CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Teleconference Live Stream on CCSD.com

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021

Members Absent

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Blackman-Taylor, Jeana Charlton, Patricia Earl, Debbie Goynes, Byron Gurdison, Robert Jones, Walter 11:42-1:04 Konrad, Chad Lehman-Donadio, Nicole joined @ 11:55 Lopez, Alfonso

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Facilities Services Unit at 702-799-0591.

1.01 ROLL CALL.

Mr. Byron Goynes, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:31 a.m.

- 1.02 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA. Motion was approved to adopt and accept the March 18, 2021 agenda. Motion: Charlton Second: Konrad Vote: Unanimous
- 2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON AGENDA ITEMS.

The following comment was submitted via voicemail:

Ms. Binder: Hi my name is Anna Binder. I'm calling on agenda item 3.05 for today's bond oversight committee. I just wanted to know, I looked through all the documents from the last meeting coming forward and I'm a little disappointed on the provided spreadsheet. It doesn't show any breakdown of how many students are serviced at each of these schools. As a member of the public from the outside looking in I can't really tell how you break down the numbers between the districts. It really makes no sense. In each district there are schools that don't service more than 1000 students and they're getting anywhere from \$10 million to \$30 million when there's other schools that service more students that aren't getting quite that much funding. I'm hoping that you guys will discuss that in more detail today. When a school like Gunderson in Mountain's Edge is getting \$64 million and only services over 1700 students and we have other high schools like Eldorado that service 2300 students only getting \$11 million for either new or replacement schools. We are just looking at that and scratching our heads so hopefully today's meeting will provide some clarification.

Mr. Wagner: It's not typical procedure to respond to the public comment, however, I think the simple answer is that our allocation of numbers as you will see today is driven by a data-driven process. The variance in a brand new build school like Gunderson costs more money than a limited modernization project such as is occurring at Eldorado. In the presentation today this represents the bond fund spent from 2015 capital improvement. It does not represent total capital

- 2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON AGENDA ITEMS. (cont.) monies spent at any particular campus or history of that campus, GST funds that are spent on capital projects at schools, or statutory reserve dollars that are spent at schools.
- 3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. Motion to approve the February 18, 2021 minutes. Motion: Charlton Second: Earl

Vote: Unanimous

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Ms. Earl: Al and I were able to meet last week with Jeff and Justin to discuss some of the comments that came up in our last meeting. We discussed how the 1998 bond program funds, which delivered more schools than anticipated, got us through until the 2015 CIP. The problem with the 1998 program is that it was very limited in how funds could be spent. You could basically only use those funds for new construction and they could not be used to modernize schools. The difference between the new schools and the older ones was drastic so when it came to the 2015 CIP equity was on our minds. However, at that time because of growth new teachers had to be hired and the budget was not there to go into schools that needed it. At that time the priority was to hire teachers and not to maintain the buildings therefore maintenance got deferred. You cannot compare what's being spent in each district. There was less money being spent at schools in the outside areas because those areas got the newer schools and they got more of the 1998 bond money. Those schools are not in as much need as the schools inside the city. You may very likely see the numbers for the middle of the city go even hirer and the outlying areas may not get as much. You can't compare how much money each district has because we're not looking at equality, we're looking at equity. We also spoke about the issue brought up at the last meeting regarding hiring project control managers. It became clear that they are not needed. Staff already has in place policies and procedures and there are multiple checks and balances. There have been many outside audits that have said that things are being run smoothly. However Jeff and Justin did say that if the BOC would like a presentation to review that they would be happy to do one. On the Motions and Taskings there is an agenda subject regarding the number of minority contractors CCSD has used and the cost of projects and programs used to reach out to minority owned businesses. That presentation will be brought forward in April or May.

Mr. Lopez: They are doing their job efficiently and the data proves it.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: I met with Jeff and his team. Before 2015 there was a need for 54 elementary schools and now we have a seat for every student in the district. That is a tremendous achievement. Sometimes when we look at the things that need to be changed we forget about all of the success that have happened to date. Jeremy Aguero will be bringing forward a bond presentation in the April meeting. This will be a summary of how the bond extension is being presented to the legislature. With Byron I've set up a town hall template that we're working through to give a set format for groups that may want to have a town hall on the BOC to clarify some of those questions that continually come up.

3.03 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIAISON. Trustee Guzman: I reached out to Jeff and Chairman Goynes. We discussed having a retreat for this committee so that you can meet with some of the facilities staff. I will be talking to the board

- 3.03 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIAISON. (cont.) about it and also discussing it with Mr. Wagner. I feel that if the committee's questions are answered and we go through the bylaws we will continue to do great work.
- 3.04 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) SUMMARY STATUS. Mr. Foutz presented the Clark County School District (CCSD) 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Summary Status Report Revenues and Expenditures as of January 31, 2021 as well as the CCSD 2015 CIP Projects in Process Report as of January 2021.

Mr. Konrad: Looking at the total current estimated costs it looks like they decreased from the prior month by about \$13-14 million. About \$13 million of that was from Gene Ward and Ira J. Earl. Can you provide an explanation on what caused the decrease in those areas?

Mr. Foutz: Once the bid process comes in compared to what the original budget was then compared to the design changes as far as what our Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) stated I will reduce those budget amounts in the current budget column to be more reflective.

Ms. Charlton: What are you seeing in the trends? I know that you have bids that are coming in or have been delivered that are coming in lower but we are starting to see some escalation in the overall environment in supply chain and limitations on contractor availability. Are you projecting any limitations or challenges as we move forward?

Mr. Wagner: We saw very favorable conditions over our last two elementary school bids. We are being told by our general contractors that there was a lull in work in the subcontractor market. That was why those bids were so competitive. We had more participation in those bids than we have traditionally had. What we are seeing and hearing from the industry is that we should not continue to expect that as we will be seeing an upward trend. We're seeing that suppliers are ramping up their production because they don't think they'll be able to keep up with the demand. So while we've enjoyed some cost savings over the last year I think moving into next year with the infusion of federal dollars we will see escalation and it will be harder to find skilled trades with the capacity to do the work.

Mr. Goynes: Does the school district know how much of the Cares Act money is coming down? Will it go towards the upgrade of the schools based on a priority list?

Mr. Wagner: We don't have a precise number of how much money will be coming to the school district. There's been reports that it may be up to \$800 million. That money will be distributed in a number of ways. It is the priority of the superintendent and the cabinet to support education as much as possible, specifically technology in the classroom and robust distance education. We are putting together a baseline of the current technology for every classroom in the district to determine what that cost will be. Staff is also working on how much it would take to make across the board mechanical upgrades to every school to increase outdoor air, adding active purification and things of that nature. Part of that money will be earmarked for capital upgrades but I do not have an insight at this moment of how much money we will have available. That money would support some of the capital projects. As we bring forward revision 5 of the CIP this fall it would contemplate that and the impact of continuing distance education model may have on the capacity of our schools.

3.04 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) SUMMARY STATUS. (cont.)

Mr. Gurdison: What my company has noticed is that the subcontractors got into a really favorable entrance cost but the exit cost was much different. There was a lot of change orders to make up for the shortfalls. I want to be sure that the district is prepared for any possible shortfalls in time and money.

Mr. Wagner: We have a comprehensive change order process that we'll most likely be bringing forward a presentation on. We have contractor documents that we hold our contractors accountable for. Controls are in place to ensure that the school district doesn't overpay.

3.05 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE.

Mr. Wagner presented the 2015 Capital Improvement Program Update that included all money spent and encumbered to date. Mr. Wagner then reported on each project within each district that has been done to date. He broke them down into 3 categories, new and replacement schools, and major modernizations. He reported on each project line by line including the school name, student capacity, project architect, project coordinator, construction cost, and project cost. He noted that district B has no new construction or replacement projects underway because CCSD did a tremendous amount of new construction in that district throughout the 98 bond program. He noted that district D has 11 new construction and replacement projects, most of those projects are replacement schools, meaning the district didn't find any new land in those areas. CCSD took schools that are in disrepair that had a high FCI and needed to be completely replaced because the facilities in those areas are older.

Mr. Wagner: These are not all of the projects planned in the 2015 CIP, you see those monthly on the report that Rodney gives you of what is budgeted. We still have an extensive amount of work that has to be done but we wanted to give you an update of what has been completed and encumbered. We will be bringing forward CIP Revision 5 in the fall of this year once we have a greater understanding of the impact of the pandemic, the impact of distance education on school capacity, and whatever impact we may have from additional funds through the Cares Act.

Ms. Charlton: Does the cost of the highlighted projects include any return of funds that may have been yielded from the contractors?

Mr. Wagner: This is a snapshot in time of spent and encumbered funds so if we have an outstanding allowance on a project that would still be encumbered. At the end of a CMAR project or a hard-bid project if an allowance is not exhausted it is then recovered by the district through what's called a deductive change order and at that time it would be updated.

Ms. Charlton: We have heard in these meetings specific safety concerns and I wanted to know if those concerns are being addressed on these projects.

Mr. Wagner: There is a safety advisory committee that is chaired by the chief of staff that brings forward recommendations. As we do comprehensive renovations the goal is to address those safety concerns. Safety concerns are being addressed in a number of ways. Some schools are site-funding smaller safety issues. We are looking at what we may have available in GST and statutory reserve funds as well. Safety is an ongoing conversation and top of mind as we approach these projects.

3.05 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE. (cont.)

Ms. Earl: Years ago operating under the 98 bond fund CCSD essentially had a contest with architects and they narrowed it down to 3 architects they built 3 schools. The purpose of that was to determine the costs in construction and later costs as far as how efficiently the schools ran with energy costs. Are those prototypes being used now when we see those elementary schools or were those eventually scrapped?

Mr. Wagner: My understanding was that there were actually 4 schools in that competition in 2008. Three of the four designs that came out of that competition are still being used with modification for building codes and other input as we build them. We revisit those designs and improve and upgrade them every time we build a school.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: How many campuses still have portables on them and how does that factor in to FCI numbers? I have 6 schools that I would like to tour. I would like to schedule some time where bond members can see some of these schools. I would like to get that list of schools to you so that you can take a look at them.

Mr. Wagner: I am going to have to get with staff regarding the portables. I'm not precisely sure about how they affect the FCI at a particular campus. What they do impact in a certain form is the over-capacity of the school. As far as visits to schools, we'll have Gaile reach out to schedule a time that works for the committee. We have to limit the amount of committee members that can be on any given tour to conform to open meeting law. We'll schedule as many tours as possible. I think it's important that the committee members that are doing this work get their eyes on what we are actually doing at the facilities. It's important that you see this work on the ground.

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

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: When speaking with Jeff he mentioned Policy 7112 which has not been revised since 2008. Policy 7112 is our guiding document for prioritization of schools and the formula of how it breaks down step by step. I would like to add to Motions and Taskings to create a working group for review and possible revisions of Revision 7112. Working group to include some members of staff, a couple of members from BOC, Trustee Guzman and an outside advisor that can advise specifically on equity. I want some suggestions on how what terminology can to use and essentially clarifying some of these questions that have come up with a revision of Policy 7112.

Motion to create a working group for review and possible revisions of Policy 7112. Working group to include some members of staff, some BOC members, Trustee Guzman and an outside advisor to address equity and what terminology can be used to clarify questions regarding the revision of Policy 7112.

Motion: Blackman-Taylor

Second: Charlton

Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Charlton: I would like to add to the Motions and Taskings a follow-up presentation from facilities and/or our public safety professionals in CCSD regarding reconciliation of some of the safety and security issues that have been brought forward between the BOC and how those are being addressed particularly as we're looking at various projects that are having renovations, modernizations, or other kinds of improvements.

3.06 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS. (cont.) Ms. Charlton requested a follow-up presentation from facilities and/or public safety professions at CCSD on the reconciliation of the security and safety issues that have been brought forward by the BOC and how they are being addressed. Motion: Charlton Second: Blackman-Taylor Vote: Unanimous

Ms. Charlton: Mr. Goynes I would like to work with you on the agenda for our retreat. I would like to include more information on different delivery methods.

Mr. Goynes: Yes, we will do that. I'd like to give each member of the BOC an opportunity to add topics on that retreat list.

- 3.07 FUTURE AGENDA PLANNING. None.
- 4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS.

Ms. Ferguson read the emailed comment that we received from Albert Schutzman from Guinn MS. His comment was as follows: The Clark County School District (CCSD) is purchasing Tier I instructional materials for Math 6, Math 7, Math 8, Algebra I, and Geometry/Geometry Honors for Middle School (MS) pending board approval.

There are two options of adopted instructional materials for MS mathematics courses:

- Carnegie Learning Math Solution (2020)
- Illustrative Mathematics 6-8 Math (2020)

There are two options of adopted instructional materials for Algebra I:

- HMH Algebra I (2018)
- Big Ideas Algebra I: A Bridge to Success (2019)

The HMH Algebra I material follows from the *Go Math* series of textbooks, and the Big Ideas Algebra I textbook follows from the Big Ideas Math series. Both *Go Math* and *Big Ideas* contain middle school math text materials. I am appealing to the board to please consider adopting these materials as well for the middle school math courses if the board is considering to approve HMH Algebra I and Big Ideas Algebra I. The continuity of using the same series will foster stability in students' math learning.

Ms. Ferguson stated that she has forwarded Mr. Shutzman's concerns to the CCSD Learning Department.

5.00 ADJOURN.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 1:49.

Motion: Charlton

Second: Earl

Vote: Unanimous