

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

At our last meeting we had our review of the business operations and report from the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS), there were several places in there where we need to dig down a little deeper to find out what the true landscape was and how we fall into practices compared to other large districts. I think there were some issues there with regard to our indexing for zoning. It wasn't clear to the council representatives that we do have those things in place. I think there is information in there that is of some benefit, there's some things that we need to look at more, and others that need to be corrected.

Today's information is going to be very important as we go into the legislative session. The governor had quite a few things on his docket and tax increases wasn't one of them so I think creativity in how we use our resources in our current tax structure to do those things that are most important to us and part of that is providing a safe place for our children to get a safe education. We'll be doing our retreat tomorrow and looking at our strategic plan and at that point there may be some things that come back that effect this committee's decisions.

Mr. Kubat: The governor did make specific mention of the state school safety report and I wonder whether the board has thought anymore about how to proceed. It sounded like from his comments that the report is finished. I know Mr. Neal wasn't going to be able to formulate its own plan until that was finished. So I was just wondering if there has been any discussion or update on that whole issue.

Trustee Garvey: From the boards prospective I'm thinking that will be part of tomorrow's conversation in that corrective strategic plan.

Mr. Neal: It hasn't been discussed specifically through the cabinet, however, the superintendent has received a report from the committee. He is also waiting to assess how the governor is going to allocate that funding, because the superintendent has spoken about that a number of times. There's an overall budgetary number in his budget for what the funding for school safety will be but how that will be allocated across the state is still unclear. That will impact how we implement some of those recommendations of the safety committee, but that has not been finalized yet.

Mr. Kubat: I'm particularly interested in knowing how your plan to move forward as a district on our own plan in response to the governor's work and the discussions we've had here.

Mr. Neal: I think that the bottom line is there's a commitment to move forward but it is obviously tied to resources both those and current district resources.

Trustee Garvey: You can always come over. Our retreat starts at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow in the Public Ed Foundation. We have a public speaking comment period that you could add those to the discussion.

3.05 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES.

Mr. Cumbers: Good morning everyone. I'm about to give you a 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Major Projects Update. For the 2015 CIP construction costs for schools projecting costs for the future, what this shows you is the current estimate for approved projects which is almost 4.5 billion dollars and our approved budget is 4.1 billion dollars so we have a shortfall. The estimated value of requested new projects that \$331,910,000.00 it's noted that it includes the Sandy Valley

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.05 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES. (cont.)

High School which you had asked us as a committee to include for consideration but you did not formally recommend it to the Board of School Trustees (BOST), and also the Las Vegas Academy of the Arts Phased Replacement is included in this number. So you see the discrepancies between what has been approved and what our estimated costs is at this time totals \$705,545,000.00.

The new schools status, estimated completion date, and estimated costs were gone over. We are very close to the resolution of the issue with Chapata Drive and Casady Hollow Avenue of the ILA.

Mr. Neal: The City of Henderson is reviewing the ILA language at the staff level to see if that would be acceptable to the Henderson City Council and then at that point once we both agree that we have something that both of our respective governing boards can sign up to then we'll immediately start the briefing on our side to our BOST and get it on the earliest agenda that we possibly can. The previous ILA was very specific about changes that the district made but it didn't address changes that the City might have made

Mr. Kubat: The idea of the caps on the student numbers how has that been resolved?

Mr. Neal: I think you're referring to the ordinance that came forward before. There was a cap that was agreed upon for this school at 719. The ordinance that we had the City of Henderson present, they removed those caps from that ordinance so that's a totally separate issue. This school in particular, there was a tentative agreement that we could agree to a cap on this one and the ILA lines out clearly how that cap works and if there is a need to increase, what that entails. This is not for all schools, this ILA is just for this one.

Mr. Kubat: So if whatever conditions in terms of enrollment zones or building in the area or anything else that would cause a need for more students there, the district could add portables to meet that need?

Mr. Neal: There's a process for doing that, we'd have to go back and get entitlements for those portables, but yes.

Ms. Earl: So just for clarification if 800 did show up you would just jam them all in the building?

Mr. Neal: We wouldn't have a choice in that case anyway. We couldn't get a portable up that quickly.

Ms. Douglass: I would like to speak as a principal on that. You know ahead of time, we check it every day. We start way before school starts so you have ample time. When I get concerned about my student numbers I call HR immediately, I call my Associate Superintendent and there's a process they go through even in a regular building. So I'm sure it's going to be similar to that other than Henderson is going to be notified by the Associate Superintendent, through the school district right? So even if you're going to show up with 800. I showed up my first year built for 800 and I showed up with 1100 students so there's a process in place no matter where you are with the district. Portables were ordered way ahead of time so I could get them there.

Mr. Kubat: This school is being designed for a smaller number than a typical design and if I remember correctly they're paying for the redesign. From a personal standpoint and what the committee has expressed before is that it's extremely bad precedent to allow a jurisdiction to

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.05 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES. (cont.)
dictate the size of any one school contrary to the standards that we have already established. I'm extremely concerned that we will see a whole wave of similar requests by other parts of our community to have smaller schools.

Mr. Cumbers: The genesis of this was not the same as the ordinance. The request to reduce the size of the school goes from the concerns of the community relative to the site and the traffic around the site access, access to the site, etc. The ordinance was targeted to reduce the size of schools going forward for all schools. At this particular site is the result of numerous community meetings and feedback from those committee members to their elected representatives for the COH and there were negotiations that were resolved regarding the issues raised by the constituents. I just wanted to point out the difference of what was the intent of the ordinance and what was the result of this negotiation as opposed to seeking the entitlements to the school.

Mr. Neal: For our staff just to take note we heard you loud and clear as a group so that when we bring this agreement to the board and we express the concerns that were expressed here today along with it as we bring it to the board for final approval.

Some discussion continued.

- 3.06 FULL NEEDS OF SCHOOL FACILITIES.

Mr. Cumbers: This is a full needs presentation. We have referred to this many times as to what the full needs of the capital program are and on multiple occasions the BOC has asked us also to consider what are the full needs for the related work that causes capital projects. I'm referring the maintenance that we do on our buildings and the preventive maintenance that we do on our buildings. What we've offered up for the BOC to consider and eventually the BOST to consider is the linked notion that you need to fund your maintenance program properly and fund your deferred maintenance and your preventive maintenance. What we're really asking to do is eventually raise the level of maintenance to our school buildings to a much higher level. Ultimately our goal is to strategically do away with the concept of deferred maintenance. We do our preventive maintenance as it's scheduled in order to be good stewards of the assets that we have and prolong the life of our assets.

We have more than 37 million square feet of school buildings and 6,578 acres of land, 5,171 acres is developed and 1,407 is vacant. Regarding the age of our buildings, we have many buildings that are 10-19 years old and soon they'll be over 20 years old. This is critical because it's at that time that you really start to experience the failure of building components and the need to do a replacement on many of the building components. The next slide discusses the industry standards for good stewardship in the maintenance area. CCSD is currently at level 3.75. The next slide is a similar presentation with regards to grounds. CCSD is currently at level 4.

Trustee Garvey: When we look at the service level agreements that were put together for say landscaping. Did it target performance at level 4 or did it target performance somewhere else?

Mr. Cumbers: Level 4 because that's what we are currently capable of funding and supporting. So what we've provided in our service level agreement to the schools is the schedule of work that we are currently able to provide. So it's a frequency of service to a particular school and then the activities that occur within that visit to the school, the type of mowing and trimming, turf control, and

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.06 FULL NEEDS OF SCHOOL FACILITIES. (cont.)

etc. And it goes even deeper than that to the tasks that are performed that are reasonable in nature, the things we do relative to the repair of irrigation, testing of irrigation, as well as fertilization and things like that.

Trustee Garvey: When I was looking at the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS) report where the council has those other schools within that group report how much it costs to do certain things, the average costs for grounds cost per acre was a little over \$1,200 per acre. Ours was like \$5,200. But when you get to a cost per student we're within cents of each other.

Mr. Cumbers: Yes, that's why I think the data is suspect in the CGCS API's. When you look at key performance indicators across all of the couple hundred indicators that they have for maintenance and grounds there's some discrepancies.

Mr. Neal: Another important factor on the data when you look at it, when they are reporting the data for the API's in that report, that's 2016-2017 data so it is a little bit dated but that doesn't absolve the issues that have already been identified with how people report, because it is self-reporting from multiple districts.

Mr. Cumbers: We had the Association of Physical Plan Administrators (APPA) visit in 2017 and asked them to give us an overview of maintenance standards and practices very much like the CGCS did. Their conclusion was that CCSD maintenance and grounds departments have been historically underfunded. It's the same result from the CGCS report. They compare the operations expenses for 74 schools in the members of the CGCS and we are dead last in terms of our expenses.

When you look at the CGCS report please understand that you are comparing an underfunded organization to 73 other underfunded organizations.

Trustee Garvey: For the APPA are there filters because a large plant like Tesla where they have the same square footage that we do but definitely doesn't have as many children running through it all the time. Were there filters that gave you choices of high density usage, anything like that?

Mr. Cumbers: Not particularly. They did have some other filters, for instance, they recommended that in addition to this number here you might consider the drive time that our people experience to get from A to B in an urban area. It might add time to the technicians' ability to complete tasks.

Turning to deferred maintenance, it's a fact that for many years we haven't done all the preventive maintenance that we should have and that really needs to change for us to have an impact and it's going to cost more money in the long run in capital investment if we don't do the preventive maintenance that we should do. We cannot defer. As I mentioned earlier our goal is to strategically abandon the whole practice of deferring maintenance. We need to get on top of it and do it as it's scheduled. First and foremost in the delivery of a new school or classroom addition to maintain its' warranty. Later on in the life cycle of the building to extend the use of our buildings and their components. What we have developed in terms of goals for maintenance is to get to a higher level of service and we know we need to do that over time. So we're asking for the strategic budget office and the superintendent and BOST to consider increasing the budget for maintenance over time and to apply some amount of funds to deferred maintenance so that we can chip away at what

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.06 FULL NEEDS OF SCHOOL FACILITIES. (cont.)

we've experienced in the past and we need to do this to avoid excess capital expense. So I hope I've responded to the request that was made that I correlate maintenance activities with the capital activities.

Similarly in grounds we're trying to obtain a higher level of service and we know we need more resources to do that so we are similarly asking for the BOC and BOST to consider the resources that we need to become good stewards for our assets.

The next slide is the industry standards for the replacement of major building systems. This is what I was referring to earlier when you consider the age of our schools. Our schools are aging now because of what we built in a short period of time previously. We built a lot of schools in a short period of time and now a lot of schools are turning 20 and that's when the HVAC systems, the boiler systems need to be replaced, and similarly the low voltage systems and technology is antiquated and needs to be replaced in order to operate. Not only for academic reasons but for efficiency of systems.

The life cycle replacement of the most urgent needs to prevent major building system failures (HVAC, plumbing, electrical, roof) on the "Danger Zone", "Critical Watch", and "Watch" lists is estimated to cost \$1,099,160,588. The strategic goal is to increase funding for the 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Some discussion continued.

Superintendent Jara via phone: May I have an opportunity to make a couple comments? Hopefully I will be at the next BOC meeting. It is definitely on my calendar to get more involved with the process as you can see from the numbers and the budget that we have currently, we have challenges with deferred maintenance and our need to maintain our schools but then also with the challenges of building our future schools and some of the costs from construction that have increased. So what I'd like the team to come back and we'll be reviewing and really looking at the specs of our facilities and we can do some analysis and see where there's opportunity within our facilities where we can be more efficient in our building program and then also see obviously how the great education states for our students pertaining to class size and also see where there's opportunities for us to look at the entire footprint of our schools because I see when I walk buildings and look at our current building structure, I think they're beautiful, but is there an opportunity for us to research and try to shave some costs with impact to our budget as we continue to build. We will be bringing something to the BOC in the next month or so for review.

Mr. Kubat: Back to the student safety and building enhancements I found an interesting article about safer schools and I wondered if that might be something that could be distributed to the BOC members and staff.

Mr. Halsey: Certainly get a copy of it to us.

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

Mr. Halsey: Anything under motions and taskings? Would anyone like to add or remove anything? There being none we'll move on.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Mr. Halsey: Are there any items we would like to add? There being none we'll move on.

4.01 COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT – FACILITIES

Mr. Cumbers: We are bringing the Capital Improvement Revision 4 to the next meeting.

Mr. Kubat: The last time I talked to staff about the physical arrangement in this meeting. As you can see from back and forth here it's not always easy to see who's talking and we have a big distance to cover especially if someone's on the phone and I had recommended that we try and shrink this skew to instead of 4 tables here to 2 tables. So that we could have a better face-to-face conversation with each other and with staff. I find that it's really conducive to us having better communication so I see that it didn't happen this time. I'm hoping that depending on the will of the committee we could ask staff to reconsider this again to get us closer together.

Trustee Garvey: Did the committee feel that the large room on the 4th floor was adequate. I guess my question would be is there any reason why that room can't be used? It was empty when I went by it.

Ms. Monette: I don't know if it's a permanent move but we were advised by staff in the building that this was going to be our meeting room. We were kind of moved here so we can absolutely inquire about moving back up to the 4th floor and see if that's an option. We will take some of the committee's suggestions as well in the event that we are limited to this room instead if we're not able. I will say that the room upstairs is actually a lot easier from a staff perspective because this is a public meeting, it's a recorded meeting so everything is already hooked up up there, where here it's a little bit harder. We will definitely make that request again to the staff in this building to see what we can do.

Mr. Kubat: My recommendation is related to this room and I find it extremely hard for us to have a good conversation with each other with this arrangement. So if we stay here that applies, if we go upstairs that was already at least circular so we had a little better sense of eye to eye contact. I do have one more thing. Jeff Wagner has just been selected as one of about eighteen young architects in the United States to have the honor of Young Architects Award.

5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS.

None.

6.0 ADJOURN.

Mr. Halsey: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Motion: Davis

Second: Kubat

Vote: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 1:02 p.m.