

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
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 89074

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Blackman-Taylor, Jeana
Charlton, Patricia
Earl, Debbie-arrived @11:38
Gurdison, Robert
Konrad, Chad

Lazaroff, Gene
Lehman-Donadio, Nicole
Lopez, Alfonso
Williams, Yvette

Members Absent

Goynes, Byron-Excused
Jones, Walter-Unexcused

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

1.01 ROLL CALL.

Ms. Patricia Charlton, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m.

1.02 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion to approve the June 17, 2021 agenda.

Motion: Lazaroff

Second: Gurdison

Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON AGENDA ITEMS.

None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Motion to approve the May 20, 2021 minutes.

Motion: Gurdison

Second: Blackman-Taylor

Vote: Unanimous

3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Ms. Charlton: I would like to thank Rodney Foutz and his entire team. We met on May 25th and walked through a comprehensive review of the fiscal reports and how they are put together.

Mr. Lazaroff: I met with management connected to the irrigation water and domestic water. I got some information but it's not related to bond as I understand it. Artificial turf was not funded by the bond.

Mr. Wagner: Conversion of artificial turf was funded by a statutory reserve fund and a portion of it was funded by Government Service Tax (GST) funds. Those projects were not funded by the bond.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: Trustee Guzman and I had a chance to meet and one of the things we discussed is greater communication between the BOC and the Board of School Trustees (BOST).

- 3.02 REPORTS BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES. (cont.)
She is going to propose an agenda item where a BOC member would have a chance to present what's been going on in the BOC at a BOST meeting.
- 3.03 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIAISON.
None.
- 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 April 30, 2021 as well as the CCSD 2015 CIP Projects in Process Report as of April 2021.

Mr. Gurdison: At the last meeting we were able to tour Bonanza High School and that was very helpful. Regarding the schools that will be opening are we able to see some of those?

Mr. Wagner: Yes, staff is invited at your convenience to tour schools. We just have to follow the Open Meeting Law so that there is not a quorum gathered at one time. Please reach out to Gaile so that we can send staff to meet you there.

Mr. Lopez: I would like to tour the news schools and I feel that other people would like to as well.

Ms. Williams: Can someone get back to me with the list of the Prime 6 schools that have been replaced and year they were replaced?

Mr. Wagner: We'll be happy to issue a written response to that.

Ms. Williams: I am concerned about the pollution exposure of the students that attend schools, such as Spring Valley High School, that but up against a gravel pit. Is there anything that you can advise us as to if anything is being done to address that?

Mr. Wagner: That is beyond the prevue of the BOC, however, I'd be happy to get that information for you and bring it back to answer your request for information (RFI).

Ms. Charlton: We've talked about safety systems that are utilized at the schools if there are air quality issues.

Mr. Wagner: Internally in Facilities we have an Environmental Services Department that monitors the air quality. They are well aware of those concerns. They work with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the appropriate mitigation. I'd be happy to have the experts' outline what has been done. We can arrange for Ms. Williams and the Environmental Services department which is headed by Mark Campbell to meet to discuss this issue.

Ms. Williams: Thank you.

- 3.05 ASSIGNMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROJECTS.
Mr. Lam: We have been trying to expand the list of the approved architecture firms. In 2014-2015 school year, eight firms were qualified to work with us. We used six of those firms. In 2015 we released a request for quote (RFQ). Eighteen firms were responsive and in compliance with CCSD

3.05 ASSIGNMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROJECTS. (cont.)

Regulation 7211. Another RFQ was released in 2018, Twenty-one firms were responsive and in compliance with CCSD Regulation 7211. The list of architecture firms that we used for school years 2016-2021 was expanded to 22. We sent out a RFQ in 2021 and 26 architecture firms responded. Twenty were approved to do future work with CCSD. Twenty-one engineering firms responded and all were selected. The 2021 list will be presented to the BOST at the July 8, 2021 board meeting for approval.

CCSD Regulation 7211 stipulates that in order to be selected for CCSD, architect and engineers must include the following:

1. Be registered or licensed in the State of Nevada.
2. Have a minimum of 5 years' experience as a principal employee of an architectural firm.
3. Have an active office in Nevada with staff and facilities adequate for large projects.
4. Be willing to work with educational consultants of the District's choice.
5. Provide evidence of knowledge and experience in school design and construction.

Ms. Williams: I am not familiar with Regulation 7211. Can someone forward that to me? Out of all of these firms how many are Minority, Women, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (MWDBE)? Are you asking these firms if they are MWDBE?

Mr. Wagner: That is not part of the RFQ process.

Ms. Williams: That doesn't stop you from asking for that information. It doesn't mean that we're using that to determine whether they are getting the business or not.

Mr. Wagner: I'll refer to General Counsel. Would we be allowed to evaluate that information as part of our process?

Ms. Charlton: I think it's having the information not necessarily evaluating it.

Mr. Pusching-General Counsel: I think you can get the information but you cannot use it as part of the evaluation process.

Ms. Williams: We will discuss NRS 623 in the next legislative session so that it can be more clearly defined. Is it possible now that you have made the selections to go back and ask those firms if they are MWDBE?

Mr. Wagner: I'd be happy to make that request from those companies.

Ms. Charlton: I would assume that this question would only be asked after the Board has approved the recommendations from the BOC.

Mr. Wagner: That is correct.

Mr. Lazaroff: Can I get a copy of the solicitation that is sent to potential firms?

Mr. Wagner: Yes.

3.05 ASSIGNMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROJECTS. (cont.)

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: Is there a policy that dictates where and how the solicitations are made?

Mr. Wagner: I have no knowledge of a policy like that. However, it is in our best interest that we reach out as far and wide as possible. It is published in the Las Vegas Review Journal and we reach out to anyone who has done business with us and the organizations that these individuals are members of and we encourage those businesses to advertise.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: My understanding of NRS 623 is that there can be nothing outside of competency and qualification used to select these firms, but you are able through Policy 7211 to create selection criteria for these firms. Am I understanding how those two work together?

Mr. Wagner: I believe that is an appropriate interpretation. The first is law and it very clear that a firm cannot submit anything to us if they are not meeting the requirements of NRS 623. CCSD's criteria is set by an internal regulation. Regulation 7211 further clarifies how we will determine their qualifications by giving us more granular details to help us evaluate their qualifications. This is a tried and true process.

Mr. Gurdison: Is the selection process for 2021 different than the one you've used in the past? It was very encouraging to see about 3 times more architects selected than in the past.

Mr. Wagner: We were able to use E-Builder to track the submissions. It was a much smoother process saving all involved time and money.

3.06 2021 ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING SELECTION LIST.

The 2021 Architectural and Engineering Selection List was provided to the members.

Ms. Charlton: This is an action item. Can I get a motion to approve this list?

Motion to approve the 2021 Architectural and Engineering Selection List.

Motion: Earl

Second: Blackman-Taylor

Vote: Unanimous

3.07 SENATE BILL 450 (SB450) UPDATE.

Mr. Wagner: This past Monday Governor Sisolak signed SB450 into law. Our 2015 Capital Program gave us the ability to bond till 2025 at which time it would have expired. We're all well aware in Revision 4 that the majority of that money had been allocated for getting those projects completed. We were not planning additional projects because additional funds were not on the horizon. This bill extends the bonding capacity to 2035. We can now plan more projects. While this doesn't address all of our needs we will still be looking for other resources to address that need. This bill is a much better approach then waiting for the bond to expire and shutting the whole program down or making the program dormant while we try to ramp it back up. We are referring to this as an extension to the 2015 Capital Program. With the passing of this bill we will be able to accomplish 13 new schools, 32 replacement schools, 2 phased replacement schools, and 4 non-classroom additions. The next step is to present CIP Revision 5 to the BOC in the fall of 2021 for recommendation. Afterwards it will be presented to the BOST. We anticipate their full support and approval and we can start on the projects then. I want to be very clear that this doesn't stop any of the work that is currently underway. All of that work will continue.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: How is community feedback incorporated into this process?

3.07 SENATE BILL 450 (SB450) UPDATE. (cont.)

Mr. Wagner: Our revision process includes community involvement, on a project by project basis.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: In terms of BOC recommendations I want to feel like I have confidence in talking with the public regarding those recommendations.

Ms. Lehman-Donadio: I think this is a very timely topic because as you look at communities and what they perceive their need to be and what the data suggests that they need the level of communication in terms of engaging stakeholders becomes critically important because that shows everyone the value of bond money and that we are being responsible, good stewards of their money in building what best meets their needs. In terms of being proactive we want to be certain that we engage the right people in the right kinds of conversations so that there are no surprises down the road. As a stakeholder how do I know that a project is coming down the way and where is the opportunity to engage?

Mr. Wagner: I agree with your comment completely. The most productive place for those conversations to take place in my opinion are on a project by project basis. The revision we bring forward is a roadmap as to when those conversations should occur.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: Regarding the list of schools in this presentation, are those a solid commitment to the legislature or do they represent a suggested scope of work?

Mr. Wagner: I would say this is a commitment of schools that will be addressed, it is not exhausted in its' scope. This does not extend all of the funds that will be available. We were specifically asked if the bond was approved what projects would be addressed. This is that presentation.

Ms. Earl: From my understanding this is not an exhausted list. There's going to be more schools and more school projects added by the time we get to Revision 5. This is just the ones that were the most needed.

Mr. Wagner: That is the correct interpretation.

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

Ms. Charlton: Are there any changes to the Motions and Taskings list?

Mr. Lazaroff: Regarding the presentation on the Real Property Needs and Land Acquisition I would like to include a map and presentation on hot spots that we have around town.

Motion to add a presentation and map of hot spots added to the Real Property and Land Acquisition presentation.

Motion: Balckman-Taylor

Second: Lopez

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Gurdison: I would like to request a list of schools so that we can have an equal contrasting timeline of replacement schools and new schools. For me, for design, I would like to request construction schedules for that so that we can find an appropriate time to visit these schools and be properly informed.

Mr. Wagner: Do you want that as a presentation to the committee or would you like us to simply get that information to you?

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

Ms. Charlton: I think it would be fine that you get that and present it to us in the liaison report at the next meeting.

Mr. Gurdison: I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. Wagner: We will get that information to you.

Ms. Charlton: In a previous meeting we had talked about the BOC getting a list of the summary items and reports on a periodic basis. Is that something we can still get?

Mr. Wagner: I'll make sure we have that for our next meeting.

3.09 FUTURE AGENDA PLANNING.

Ms. Charlton: On behalf of Mr. Goynes, we had discussed in lieu of having our next meeting in July to instead have a retreat of the BOC for the purpose of sitting down and going through the bylaws and some of the policies that we have been discussing. This opportunity would make us better informed, and with the extension of the bond even more so. We can also send out information through Gaile to see if that date will work out. We were also looking for a facilitator to help us with this process. Trustee Guzman will be attending and was quite excited to do so.

Ms. Blackman-Taylor: We are looking at a tentative date of July 29 with an extended meeting of perhaps 9a.m. to 2p.m.

Motion to hold a BOC Retreat in July instead of a regular July BOC meeting.

Motion: Blackman-Taylor

Second: Lopez

Vote: Unanimous

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS.

Ms. Austin: I received 2 emails on non-agenda items. The first one reads as follows:

My name is Jessica Allen and I'm working both June extension and ESY and frustrated by the additional training mandated for teachers this summer. I know we have the option to opt out, but if I don't do it now, I will lose classroom prep time or something equally valuable at the beginning of next year. Why should I not have the option for pay later when I'm supporting the district this summer?

I completed my Envision asynchronous work TWICE last night and my progress wasn't logged. Why is the district wasting our time with this program that can't even accurately save our progress? This is exactly the type of situation that makes me feel like my time isn't valued by people making decisions in the district. I'm supporting my students and school through being available this summer when it's clear there was a shortage of support. It's disheartening.

Mrs. Jessica Allen, M.Ed

ESY SEIF

Edwards ES

Ms. Charlton: This issue will be forwarded to Human Resources.

4.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS. (cont.)

Ms. Austin: I will inform Ms. Allen.

The second one was from Ms. Allen as well and reads:

My name's Jessica Allen and I'm a teacher and parent of an incoming preschool student this fall. I implore you to support any policies regarding support/acceptance of critical race theory; it acknowledges individuals may not hold racist ideals and illuminates how beliefs founded in racism have influenced American systems such as the public education system, laws, etc. It's uncomfortable to address our role within this systemic oppression as white educators, but we owe our students and peers that discomfort. As a whole, our district struggles to adequately support Black students. Research has shown that Black students are over identified as having Emotional Behavioral Disorders (EBD) with connections to cultural breakdowns between white staff and Black students. On average 40% of students with EBD graduate high school. This relates to the school to prison pipeline and is a clear example of the problem! Like Katie Williams once tweeted, follow the science.

Mrs. Jessica Allen, M.Ed
ESY SEIF
Edwards ES

Ms. Charlton: This issue is on the agenda for the next BOST meeting which will be held June 24, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Austin: I will inform Ms. Allen that this will be addressed at the BOST meeting on June 24, 2021.

5.00 ADJOURN.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 1:45.

Motion: Lopez

Second: Gurdison

Vote: Unanimous