools and the new schools moving forward.

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

*Motion was approved to remove the Hot Spot Analysis item from the Motions and Taskings, page 1 of 3.*

*Motion: Kubat*

*Second: Davis*

*Vote: Unanimous*

*Discussion:*

*Mr. Lazaroff stated he wasn't satisfied with the presentation on the Bureau of Land Management on January 21, 2016, and did not want to remove it from the Motions and Taskings. Mr. Cumbers requested clarification on what staff can do to satisfy Mr. Lazaroff's request on BLM issues. Mr. Kubat suggested staff and committee members satisfy the questions either via e-mail or a meeting. Mr. Lazaroff agreed to provide Mr. Cumbers a list of questions he would like addressed. Mr. Lazaroff stated he would create a list of things that the BLM did not cover but should have covered including working up the plan and how the plan works and would pass it on to staff and see if staff agrees. Mr. Kubat suggested that Mr. Lazaroff's comments to staff still go forward and that staff provide answers. Mr. Reynolds stated that the previous presentation was very informative to him and agreed that staff has no responsibility to this committee and that it is unfair to have staff continue to present on this BLM item.*

*Motion to have the Bureau of Land Management item removed from the Motions and Taskings, with the stipulation that if Mr. Lazaroff has specific questions, he should direct them to staff or to the BLM.*

*Motion: Reynolds*

*Second: White*

*Vote: 8 – Yeas 1 – Nea Motion: Passes*

*Discussion:*

*Ms. Eva White asked Mr. Philpott for clarification on why the Funding of Future Land Acquisitions/Off-Site Improvements item on the Motions and Taskings, page 2 of 3, was requested to remain on the list and wanted to know the history behind it. Mr. Philpott responded he thought it was because he needed more information on the off-site cost. Mr. Kubat suggested that rather than have this item come back to this committee, that maybe it can be resolved by staff answering all questions and listing what the off-site costs are. Mr. Philpott agreed on the suggestion. Mr. Cumbers responded that he would provide the answers.*

3.09 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

*Motion for Mr. Wagner to present more listings of efficiencies that have been found and trade-offs that were done would be helpful for this committee to understand and share with constituencies. Mr. Davis requested a friendly amendment – that this be done through e-mail and not bring back to this committee; if not satisfactory to anyone, then it would be presented in a public meeting. Mr. Kubat commented that if the e-mail captures visualization as well, it would be very helpful.*

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

*Motion: Kubat*

*Second: Davis*

*Vote: Unanimous*

*Amended Motion: Davis*

*Second: Reynolds*

*Vote: Unanimous*

**4.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. None.

5.0 ADJOURN: 1:38 p.m.

*Motion: Davis*

*Second: Kubat*

*Vote: Unanimous*