

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, APRIL 21, 2016

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bowler, Richard	Lopez, George
Halsey, Jim	Morley, Thomas
Kubat, Charles	Philpott, Steve
Lavelle, Lisa	Reynolds, Jacob
Lazaroff, Gene	White, Eva

Members Absent

Davis, Al
Earl, Debbie
Munford, Harvey
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 April 21, 2016, agenda.

Motion: Morley

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion for approval of the Minutes for the March 17, 2016, agenda.

Motion: Lavelle

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES. None.

3.03 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

Mr. Kubat questioned one of the reports, the 1998 Capital Improvement Program, Interim Capital Plan, Projects in Progress as of March 2016 (Ref. 3.03 [F]), page 1 of 10, where it raises red flags. He asked staff to address the reasons for the red flags. He asked if the projects are over budget the entire program due to the increase of additional classrooms, or because of the previous discussions pertaining to the legislation. Mr. Cumbers responded there were changes in the scope due to the bigger size of the schools including the five construction manager at-risk projects.

3.03 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. (continued)

Mr. Kubat asked from the original estimate of the cost per square foot if there is tracking relative to the cost per square foot of the original budget. Mr. Cumbers stated that this has been an issue, but is being addressed going forward. He said another issue being faced with right now is the increasing cost similar to those five or six years ago. Ms. Lavelle commented it would be helpful if the report would include project by project of cost overruns for a better analysis to understand at what point the problems are surfacing and what is being done to address them. Mr. Cumbers stated that the bottom line is, the cost estimates of any project is an imperfect science. He continued by stating that trying to estimate what these projects are going to cost and on these first set of projects we're seeing what the current environment is – labor costs is the major component of these projects. He said that going forward staff will try to do a better job of estimating what the costs will be.

Mrs. Alston explained the different components, status, original estimate, budget impact increase/decrease, and the project/remaining value in progress. She stated that the building per-square-foot cost on the original estimate and what staff is seeing on the bids are very close. She stated she did not know why the site costs are higher but that she will report back to the committee next month.

Mr. Kubat commented that staff needs to do value engineering and make sure they consider in the process the long time maintenance and life cycle costs of materials and systems. He also stated that in the past when we were building so fast, we had issues with qualified contractors and different contractors doing work for the District that limited our pool of qualified contractors to a degree. He encouraged staff to find a way through contractors' input on how the District could do better to qualify more contractors for projects. He stated this would be a great resource for the District to go forward with that knowledge and background and possibly not wait and start with these first projects – try to learn something from that point of view as well as on the design, bid, build side with feedback from those contractors.

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

School Naming Committee: Trustee Young thanked the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) for their services. She also acknowledged Trustee Wright and Trustee Garvey's presence at this meeting. Trustee Young began by providing the BOC with updated information on the School Naming Committee (SNC), for which Trustee Wright is the Chair. She stated this committee met on February 22, and on March 29, 2016, and that they recommended changes to P-7223 on Naming of Schools and Educational-Related Facilities. Trustee Young said that "Notice of Intent" will be going to the Board on May 12, 2016, and that they will be reviewing changes to policy #7223 for final approval and adoption. (She said that anyone needing more information can call Cindy Krohn, the Board's Executive Secretary, at the Board Office (702) 799-1072.) She spoke on the highlights of modifications that included: (1) opening the naming of elementary and middle schools to include former District employees and citizens; (2) the process for when a school closes and what happens to the name of that school that is closing; (3) the SNC will be releasing for "Call for Nominations" for six elementary schools opening in the Fall of 2017. This information will be on the Clark County School District (CCSD) Website and applications will be available in mid-May 2016.

3.04 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIAISON. (continued)

In September 2016, applications will be available for six more new elementary schools. In October 2016, applications will be available for six more new elementary schools. In December 26, 2016, the SNC will be recommending and looking for approval from the Board for naming six new elementary schools.

Property Tax: Trustee Young spoke about the "Property Tax" initiated by the Nevada Legislature that was capped at 3 percent back in 2005 that took into effect in 2006. She said now we have a 10-year average of taxes. She stated that there is a statement by the legislators that states that the home property tax cannot be higher than the business tax which further lowers our property tax. She said now we have a 0.2% in terms of growth.

Assembly Bill (AB) 394: Trustee Young updated the BOC on AB394 that has changed from the "break-up" of the CCSD, to the "Reorganization" of the CCSD. On Thursday, April 7, 2016, the AB394 Legislative Advisory Committee met and voted to hire Mike Strembitsky as a consultant to develop a District plan related to empowerment. Trustee Young said Mr. Strembitsky will advise the CCSD on taking that concept of empowerment schools and taking it to all of CCSD's 357 schools.

3.05 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 19.

Mr. Cumbers updated the BOC on the actions that the Board of School Trustees (BOST) took at the meeting April 6, 2016, Board Work Session. He discussed the presentation previously presented to the BOC regarding the two major issues: (1) the 1998 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Revision 19, and, (2) the 2015 Capital Improvement Program, Revision 1.

1998 Capital Improvement Program: Two Options – Option 2 was the recommendation from this committee to the BOST that was approved and included:

- (1) Increase in scope for the West Prep Academy, Preparatory Institute School for Academic Excellence at Charles I. West, Elementary School Addition
- (2) Increase in scope and budget for the Boulder City HS project
- (3) Set money aside for the parking and flooring at Southeast Career and Technical Academy
- (4) \$9 million for the Virgin Valley High School Gymnasium

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 1.

Mr. Cumbers reported that this item included the "Seven Decisions" on a previous presentation that included a range of projects including new schools in different calendar years, school additions in different calendar years – 2017, 2018, and 2019, and also included the following:

- (1) Replacement Schools
- (2) Five Phased Replacement Schools
- (3) Modernization of numerous projects

The BOST considered this committee's recommendations and approved as recommended with the caveat that there is flexibility within those decisions to make some changes as conditions merit or

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 1. (continued)

other opportunities come forth. Mr. Cumbers said that the Facilities' staff's direction is to go forward with the "Seven Decisions" as recommended by the BOC and approved by the BOST.

Discussion:

Mr. Kubat commented on the John C. Fremont Professional Development Program as was discussed at the previous BOC. He had asked staff to consider this program when taking the recommendation forward to the BOST. Mr. Cumbers responded that he would let Mr. McIntosh address this. Mr. McIntosh clarified that this issue pertains to instructional programs and Facilities staff does not make determinations regarding instructional programs and where they are implemented. He said the Superintendent and the Chief Student Achievement Officer make those decisions. Mr. McIntosh also added that there is a process regarding closing a school, and there is a statute associated with closing a school, as well as a Board policy associated with closing a school. He stated it requires at community input hearing and it also requires a study regarding instructional programs that are at that school. He said what staff is recommending is a Capital Process.

Mr. Morley asked about the architect selection. Mr. Cumbers responded that it hasn't been done yet. He stated that as of April 6, 2016, the Board added 36 new projects to our agenda and we have over 100 projects currently.

Questions on Agenda Item:

Speaker #1: Mike Taack, On-Site Professor, John C. Fremont Professional Development Middle School (PDMS). Mr. Taack stated he did not receive requests for information from staff even though he prepared it. He provided the BOC and staff with a brochure on the John C. Fremont Professional Development Middle School (PDMS), Professional Development School Program Information. He stated he did not attend the April 6, 2016, Board Work Session, but did listen to the hour and a half audio and he stated there was no mention of the Fremont PDMS. Mr. Taack stated it is important to have this program in the inter-city schools and he said this program has shown success in their school.

Speaker #2: Shawn Kelly, Teacher at John C. Fremont PDMS. Mr. Kelly stated stakeholders need to be informed as to what is happening with the school from the principal to the families because he said nobody knew about the school being closed down. He said there was communication with students and these students formulated and asked why this school is being taken away with no discussion. Students asked why not renovate, improve, or build a new school. He said students feel the positive affect on partnering with universities and having classrooms with college students.

Speaker #3: Cesilia Arroyo, Parent, speaking on behalf of all the parents that don't speak English. She stated she is concerned about the closing of John C. Fremont PDMS. She said nobody received notification and that parents would like to have

3.06 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, REVISION 1. (continued)

bilingual letters sent out so that they are informed on the school's events and issues.

Speaker #4: Laura Lopez, Non-English speaking parent of two students, one in the 6th and one in the 8th grade. She addressed her concerns in Spanish. She stated she was upset about the notification letter she received today regarding the closing of the school and was not asked for an opinion. She stated parents did not receive the notification letters in Spanish and would like this process changed. She also stated that the majority of students attending John C. Fremont PDMS, walk to school. She said any other school would be too far and is uncertain if transportation would be provided. She said she would like to know if this committee could help regarding holding a meeting so that the bilingual community could voice their opinion with their concerns.

Mr. Morley asked Mr. Halsey if in the future a translator could be provided. Mr. Halsey replied that it is not an expense that he could authorize – CCSD would be the one to authorize it. Mr. Morley asked “What if I donate one?” Mr. Halsey replied that, that is something he would have to consult with the District.

The question was asked why the school is being closed. Mr. McIntosh commented that the school is not closing. He stated the recommendation given to this committee on the 2015 CIP, Revision 1, on these two schools, John C. Fremont PDMS and J. D. Smith MS, was because they met the replacement criteria – they are both very old, both under enrolled, and both require replacement. Mr. McIntosh stated the analysis was to build J. D. Smith as a middle school and rezone, and rebuild Fremont MS as an elementary school because of the need for elementary capacity in that particular area. He stated the recommendation from staff to this committee was accepted and taken to the BOST and they approved the recommendation, but this does not mean that it is moving forward for closure, it means staff will go forward with beginning the process of this project. Mr. McIntosh stated that CCSD staff, moving forward, will follow the statutes and the policies and have the community input meetings and discuss the information District staff receives, and based off that information, staff will decide what the best plan is moving forward.

Mr. Reynolds wanted clarification for the record that it is his understanding that this plan is at least three years away and that discussion and meetings will be taking place before anything is demolished.

Ms. Lavelle commented about this committees' recommendation and on the flexibility that this decision included – that the intent was not for absolute closure and that any concerns would be addressed before any actions were taken to close or build.

Mr. Philpott commented that John C. Fremont PDMS's location offers a unique location for the community, and should be looked at more closely. He said because the Baker Park Pool offers a unique opportunity for the District to work with the City of Las Vegas and Mayor Goodman to make it a new academy, K-8th grade, and offers all types of curriculum development for students from UNLV. He said he thinks maybe the facts and figures were worked up too closely, but left the community and students out of the equation.

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

Dr. White acknowledged that there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UNLV and the District, and that there is a formal agreement.

Trustee Young thanked the speakers who showed up to address their concerns. She stated that as a Trustee, that the District is very careful about getting the community involved and hearing their voices prior to any real discussions about closures. She said that from a Trustee’s point of view, they make sure that the community is informed and that their input is brought forth to the table. She closed by stating she would work with these concerned members on this issue.

Motion was approved to remove item three, dated 3/19/15 (by Lisa Lavelle), from the RFPs and Contracts, from the Motions and Taskings, page 1 of 3.

Motion: Lavelle Second: Kubat Vote: Unanimous

Motion was approved to remove item two, dated 6/18/15, from the Funding of Future Land Acquisitions/Off-Site Improvements, from the Motions and Taskings, page 2 of 3.

Motion: Lazaroff Second: Reynolds Vote: Unanimous

Motion was approved to remove the first two items dated 6/18/15 and 5/21/15, from the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan, from the Motions and Taskings, page 2 of 3.

Motion: Kubat Second: Morley Vote: Unanimous

Motion was approved to remove item one, dated 7/16/15, from the Deferred Maintenance, from the Motions and Taskings, page 3 of 3.

Motion: Halsey Second: Reynolds Vote: Unanimous

Discussion:

Ms. White asked Mr. Lazaroff if item: Criteria for Educational and Functional Requirements could be removed, and Mr. Lazaroff replied there are issues that have not been resolved and would like to leave it in the Motions and Taskings. He stated storage facilities is a big issue at schools; circulation, special purpose rooms, gyms, scoreboards, and turf issues of field; safety issues – artificial vs. regular grass fields.

3.08 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Motion was made for a presentation on what the process is for selection of architects and engineers, and why.

Questions:

Mr. Kubat in summary commented there was a previous presentation not that long ago, when Mr. Cumbers brought forth a list of architects/engineers not that long ago and he suggested maybe whether than take up this committee’s time for another presentation, maybe it would be more useful to have a one-on-one discussion with Mr. Cumbers.

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

Trustee Garvey commented that the conversation the Trustees' had at the April 6, 2016, meeting was not on "flexibility" and that it did not center around John C. Fremont PDMS at all. She said the conversation from the Board was on the investments in our prototypes; how we are selecting architects by making sure things are kept local as much as possible and not given to a brand new partner when they don't have the experience and referred to the experience with "Big Town", and what happened with that contractor. She stated that the Trustees want to expand the ability to have a good variety of partners to work with and not limited to one or two. Trustee Garvey expressed her point of view: that she would like this committee to know what the criteria is – will a full school go to a brand new partner – she said this is what her input to her representative pertained to.

Mr. Kubat asked if Mr. Cumbers believes that this request goes beyond what was presented before.

Mr. Cumbers commented that the question at issue is not the number of architects on the list, but the assignment of work to those architects. He said if this committee would like to set qualifications for staff to assign work or give staff direction as to how to do that process, then this committee could make that recommendation to staff. Mr. Cumbers clarified that staff was previously asked to "expand" a list of architects and that is exactly what was presented. Dr. White wanted clarification if the question was, "how do you select architects and engineer" but really the question is, "once architects/engineers are selected, how are the jobs assigned," and asked if that was really the question," because she wanted to know whether to go "Yeah" or "Nay." Mr. Halsey responded that, "that is the way it is interpreted by them."

Motion: Morley

Second: Lavelle

Vote: Unanimous

Motion was made for a presentation from the Networking Department and the Surveillance Department to explain their process when building new schools.

Questions:

Mr. McIntosh asked for clarification on the request. He informed the BOC that the Networking Department and the Surveillance Department are two different departments in the District; he asked what specifically the committee would like the focus to be. Mr. Halsey responded that it needs to include the process and how staff determines what they need in the school such as materials and engineering. Mr. Cumbers commented these departments have a set of criteria including the specifications for elementary schools but not comprehensive with regard to other schools. He said since staff is not building middle schools or high schools, the specifications have not been revisited for these schools from five-to-six years back. This presentation would apply broadly to every building built. Mr. Philpott asked for clarity if Networking Services is determining if each student will have an iPad or other type of device for these new schools that are opening. Ms. White responded that she works with principal groups and discussions are held to determine the needs they have on educational/ instructional needs based on costs and what the people want (depending on what schools can afford). She said "best practices" are applied to all future elementary schools. She also clarified that one-on-one technology is not in the future Ed Specs.

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

Motion on Question was voted on unanimously.

Motion: Reynolds

Second: Morley

Vote: Unanimous

Motion was made for a presentation to review elementary, middle, and high school prototypes.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Halsey

Vote: Unanimous

Motion was made for a presentation on the construction of Empowerment Schools and how it is implemented; the effects and process.

Trustee Young clarified that at this time this is only a “concept” and does not involve construction – she said that this is way down the line.

Motion was rescinded.

4.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Mike Taack, Speaker, thanked the committee for listening on the John C. Fremont Professional Development Middle School and for taking the time to review the material he provided today. He also stated he wanted Mrs. Rios to refer to them in the Minutes as, *Professional Development Middle School*.

5.0 ADJOURN: 1:06 p.m.

Motion: Kubat

Second: Reynolds

Vote: Unanimous