

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
FACILITIES SERVICES CENTER EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
1180 MILITARY TRIBUTE PLACE
HENDERSON, NEVADA 89117

THURSDAY, April 18, 2024

11:30 a.m.

Roll Call: Members Present

Blackman-Taylor, Jeana
Camejo, Abraham
DeFalco, Matthew
Flatt, David

Gurdison, Robert
Konrad, Chad
Lopez, Alfonso
Petersen, Todd-arrived at 11:40

Members Absent

Goynes, Byron
Lehman-Donadio, Nicole
Williams, Yvette

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

Roll Call.

Mr. Lopez called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

Flag Salute.

Mr. Lopez led the pledge of allegiance.

1.02 Adoption of the Agenda.

Motion to adopt the April 18, 2024 agenda.

Motion: Konrad

Second: Gurdison

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 Approval of the Minutes.

Mr. DeFalco wanted the following statement that he made included in the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) minutes from the February 15, 2024 meeting. "I asked a question after 2.05, project workforce diversity update, I said first of all, thank you for everyone for your hard work. I think this is great work that you all have been doing. One thing that jumped up to me, there's a list of demographics as I would call them, I'm interested in where those came from. And the 'other' I think it was represented was for mixed race, but I would imagine that includes other disadvantaged communities, i.e., LGBTQ, veterans, women, right? And does it, first of all? And I am interested in, on the outreach part, some of those groups that I just

mentioned aren't included here. There's no LGBTQ groups for example. There's no veterans groups, there's no women's groups.”

Motion to approve the minutes from the February 15, 2024 meeting as amended with additional comment from Mr. DeFalco.

Motion: Blackman-Taylor

Second: Camejo

Vote: Unanimous

2.02 Report by Chair and/or Liaison Representatives.

Mr. Konrad stated that he had a meeting March 5th with Ms. Williams, and Ms. Jeana Blackman-Taylor regarding concerns that Ms. Williams has with rising costs in change orders specifically. He had a follow-up call with Mr. Foutz and Mr. McLaughlin to discuss those same topics, change orders and cost controls. This was intended to be in preparation for a call that he was going to be on with Ms. Williams and Mr. McLaughlin. At the last minute Mr. Konrad had a schedule issue and wasn't able to make that call. He suggested that a conversation should take place with Ms. Williams at the next BOC meeting.

Mr. Camejo reported that he was able to meet with some business owners that are now completing their applications to do more business with the school district. He said that at the next meeting he will be able to provide a better update regarding workforce and bringing more applicants to the table to help everyone do more business with the school district.

Mr. Gurdison said that he had a meeting with Mr. McLaughlin that focused on the new prototype design. He also met with Ms. Blackman-Taylor to discuss ensuring that stakeholders were at the stakeholder meetings. He has attended design meetings with teachers, principals, parents and staff. He wants to make sure that all of the current issues that have been happening in the news, as far as, safety and security for our children are met.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked if calming centers where kids could go to regroup were discussed in these meetings and wondered what sort of feedback is incorporated with the actual use of some of those spaces.

Mr. McLaughlin responded with yes. These are called accessory rooms and are clearly vital to delivering educational content. He went on to say that a lot of the things that you see in the new prototypes are the group rooms, the learning stereotype attributes that allow for those other things to happen in our schools. In the past those programs were happening in the school and they were taking over a classroom which was impacting capacity, but we've tried to address the most amount of those we can feasibly account for in the new prototypes.

Ms. Blackman Taylor reported that there have been continuing conversations with more robust community input regarding the delay of CIP 6, although there's still the intention to get public participation with that as well as any sort of community master plan. The executive committee had a productive meeting with Trustee Williams where bylaws were discussed and the increase of the connections between these two entities and help make things move a little smoother.

2.03 Report by the Clark County Board of School Trustees' Liaison.

None.

2.04 2015 Capital Improvement Program Summary Status.

Mr. Foutz presented the Clark County School District (CCSD) 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Summary Status Report, Revenues and Expenditures as of February 29, 2024, and the CCSD 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Projects in Progress as of February 2024.

Mr. Camejo asked if the district needs to have replacement schools at the current plan of enrollment.

Mr. McLaughlin stated it's a multi-pronged response. Enrollment does affect what it is we build. Replacement schools are unique and it was already a goal of the CIP Revision 5 to downgrade our capacity as we replace certain schools. Some of the what we are replacing are very aged, dilapidated structures, so that needs to occur regardless. It definitely targets the future CIP. The district doesn't need to build as many entirely new schools just for capacity sake. It's more condition-based at this point.

Mr. Camejo said that the principal at Valley High School asked when that school will be scheduled for a replacement or a major update.

Mr. McLaughlin said that there is a very complex process of when schools get any sort of improvements but that he can follow up with him and that principal.

Mr. Konrad asked when they should expect to see CIP Revision 6.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that conversations are ongoing with the interim superintendent about what we want to carry forward in Revision 6 and that he doesn't have a timeline yet but will soon.

Mr. Konrad said that the way he looked at an upcoming presentation of Revision 6 was that it would give us some clarification on the changes of Revision 5. This committee has talked many times about cashflow and the constraints that cost increases have put on just the ability to accomplish everything that was originally planned, and feels that it might be helpful for them to see a changed outlook on what can be accomplished from what was proposed for the current revision.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he didn't think that we would have a revision by the end of the calendar year, and reiterated that conversations are ongoing. He stated that staff can explore and share where our current dollars are going to maybe meet or exceed or not meet the obligations of Revision 5. We can certainly follow up with you on that.

Mr. DeFalco asked why the bids were so over budget.

Mr. Foutz replied that the producer price index is up 40% on construction items from February of 2020. This includes items related to supply chain issues. The inflation factors that drives all that up year after year. The other side of the equation is our contractors, when they're making these bids, I'm sure to some degree they're trying to bring those numbers and provide some contingency on their behalf so that they are not having to construct something that's not making them enough profit. So all those things factor into this equation and right now we are taking a conservative approach by doing a significant markup on these. If those markups on these projects are coming in better than we expect, then you'll see some of these prices come down in the future.

2.05 Project Workforce Diversity Update.

Mr. McLaughlin introduced this presentation saying that this is a part of the annual reporting that staff does for the BOC. This is our current trends outlooks and will greatly inform some of the questions we've received so far, but we'll inform future CIPs and the motivations and goals of the committee.

Mr. Baldwin presented and explained information on CCSD enrollments, Clark County birth rates, student yields, and the enrollment projection for the next 5 years.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked if there has been consideration to expand magnet programs at middle schools.

Mr. Baldwin said that for the 2024-2025 school year Burkholder Middle School is becoming a full-time magnet school and that both Burkholder and Johnston Middle Schools will be science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs. The district had received a grant for each school from the federal government for magnet schools assistance program.

Mr. DeFalco asked is the district has any data of students returning to CCSD after they have been at a charter school.

Mr. Baldwin said that would be a difficult endeavor. When students leave CCSD, the reporting for leaving is lacking. Sometimes CCSD is not properly notified, so we don't necessarily know that they're going to a charter school or leaving the state entirely. We often see students that are in CCSD will leave and come back in a year or two years.

Mr. DeFalco asked that if the red areas on the Hot Spot map is where we currently need new schools.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the high schools that are currently planned within Revision 5 are plans specifically to address these areas and includes elementary and middle schools.

Mr. Foutz added that if you compare the elementary schools at the beginning of the 2015 CIP program, you will see that each year that Mr. Baldwin provides this presentation the hot spots are decreasing on a timely basis. We have built many elementary schools in this program.

Mr. Camejo asked that with all the STEM programs, magnet programs, and CTA buildings being built, if the focus should be on those types of buildings versus the normal regular schools programs moving into the future.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he thought that would be nearsighted if that was the only focus and that there is a place for our choice options and there's also a place for our neighborhood schools for families to choose to send their kids.

Mr Camejo asked that in 15 years from now if we should be moving more towards one or the other.

Mr. McLaughlin said yes, and that Mr. Baldwin's presentation highlights that at the ninth grade level in particular we continue to expect that percentage to grow. I think at the five-year mark, it went from 107% to 113%. So we'll continue to see that attraction at the high school level continue. So I think it is wise to want to continue to expand our choice options. Also, our choice options are only as good as the programs that

2.05 Project Workforce Diversity Update. (cont.)

they're offering. Our magnet office is one of the top ranked programs in the nation and I have faith that they'll continue to offer programs that are attractive to families, but if that were to change, that metric could also change. It's a multifaceted complex situation to say. I think families have attractions to both.

Mr. Konrad asked if staff sees an impact in that total need in the budget in how we plan for revisions in the future. This shows a 15 to 20% decline in an overall enrollment in a matter of 10 years. Is it large enough or is there enough impact here to have an impact on the strategy of the budget?

Mr. McLaughlin said that it has impacts on it clearly. I think the thing I want to emphasize is our buildings know no birth rates. They are still physically built assets that we have to maintain. In the two thousands number, you saw that we were gaining 13,000, 10,000 students a year in that era. So we built for that and we still have those buildings to maintain and take care of. They probably need changes, but it just shifts from new schools to more taking care of what we have and better utilizing those either with new program offerings or just painting the walls, repairing the roof type thing.

Mr. Foutz added that Revision 5 incorporated staff giving a list of schools that we wanted to do work on to the legislature and the governor's office. It's that list that I anticipate those additional funds are going to be dedicated to. Obviously, as we've talked about, the shortfalls that we will have as far as the dollar value to complete all those schools is one issue. Revision 4 included us having the ability to do modernization projects as well, potentially taking it funds that we no longer will use because we're funding that with medium term bonds. So we had money set aside to allow us to continue to do comprehensive mods as well as if we need to do emergency HVACs and those types of things. So the question is ultimately when we get to the point that we're running out of those funds, what do we do from there.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked about schools in new developments what efforts are undertaken as a developer in making these presentations to planning commissions. What sort of accountability measures are there for what developers promise to entities? What sort of participation does CCSD have in those planning commission conversations?

Mr. Baldwin stated that our Real Property Management department typically works with all residential development master plan developers. They work with them on a development agreement for space and sites for schools that also uses that student yield calculation and whatever their total scale is for their total master plan. We then decide how many school sites we need to set aside based on the total number of residential units. The developer puts the signs up on these sites. However, we as CCSD may not have anything currently scheduled for that site. We may not even have ownership of that land, there's just an agreement with the developer.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked what sort of contractual requirements developers have to CCSD.

Mr. Baldwin answered that there are some master developer agreements that have clearly set aside lands. There is also the more historic route where we knew where a developer was building and we worked in conjunction with BLM or others on how we procured our own land within those same developments.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked if CCSD is responsible for any development or purchase of that land.

Mr. Baldwin said that CCSD develops the land that they have given to us in one means or another.

2.05 Project Workforce Diversity Update. (cont.)

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked if there was a financial commitment to CCSD to participate in building that school.

Mr. McLaughlin said that he would have to historically look if there's any financial contribution towards it, but to his knowledge there's not a widespread policy on that.

Mr. Lopez asked what the difference is from a CCSD sponsored charter school and other charter schools.

Sammy Randolph, legal counsel with CCSD, stated that CCSD is the actual sponsor and liaison between that charter school and the state with the other charter schools that are also public schools. The State Public Charter School Authority sits as their governing institute overarching organization. It is the liaison between the charter schools and the state. So that's a distinction, whether it's overseeing by CCSD as a sponsor or the State Public Charter School Authority.

Mr. Lopez asked if CCSD provides the teachers and principals for those charter schools that are sponsored by us.

Ms. Randolph responded that the charter school employees are not CCSD. CCSD simply sponsors them.

2.06 Questions on and/or Removal of Items on Motions and Taskings.

Regarding the request by Ms. Williams for a report on the 'Analysis of District Cost Savings and Options to Provide Access to a Larger Population of Students'. Mr. Lopez stated that in her absence he will make a motion to table this until we get an update from Ms. Williams.

Motion to table the item titled 'Analysis of District Cost Savings and Options to Provide Access to a Larger Population of Students'.

Motion: Lopez

Second: Blackman Taylor

Vote: Unanimous

3.01 Public Comment on Items Not Listed as Action Items on the Agenda.

None.

4.00 Adjourn

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:53 p.m.

Motion: Camejo

Second: DeFalco

Vote: Unanimous