



## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.03 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. (cont.)

for the entire program. The implications are that perhaps some project can be eliminated or some substitution has to be made in order to bring the whole program in at budget.

Ms. Charlton: Do your project costs include a contingency and if so what is the percentage on average? Some of that may be addressed through other contingencies unless it is tradition that you use all of those up.

Ms. Alston: It does contain contingency depending on the stage of the project, it changes. When it is at its planning stages it has a high contingency of about fifteen percent. If there are some issues that we know about we could actually increase that to twenty. As we move forward through design, and we get those estimates we'll start to review the contingency, move it towards whatever those things are. Then as close-out happens reduce it down to five and wait for close-out. When close-out is done we release it back into the pool. We monitor that very closely.

Trustee Garvey: With this, how will you determine what projects aren't done if you continue to have over-budget issues?

Mr. Cumbers: The process would be that we would bring back recommendations to the BOC and they will make a recommendation to the Board.

Ms. Lavelle: Did I hear the word acceleration? Who's accelerating?

Mr. Cumbers: Due to the tariffs on process of steel, labor, and there's a lot of construction going on around town we're finding that the bids that we're receiving are higher, and higher and higher.

Ms. Lavelle: So it's not acceleration in terms of someone's behind schedule.

Mr. Cumbers: No.

Ms. Alston: On the report that follows just after that report which is the Projects in Process it will show you the status as it changes through contingency or process, which projects that's happening in. So you'll see the pluses and minuses in the budget impact column. The additions that I did came in not as over-budget as we thought so that's actually good. Still everything that you're seeing as it's bidding right now is over-budget. I think we talked to you about this last month. We'll probably be coming to you next month with a presentation of what we think is going to happen. Similar to what I did right before Revision 3 where I showed you what we were tracking in cost per square foot, we'll do the same thing again. I think we need to do an update as to what's going on.

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

Trustee Garvey: Myself and others have been receiving requests from SOT's on safety issues, and remodeling of their campus especially their foyer, surveillance cameras, and those kind of things. I know we're still working with the Safety Committee and trying to figure out what the best areas for us to invest in for that. When we get to a point, I think if it comes to an issue of shifting how we allocate resources for remodeling or security cameras, it may be to a point where we need to do a joint meeting between this committee and the BOST just do that we have that clear communication because I know that the safety of our students is a priority.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.04 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIASON.(cont.)

I had a meeting with Mr. Neal, Rick Baldwin, Jeremy Aguerro from Applied Analysis, and Kristen Sear talking about patterns of how people are moving, who's moving to the valley, the impact of charters, and many different aspects of what's making it difficult for us to actually plan where to put schools, and the cost that may be related to that. That discussion as more data analysis is done will be coming back to this committee so that you can have your conversation and bring your expertise to that. I know you probably are having some of those same frustrations when you get land acquisitions and then communication as to what other competing schools are going to be in that area, and how does that relate to costs of transportation. Hopefully that will be coming forward to you because I think that we're already behind the eight ball on that particular issue. One of the things that Mr. Aguerro did say is that the people that are moving here are changing, and where they are living is changing too, to where you're having more families that have fewer children or no children. There could be a big influx from California given the Federal Tax Act that was passed. All of these things are going to impact a lot of what we're going to be seeing as we try to plan.

One of the things that was brought forward that I think is a really good idea is we have a master plan that we do with our revisions for building, but having a master plan that dovetails and coordinates with the city, the county and different entities could be something that would be very beneficial to us as a District.

I was able to discuss a little bit about your Value Added request at the BOST meeting when the presentation on the CMAR vs. Design-Bid-Build was given to the Trustees. The Trustees at that point came to the consensus that they would like either a written formal 'this is what we see and think about this' back to the Board or have a representative come back and give a brief report.

Mr. Reynolds: Has there been any RFP's on the potential security items that they are doing?

Mr. Neal: Not at this time. The District has not decided that is where they want to go just yet.

Mr. Reynolds: What stage of the process are they in planning wise and analysis wise?

Mr. Neal: The Superintendent has formed an internal group because you know we were part of the Governor's Task Force and we have representatives on that, but he has formed an internal group to actually assess how we are going to go about dealing with a large entity such as the District on best practices and best ways to move on safety. That internal committee has yet to meet, I think our first meeting is coming up next week. I think that's going to be one of the first decisions that we have to make, how we are going to assess the entire District understanding fully that we don't have the organic capability to do so. We will bring back that decision to you because I know we've had safety issues on here before and so once we have a report to bring up we will bring back a report to this committee on what we're doing. I am one of the members of that committee.

Ms. Charlton: Do you have an estimated time frame of when that demographic report will be provided because what, if any, impact could that have on the plans for schools, expansions, build outs, and etc.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.04 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES' LIASON. (cont.)

Mr. Neal: Mr. Aguerro has not given us any detail on when he will bring that forward. We've had some raw discussions on how those demographics are changing, but I'll have to get back to you on a firm date to bring that back to this committee.

Ms. Charlton: And this might be a follow up for staff, is what do you anticipate, could this have some impact on what some of the future plans are for the work plan to the current plan between sizes of schools, locations of schools, and new locations that are needed, as well as land?

Mr. Cumbers: My answer to that would be that we are so short of funds relative to the overall need, and the schools that we are building are in areas where they are very overpopulated, overcapacity in nearby schools or we're adding additions to schools that are 140% or more overcapacity that I don't see that any of the priorities in the current plan would change, and in light of the fact that we don't have any more money in this program for new projects to be assigned. It will likely have little or no impact on this program.

Some discussion continued.

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Mr. Cumbers: I'd like to introduce Linda Perri. She has a couple of remnant pieces of property that the school district doesn't need. We can't do anything with those parcels but there are people interested in buying these particular parcels.

Ms. Perri: As with the acquisition and disposition of property we have to bring those before you so that you can make recommendations. In my tenure with the District I have not disposed of any property so it's my learning curve as much as everyone else's. We did outline the procedures for the disposition. It is very detailed as to what we have to go through.

Basically we have two parcels. One is next to Bass Elementary School. It's a 2 ½ acre parcel. It was originally acquired through a BLM patent and that patent had a 25 year provisional clause on it and that expired in July 1981. The second parcel we have, Owens and F Street, is a smaller parcel. It's 0.82 acre. It was dedicated to the District through a subdivision process and we don't have a buyer for right now but I wanted to bring that forward as well with the other parcel.

What we're looking for is a recommendation from the BOC as to how you would like to either sell it or not sell it to make a recommendation to the Board and how to sell it. Whether it's through a broker or through the bidding process. That's what we had outlined in this reference material as to the procedure for both processes.

We ordered two appraisals back in June. One came in at \$325,000. We had to have the Superintendent of Public Instruction, through the disposition process, order a second appraisal. That appraisal came in at \$525,000. Because the appraisals were so far apart, we had to order a third appraisal. That third appraisal came in at \$462,825. We are looking to you to make a recommendation also as to what you would like to sell that parcel at. That's basically what we are looking at right now. The Board can set the appraisal at \$525,000, it can be above that, it just can't be below \$325,000.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT. (cont.)

Mr. Reynolds: If I understood the report correctly the Board itself would choose to appoint a broker and the Board has to set a minimum price. Is that correct?

Ms. Perri: Yes.

Mr. Reynolds: So what are you asking us to do? Are you asking us to say what is the minimum price that it would go for?

Ms. Perri: The minimum price is \$325,000 because it can't go below the face value. It can be above that, it can even be above the \$525,000.

Mr. Reynolds: So what I'm asking is when the Board puts it on the market don't they have to identify a minimum price or has that already been identified with the \$325,000?

Ms. Perri: No it has not.

Mr. Reynolds: So the price they have to identify when they put it on the market is that what you are asking us to give them?

Ms. Perri: Yes.

Mr. Reynolds: So if we recommend a price as the minimum price and there's just no offers, we could put it out there for \$400,000 and a broker could ask \$650,000 for it, right?

Ms. Perri: Correct.

Mr. Reynolds: What is the process if it's just not selling? Does it go down to whatever we recommended and then come back to the BOST saying will you recommend a lower price so we can sell this property?

Ms. Perri: Yes.

Ms. Lavelle: I thought you were talking about two parcels.

Ms. Perri: There was. The parcel on the 2 ½ acre parcel that we did all the work on and got all the appraisals on those are the ones we're asking for.

Ms. Lavelle: So you only got one appraised of the two parcels.

Ms. Perri: Right because we only have a buyer for that one we don't have a buyer for the second one.

Ms. Lavelle: Okay. I have a couple more questions. You got the buyer first and then you're trying to figure out how much to ask them?

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT. (cont.)

Ms. Perri: Yes, because there's a whole process that we have to go through per NRS to sell.

Ms. Lavelle: Did they make an offer?

Ms. Perri: They can make an offer. I believe they have and I don't know what that offer is. I'm sorry.

Ms. Lavelle: Who picked the appraisers? I assume you did. Were there qualifications for these appraisers because these are wildly different and appraisers are kind of an art form which is why you get vast differences like this? What are you asking us to do in terms of this parcel?

Ms. Perri: Do you want to recommend to the Board to sell it and how much do you want to recommend to the Board to sell it for?

Ms. Lavelle: Why would these parcels be sold instead of being held for future development?

Ms. Perri: A buyer approached us about the one parcel and we went through a vetting process with Capital Management Group as to whether or not we needed to contain that parcel and they decided that we don't because we have two other parcels adjacent to Bass Elementary School (ES), this one is across the street from Bass ES, it's adjacent to a church. The church has approached us asking if we would sell it to them for an expansion of the church.

Mr. Cumbers: This 2 ½ acre parcel as Linda explained is across the street from the church depicted on this aerial and then we have on the other side of the church another 2 ½ acre parcel which is continuous to the Bass ES property which may be used in the future in the event that we did for instance, a classroom addition at that school. We've come to the conclusion that the 2 ½ acre parcel across the street is not really useful to us and we had someone approach us as to whether or not there was a willingness to sell it because they desire it for parking for their church. That's how this came up.

Ms. Lavelle: I'm sure this had been done before. This isn't the first time.

Mr. Cumbers: No one on our team has experienced a sale of a piece of property like this. We have agreed to sell the Jefferson Yard as you might be aware.

Ms. Lavelle: Are you looking for rather than an ad hoc process here, are you looking to this committee for an overall process for what we would recommend for the sale of any property regardless of whether somebody has popped up and said yes we want to buy this or the District decides they don't need the properties anymore?

Mr. Cumbers: The process is defined and Linda explained we had to get an appraisal and then the Superintendent of Public Instruction has to get an appraisal. It's a convoluted process. It's not like we can get a broker and sell anything.

Mr. Lazaroff: Is a land swap on the table for equal or higher value?

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT. (cont.)

Mr. Neal: Are you speaking with the church or some other entity that may be interested in a sale that we have not heard from?

Mr. Cumbers: That has not been explored at the same time we don't know of anybody that wants to do such a swap, under the current regulations we have to look into that.

Some discussion continued.

Mr. Alhawayk: I'm Samih Alhawayk and I'm the Chairman of the Board of the church across the street. I do have a bunch of exhibits here which will help answer a lot of your questions. The reason why it's my educated guess why the price variation is because maybe one of the appraisers did not pick up is there's a large power raiser that is impacting the north half of the parcel taking about 80 feet of the parcel and the road is not dedicated so there is an additional loss of land so we start with 2 ½ acres and we end up with 1.67 acres in that area.

Ms. Lavelle: This is an underground power raiser, right?

Mr. Alhawayk: No it's an overhead high power raiser. It's just 80 feet away from falling wires in case one of the wires were to fall. You have to be set back at least 80 feet which is where the easement is. We have expressed interest in this parcel because it's our expansion area. Mainly it's for parking. We are very friendly with John C. Bass ES, we have a good relationship for parking on their side. We've been there for 17 years and we've never had any issue with them. Our gates are always open during business hours so some parents will decide sometimes to park in our parking lot for safety.

We are definitely interested, we are the ones who approached the school district. We are willing to give an offer for the lowest price that you recommend and whatever the process, if it's NRS, we'll follow the procedure. If we're lucky we'll get it. It will help us a lot because it's our future expansion. I'd like to submit this information to you.

Trustee Garvey: What are the costs associated with the two different methods of selling the property?

Ms. Perri: That depends if you want to pay a broker commission or not on top of it. We would have to find a broker to get through that process, it would be the same process as trying to go through the architectural process. It would have to be run through purchasing and there's associated costs for that.

Trustee Garvey: Then just putting it with a public bidding, is that just at the Board office?

Ms. Perri: Yes.

Trustee Garvey: So I don't know if that's something for discussion, has anyone ever been involved in something like that?

Mr. Lazaroff: Is a donation to the church a reasonable option?

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT. (cont.)

Trustee Garvey: A donation to the church? I'm not sure if in this environment if CCSD made a donation to the church of 2 ½ acres if that would be in our best interest to represent our constituents. I think probably part of the reason that there's such detail in this is we used taxpayers dollars to purchase this at some point for the will and the power of the law on behalf of taxpayers. We want to be very careful.

Mr. Reynolds: I don't feel comfortable making a recommendation as to value at this time without seeing the appraisals themselves.

More discussion continued.

Pastor Nadim Abou Zeid: We've been here 11 years. We are the best neighbors for the school because most of our children go to the school and we support their all day events and fundraising. The church and the school are in the same battle. Your property is not in the front of the school, it's far. Because you are lacking parking, our gates are open if you want to park. We'll put in the money, at least \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 coming from our pocket. I don't think we need to go in circles and make it difficult for ourselves and each other. I recommend that you sell it directly to us. I don't want a bar or a club in front of the school or church.

*Motion for property to be sold on the auction option.*

*Motion: Reynolds*

*Second: Earl*

*Vote: Unanimous*

Trustee Garvey: I'm sure I could reach out to one or two of you myself to ask your expertise on those appraisals. Maybe that could be something that there could be some expertise input on that.

Mr. Philpott: We've always discussed these pockets of unused property around the county and I think there should be a time come that we should move forward on disposing of those pockets. There is always an expense, whether they are vacant or not, whether it's the school police checking it out or it's fencing requirements or its graffiti removal. There's a constant expense to that property. So we see that the District no longer needs ½ an acre or ¾ of an acre we should get it out from underneath the school district's responsibility and put it back on the open market.

Mr. Konrad: I support the recommendation, I feel we have a duty to the public who funds these assets to make sure we have fair market value. I support the auction proposal but I do not think we have enough information to make a determination of cost.

Ms. Lavelle: So the motion as I understand it is that the property be sold at auction. The issue of minimum bid price if there's going to be one is not part of the motion.

Mr. Reynolds: That's correct.

Ms. Lavelle: Part of what I think you wanted is price which is a separate issue and when I'm talking about a hybrid I'm talking about a minimum price based upon something or other, presumably that's going to be an appraisal or maybe an offer that you've already got, that may be the minimum price. Then we put it to auction and see what happens. We don't have enough information. Is that what I'm hearing? There are a lot of people on this committee who have experience with and a



## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.05 REPORT OF POTENTIAL SALE OF TWO PARCELS OWNED BY CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT. (cont.)

different insight as how to value commercial property. Trustee do you want us to look at the appraisals or do you want us to make a recommendation about that?

Trustee Garvey: I think what I'd like to do is take this back to our next Board meeting. The meeting is next Thursday, and ask at that time if the Board as a whole would like to assign at least 2 or 3 individuals from the BOC to review the 3 different appraisals and then send that information to the Superintendent and the Board as to what your findings are. That will give us some more insight as to what is going on.

More discussion continued.

Ms. Lavelle: Is there a motion with respect to how to proceed on the second property?

*Motion to allow the staff to go forward with appraising that property in order to sell.*

*Motion: Reynolds*

*Second: Konrad*

*Vote: Unanimous*

Mr. Konrad: Has there been a study or report done to identify all of these type of parcels?

Ms. Lavelle: Maybe that's something we can do for Motions and Taskings.

Ms. Perri: Annually we do go through and we look at all the vacant parcels. There are some remnant parcels that are small but most of them we try to retain because we will need them in the future for schools or for any other administrative buildings. It's so difficult to obtain the parcels through the purchase and acquisition and it's even more difficult to obtain them through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). We try to retain as much as we can.

Mr. Konrad: So this is truly the only parcel?

Ms. Perri: There's probably a couple others that are out there. There's a twenty acre parcel that was bought back in 2002 that is actually in the Nellis Air Force crash zone so if you'd like to make a recommendation to get rid of that.

Mr. Konrad: There might be some efficiencies in evaluating the property.

Ms. Lavelle: I think that's a good suggestion. I think that whether just shot gunning it maybe we could ask for a report on Motions and Taskings when that comes up if you could bring it up at that time.

### 3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD VALUE ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD.

Mr. Cumbers: This is the report that was asked for subsequent to the cost analysis Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) vs. Design-Bid Build. I'll introduce Jeff Wagner, Director of Construction Management to offer his presentation about the value and analysis.

Mr. Wagner: As stated in the last meeting this analysis is somewhat objective, this is my opinion. I tried to give you some insight as to how I arrived at that opinion. Following the last meeting I sat down with the Project Managers for each project. I looked at things like the original substantial

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD VALUE ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD. (cont).

completion date. I looked at warranty notices. I did a literature review of periodicals and trade publications. I don't think it changed my opinion per say, but it adds some validity to the opinions I have. Not all construction delays are created the same meaning a delay in one project isn't necessarily equivalent to a delay in another project. All warranty notices aren't created the same meaning the warranty notice an adjustment on a door closure is not the same thing as a generator failure. I don't know if you can draw specific conclusions based on the numbers but it did help inform the conversations. I've given a brief review of the both of the delivery methods. This is exactly from the last presentation. I believe everyone on the committee is familiar with the two delivery methods. For Design-Bid-Build the pros are: typically lower overall project cost; broadest opportunity for sub-contractor participation; CCSO has the opportunity to review competitive bids for construction costs; and, contractors are familiar with the process. Cons for Design-Bid-Build are: general contractor chosen primarily on price; general contractor typically provides less oversight; constructability issues are not discovered until work in the field has already begun; schedule control is more difficult; general contractor is not on board early in the process to give feedback during the design process; less transparency than alternative delivery methods, and, harder to close out the project and complete the punch list. For CMAR the pros are: contractor is selected on qualifications; contractor participates early in the process via pre-construction services; smooth and timely transition from design documents to start of construction; can create the best collaborative team structure; general contractor typically provides more oversight resulting in less warranty notices and call backs; and, transparent procurement. Cons for CMAR are higher overall project cost and less sub-contractor bid coverage.

Ms. Charlton: Jeff can I ask for clarification on what you were saying particularly about the less sub-contractor bid coverage and then also the point that you made on the Design-Bid-Build because you indicated that you don't prequalify the sub-contractors plus isn't just the bid from the Design-Bid-Build contractor it's just the bid. So do you know what coverage is included in that bid if it is just that process where you also said that there's transparency that they open the sub-contractor bids on the CMAR with you?

Mr. Wagner: The school district across the board does not prequalify subcontractors. CMAR prequalifies their subcontractors. In the hard bid process the general contractor doesn't tell us how many bids they got. They are required by statute to list their 1% and 5% subcontractors and we ask for an expanded listing so we know who these subcontractors are at bid time that they selected and we use that as a check and balances to make sure they are actually using those subcontractors during construction to prevent bid shopping but they don't have any requirement to tell us that I got 3 numbers on framing and 4 numbers on glass. In the CMAR process we are intimately involved in the subcontractor bid process. Subcontractor bids are actually delivered through our system E-Builder and they are opened by our Contracts and Compliance Department in conjunction with the CMAR contractor so we know precisely how many bids we got and what those bids were. After analyzing all of this information and talking to everyone involved I knew the ultimate question would be what should we do, what would you recommend, what is your conclusion. My conclusion is we've been using both methods for delivery, both methods offer some advantages to the school

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD VALUE ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD. (cont.)

district. When we have built a school such as the SH Architecture Prototype ES which I think we're on round 6 or 7 at this point, we understand the building very well and the subcontractors understand the building very well. We are less likely to find new unforeseen conditions. It behooves the District to get the absolute lowest price they can for that project and we typically choose the hard bid for those types of projects. When we have a project that presents unique challenges, such as building a new school on a field of the existing school while the existing school is on session. That adds a dynamic to the project for a whole host of reasons. You may find conditions you weren't anticipating, at Ullom we had to tear down part of the existing building to make room for the new building, we put portables on the site. We may have to move students multiple times throughout the school year. It behooves the District to have a partner in that process that's willing to work with us, identify those issues, really scrub the drawings very well before we start, possibly go out and do some discovery. Griffith ES is a good example of that. We went out and did discovery during the preconstruction phase to have a better understanding on what we might find underground, what the utility issues might be. So dollars to dollars we spend more money if we use CMAR but there are times when it's in the best interest of the District, it represents the best value.

Mr. Lazaroff: With regard to cost, do you combine direct costs of construction with indirect costs in your office?

Mr. Wagner: The cost analysis was based purely on construction costs.

Mr. Lazaroff: What percent would you say that you throw on top of that for your office and oversight and things like that compared to CMAR and Design-Bid Build?

Mr. Wagner: 8% is typically the design cost plus or minus and that's essentially the same whether it's CMAR or Design-Bid-Build. There is a preconstruction services fee and I believe that was actually factored into the numbers. That preconstruction services fee has been factored in. That's the cost of the contractor to participate during the design phase. Our office does not track man hours per project. Generally we see that there is probably 85% of the effort on a CMAR project from our office as there is on a hard bid project. Now there are outliers. There are hard bid projects that require all hands on deck and that will blow that 15% out of the water and there are CMAR projects that run extremely efficiently that require less labor. If you asked me a general number I would say that it's approximately 15%.

Mr. Lazaroff: What you're basically saying then is when you're comparing costs overall it's actually less expensive to do it CMAR from your perspective?

Mr. Wagner: Our level of effort is typically less on a CMAR project. What that equates to in dollars Ruby would be able to calculate that for you but I don't think it would offset the cost overrun.

Some discussion continued.

Ms. Lavelle: So just to sum up what you're saying, as I'm hearing you, it's not necessarily an apples to apples comparison. There are some projects that you feel are more appropriate for Design-Bid-Build, and more complex, hands on project that you would recommend CMAR. It's not a one size fits all.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.06 CONSTRUCTION DELIVERY METHOD VALUE ANALYSIS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK VS. DESIGN-BID-BUILD. (cont.)

Mr. Wagner: The worst thing in my opinion to come out of this conversation is a decision to use one method or another method exclusively.

More discussion continued.

Ms. Lavelle: During the break Mr. Neal brought up a good point that I think is well taken and we need to talk about. At the last meeting I think the same presentation that Mr. Wagner presented to us is going to be presented to the BOST and they may want some input from us as to what our thoughts are as a group. I sort of summarized what I understood Mr. Wagner to say and let me just say that for my part I'm on board with that. Everyone else may have a different idea of what you're thinking about and I think that that might be helpful. As a group do we want to make a group comment or are there certain high points that members of the committee feel that the BOST needs to be concerned about or thinking about?

Mr. Konrad: I think I agree with you. I think we need to allow the qualified individuals to be able to make the decision necessary, the right decision for the right job. I don't think they can make a determination on which one's the right one in general as a blanket statement.

Mr. Gurdison: I would agree with that. My experience I work with state and local colleges here with the public money and the CMAR process is a very appropriate delivery method for that. There's better value of design accountability, that's a big one, and just some ownership of the design accountability. It's been a very successful delivery method. You brought up a really good point about favoritism so CMAR from my experience has been huge on qualifications, how many jobs have you done and what are the stats on delivery time. So I think there's a lot of quantitative initiatives to be able to select proper CMAR. So for the public money I think CMAR is really effective.

Ms. Lavelle: I'd like to address that last issue, too. My experience is that I represented public entities in my career in projects and both CMAR and Design-Bid-Build. Whether it be an agency approves and vets these people or not contractors have a staple of folks that they work with. Sometimes under Design-Bid-Build they are forced to take a low bid to get the job and then they might have problems with that. So it's not always just because you haven't worked with somebody before doesn't necessarily mean that you're getting somebody who isn't going to be helpful. Any other comments? Do you perceive anything else that you need?

Mr. Neal: I don't necessarily think so. What I'm kind of gleaning is that you understood and agree generally with the conclusions drawn by Mr. Wagner and that in the end both methods have value and that you're comfortable that we have the professionals that can choose which one is proper for the project. Will that be a proper assessment of the general consensus of the panel?

Ms. Lavelle: All those that agree with Mr. Neal raise your hands. The BOC agreed unanimously with Mr. Neal's statement.

### 3.07 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE.

Mr. Cumbers: This is my presentation. To take you through it there isn't a lot that has changed and as usual the changes are in red. South El Capitan Way and Mountains Edge Parkway that's an elementary school on a BLM site that we had to relocate. It's now scheduled for 2020.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.07 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE. (cont.)  
Mr. Wagner: Mountain's Edge Parkway and South Buffalo Drive middle school is scheduled for 2021. J.D. Smith which we just started construction on will be 2021.

Mr. Cumbers: I beg your pardon. So we have an error in the reference material relative to the Mountain's Edge Parkway and South Buffalo Drive middle school project, which Jeff is pointing out, will be scheduled for delivery in 2021. J.D. Smith, for instance, is 456 days of construction followed by integration of networks and moving in the furniture and things like that.

Ms. Charlton: I see that the Henderson Inter Local Agreement (ILA) negotiation is still under way for Chapata Drive and Casady Hollow Avenue. It doesn't take that long to build an ES because it says 2019 so that would be less than a year for construction?

Mr. Wagner: We have successfully built an ES in 300 days so we still have an opportunity to deliver that school in 2019.

Mr. Neal: So we are down to the last pieces of getting this ILA so we think that we'll be able to get there we just have to get that done and get in active conversations to get that approved and get the language to take to the Board.

Ms. Charlton: So you don't have to do a bid process because you have pre-selected contractors?

Mr. Wagner: The project is bid once but it has expired so we will have to rebid the project. The bid documents are on the shelf essentially. It's a very tight window which may close.

Mr. Cumbers: As I mentioned earlier in regard to funding, any project that is on this list currently may be subject to review by you and the BOST. Next month we're going to present an update on the finances of the 2015 Capital Improvement Plan and we haven't settled on what particular project but we may have to bring forward some options for you to consider when it comes to deletion or changes in the scope or converting a single project to a phased replacement or something like that in order to conserve funds. That's the reality of it.

I'll move on to the classroom additions for 2018 and 2019. Lois Craig has been completed as well as all the other classroom additions to be delivered for this school year with the exception of Vegas Verdes. It lagged in construction and will not be done until October 30<sup>th</sup>. For 2019 you can see the bid dates that have occurred for these 4 ES classroom additions and then the Board dates for the construction contracts, and the same thing for Elizondo ES for delivery in January 2020. This was delayed from this group of 2019 projects at the request of the Board because we had to move the location of the classroom addition.

Moving to the classroom additions for 2020, 2021 and 2022, this is the list of schools and the number of classrooms for each school. They are all in planning right now.

With regard to replacement schools, Griffith is currently in construction and will open in 2019. Bishop Gorman High School we've scheduled demolition for January 2019 because we need some time to locate a department called Crisis Intervention and they are currently located in the former rectory of the old Gorman campus, so they are going to be moving to the Greer campus behind the

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.07 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE. (cont.)  
Greer Administration building and to a group of four portables all connected to one another. At the Gorman campus we will build the Global Community School. It's going to open as a swing school in 2020. Mackey, Wasden and Edwards are all in the planning and scheduled to open in 2020. John C. Fremont will reopen as a swing school in 2021 and then in 2022 as a K-8. It's currently in design. All the rest of the projects on this list are currently in planning.

Turn to the last slide of phased replacement schools. Twin Lakes is currently in construction. At this particular project there had been a previous construction project that created the admin offices and multi-purpose room those facilities have been retained, the rest of the campus has been destroyed and the new classrooms are under construction. Sandy Valley the ES baseball and football fields are currently in design. This is another one we're going to discuss in detail at the next meeting. We'll be talking about the fields and the cost estimates of those fields, we'll also be talking about the potential high school building at that site. Southeast Career and Technical Academy is currently in design. We have some preliminary prices on this project and it's way over budget in terms of what we estimated it was going to cost. So it may be a project that we have to convert to in phase 3 placement. Mabel Hoggard is in planning.

Mr. Reynolds: Which one did you say is way over budget? Was it Southeast Career?

Mr. Cumbers: Yes. There are very old buildings on that campus. There are some newer ones, the commons and one 2 story classroom building. The culinary program is currently in portables. The old building E was expanded multiple times. There is potentially one portion that could be saved. Jeff and I walked it two weeks ago. But the design that we have for the scope of the original project and was expanded to create space for another 250 students. The cost is extremely high and we need to bring it back in. It's almost double from what we have incurred in the past.

Ms. Monette: So with the middle school in Mountain's Edge moving to 2020-2021. We're saying that we may be looking to deliver the middle school and high school at Mountain's Edge in the same year.

Mr. Wagner: Yes.

Mr. Lazaroff: Are we working around the faults?

Mr. Cumbers: Good question. We actually had to move the location of the gym design because the fault line was underneath the existing gym which is very well understood now.

- 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES.

Ms. Lavelle: We have some guests today. I'm going to introduce Stephanie Garcia Voss, who is the Assistant City Manager of the City of Henderson (COH), and Lisa Corrado, who is the Assistant Director for the COH. I sent an invitation for representatives of the COH to come to this meeting. They have not only come today but they requested a meeting so I had the opportunity to spend about 25 minutes before the meeting to get an idea of what they think. They are going to say what their concerns were and they answered some of my questions at the time. I want to thank them for appearing today.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.)

Mr. Cumbers: First of all I'd like to thank the folks from the COH for being here today. Thank you very much. I'm sorry for the delay in bringing you forward to speak. I'd like to comment that the COH has always been forthcoming and very cooperative and communicative with us on a number of different issues. That's much appreciated. They brought this ordinance. Many of the things that you see in the ordinance in blue, they are things that we're already doing and they don't affect us in a material way. I think they will affect charter schools and other schools that may be developed in Henderson. In the reference materials there is a significant change in the draft of the ordinance that eliminates the hard cap of students at elementary level, middle school level and high school level. We look forward to working with them on each different project to establish the right size for the schools and share with them the knowledge that we have about the entire Clark County, all the standards that we have in place for schools county-wide so they understand what we're doing and why we propose what we propose.

Ms. Garcia Vause: I am Stephanie Garcia Vause and I am one of the Assistant City Managers, Chief Strategy Officer. Myself and Lisa Corrado are heading up our education initiative and we're here to share just a little bit with you. First to set the stage, it sounds like there was a conversation at your last meeting and want to make sure you know that we have the draft that was being circulated and we have been working quite a while between ourselves, school district staff, the charter school staffs who were all asked to participate and provide feedback and at the time that you had your last meeting the draft ordinance had not been scheduled and it is still not scheduled so it's in draft form and it's being discussed and something that we always do as a city is discuss and negotiate before we put something forward because we want to have a reasonable expectation that we've landed on the right language before we go further. So I wanted to make sure to set that stage and also any language that would be adopted in terms of a bill by our council would be something that is in effect prospectively for our new schools. Right now there are no new schools that are in vision beyond one school in particular, but anything that would come forward after that would be discussed after the adoption we would want to take a look at how this ordinance would impact any schools in the future. Just to set the stage, because I know that real meat of the conversation is about the draft ordinance, I wanted to talk a little bit about why the COH is involved in schools because some people might say what is a local government, what's our role as a city government involved in schools. One thing is that the COH on behalf of the entire southern Nevada region, we're the recipients and the project managers for the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Planning Process. That was a federally funded grant on behalf of the entire region in order to develop priorities for us. When we surveyed more than 70,000 southern Nevada residents on behalf of everyone and as a reminder the school district is part of that process, Henderson residents ranked education as the top priority. Valley-wide the two things that came up most important were economic development and education. If you took a look at COH resident results education is the top priority. We then followed up and worked on our own COH, Henderson Strong Comprehensive Plan, we surveyed our residents even more closely and it reached 26,000 residents and school and education ranked among the top three in community priorities in every one of our zip codes. There was a lot of support for creating our own Community Education Advisory Board. We heard make education a priority, protect our learning environment, seek more local autonomy and that's how we ended up with the creation of our Education Advisory Board. You've probably read recently that over this last year we were able to reinvest redevelopment set aside funds as well as, we're the only jurisdiction that has taken a portion of our tax revenues and dedicated it back to schools. School principals were able to come in and make requests, clearly that was only a small portion because that's what we've collected so far, but the recreational

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.) marijuana set aside funds will continue to increase now that we have a few more quarters. Requests were really varied and these were all based on what the principals and the schools were asking for. It could have been technology, library improvements, tutoring, other facility improvements and behavioral and social intervention programs just to name a few. This is a slide that talks about some of the services we provide in terms of helping with wrap-around, after school programs, shared use facilities, crossing guards. We're in it together. We are really interested in making sure that our students have great learning environments once they leave your school, that we're doing thoughtful planning around the schools to make sure that they are safe for kids to walk to, safe to get back and forth from, but we are interested in how schools impact our community. We've been working on this for a long time. I'm going to pass the clicker over to Lisa but we have a tradition of being advocates for schools and it's very important to our community. That's what really brought us here to set the stage for what we can do better in terms of planning for schools in the future.

Ms. Corrado: I'm Lisa Corrado. I'm the Assistant Director of Community Development and Services of the City. I'm going to talk a little bit more about specifically how we ended up getting to the place of drafting an ordinance on school siting. As a city we're interested in the interactions in our community, how buildings relate to one another, the interaction of land use, transportation, and public safety. When we talk about schools we're not just interested and concerned about integrating schools into the community but all kinds of other uses; parks and recreational opportunities, and other things that add value to the student learning environment. We're looking broad at a variety of things and that's what I'll walk through in the draft ordinance. We are interested in neighborhood design, access to schools, pedestrian and bicycle access, safe routes to schools. We value that and prioritize that. Community development block grants is also a resource that we use to support and fund after school programs. One of our priorities is called the Consolidated Plan for our Community Development Block Grant Funds. We have a plan that has three key priorities and one of them is education so education, housing, and economic development. We have non-profits set up that make requests for funding for things like after-school programs and we prioritize the ones that relate to education. These are just some of the ways we are involved in education in addition to what Stephanie mentioned. We also have a long history of working together with the school district on school site planning. We like to brag about the fact that we were the first city in Nevada to require developers of master-planned communities to set aside school sites. The first school that we did that was in 1980 for Nate Mack. We're thinking about planning for complete communities that have schools and other amenities from the beginning. Since then we've had 17 additional school sites that were set aside for developers in Henderson because we are advocating for that in the negotiating stage through the entitlement process. One of our more recent ones was Smalley in 2007.

So what are we trying to achieve with the ordinance? Our charter schools do not have standards. Public schools already have standards, prototypical designs and recreational areas and onsite parking areas. Our charter schools right now can go into any area, industrial areas, and commercial areas with a provisional use permit. We're trying to set some standards for school site planning and design for all of those. The way we looked at this when we first started meeting with the District is meant to be an incentive because right now the school would have to get a provisional use permit so we set some criteria in place that if you meet these things then you don't have to go through that process, that eliminates a public hearing and some of the issues that come up with that. If you don't you can still apply you just have to go through that CUP process. As we



## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.) mentioned it would apply to charters and private schools. It is meant to provide pedestrian and bicycle safety. It's also intended to be contact sensitive so depending on what is next to the school we're looking at adjacent uses, also adding standards to residential development so that those developers need to provide pedestrian and bicycle access to a nearby school or if there's a vacant lot in between a new sub-division and a school that they have to provide a path between those in the interment as that site gets filled in and we would also like to be made aware of major rehabs or remodels. In general we're trying to achieve a positive learning environment for students. That's the general approach and the original draft that we had worked on with the school district didn't address those program capacities but we thought that we needed to communicate that because we were trying to address some of the impacts through traffic and asking for traffic studies but we weren't really talking about the capacity of the school. We realize that became a problem and the school district preferred that we did not include that so we removed that language. That's why the draft that you have now doesn't talk about capacity. It still has the language about traffic studies. There's 3 sections of our code that this would effect. In the administrative section is 19.6.3 we're adding to the concept plan to be done up front. We're adding schools, so any school K-12, charters and private schools, so we're aware of that in the beginning of plans for schools. On the last page is the School Impact Analysis. This is for developers when they are doing a land use plan update and maybe there's a change from commercial maybe there's a change in land use from commercial to residential, we want to be able to do a school impact analysis. This is for the city. This is administrative stuff for us to be able to do some analysis. There's another handout that is a use table up at the top, it's 19.5.4. This shows that if you meet these certain standard then you would have a standard application whereas right now it's a conditional. Some of the standards have to do with traffic impacts and recreational areas. We got some of that language from the school district because your schools have great recreational areas. A couple of those have to do with site access.

There's a longer list on building design standards, 19.7.6, we're again addressing some residential impacts in this section as well as school design. So as I mentioned we want the developers to provide interim pedestrian pathways and access similar to some other uses we'd like to see better access. School design standards is section E. The blue language is the new proposed language and it describes our comprehensive plan, what we're trying to achieve in terms of walkability and positive learning environment.

If there's something specific that you're interested in we can highlight it. I just wanted to walk through some of the key features that have to do with design, walkability, landscaping, and some programmable areas. We are asking that if there are locations for portable classrooms, like if the site plan is designed to eventually have portables that we'd like to see those upfront in the site plan.

Mr. Lazaroff: Which item do you want to address first in terms of questions? Do you want to address your handout or your presentation?

Ms. Garcia Vause: I think the item that you have on the agenda today is the ordinance.

Mr. Lazaroff: I have a few questions on the ordinance. The first question I have is in regards to the traffic impact study. Who pays for the traffic impact study?

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.) Ms. Garcia Vause: The school district.

Mr. Lazaroff: For the increases to bring portables on it talks about adding a traffic impact study at that point and also talks about a traffic impact study for those that do not have one on record. Are you still requiring one for established schools?

Ms. Garcia Vause: If a school that does not have one on record is coming, I noticed with the CIP there might be a school that has 18 classrooms that's being added we would ask for a traffic impact study.

Some discussion followed.

Mr. Philpott: How long does it take to do a study and what's the average cost?

Ms. Garcia Vause: You would have to ask about the average cost to your staff.

Mr. Philpott: I'm asking the city. What do you see coming in as an average cost in your city?

Ms. Garcia Vause: We do not pay for traffic studies so I cannot tell you because we don't commission those.

Mr. Philpott: So you have no idea what burden this will put on the school district.

Ms. Garcia Vause: We do not pay for traffic studies your staff can answer that question. As for how long it takes often times depends on the quality of the traffic study that is given to us.

Mr. Philpott: Blake, how many traffic studies do we do on an annual basis right now?

Mr. Cumbers: One for virtually every new school.

Mr. Philpott: Do we have a cost on that?

Ms. Alston: I don't know off the top of my head but yes.

Mr. Wagner: It's typically under \$10,000.00.

Mr. Philpott: And we're just talking about how we don't have enough money and now the city's coming in and asking us to spend more.

Ms. Lavelle: Are the criteria for the traffic study under this proposed ordinance different from what's already being done? Are they the same study or are you requesting additional?

Ms. Garcia Vause: It sounds like the District already does a traffic study. We're just asking for it to possibly be done earlier in the process and for significant expansion.

Ms. Charlton: I was just going to echo your point. It sounds like they're already being done. They're already a requirement for a new school and I think what I heard and from what I'm reading in the

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.) ordinance is that the school envisions if they are having portables you would only do the one study that you're already doing anyway.

Mr. Philpott: We move portables in and out all the time so we can incur more traffic studies once the school opens.

Mr. Wagner: We only do a traffic study when it's required by the jurisdiction. If we build a new school and part of the entitlements process includes a traffic study, we'll do a traffic study. We do not currently do traffic studies when we move portables onto sites. We do provide portable infrastructure when we go to these schools so we could expand our current traffic study to cover the portables that we provided infrastructure for.

Mr. Philpott: That's the point I'm driving at. You're imposing additional requirements on this District that no other community is requiring right now to do a traffic impact study on increased student load or on putting new portables in place. That's a requirement that I think is only imposed by the COH. So my question to you is why won't the COH pay for that requirement if it's above and beyond the study provided by the district?

Ms. Garcia Vause: I cannot answer that question because I do not know whether or not if, let's say for example, there is high school in another jurisdiction if there are 1,000 students being added to that high school, I don't know what Clark County ordinances entail or what their process is to be able to answer that question. Clark County or Las Vegas may determine that adding 1,000 additional students or classrooms to serve that could yield a traffic study.

Mr. Philpott: We're getting nickel and dimes on all of these additional requirements brought on by the municipality and the District has a limited budget.

More discussion continued.

Ms. Lavelle: So what we're saying is that these standards to be proposed, can you identify any of these requirements that are different from or exceed what the school district already has imposed in other jurisdictions?

Ms. Garcia Vause: I think the school district would have to let us know but we've been having ongoing conversations for a number of months and for example the open space requirement was derived based on conversations so that it was already an acceptable standard. So I think that question would probably be more appropriate for the school district staff to be able to do some type of evaluation.

Ms. Corrado: I think the language on the school capacity that was the only thing that was new and that came out. So we haven't changed anything else since those meetings and you still have to opportunity to review it and make sure but that was the only that we felt we were addressing all of the concerns about impacts of population capacity through traffic. We not coming right out and saying where that is coming from so we set some proposed numbers that if it exceeded that then we could negotiate an ILA or something to identify any given measures. We took all of that out so that's the only thing that I think the District didn't want and we took it out.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

### 3.08 IMPACT OF THE CITY OF HENDERSON'S ORDINANCE ON FUTURE SCHOOL SITES. (cont.)

Ms. Lavelle: This may be something we address in a subsequent meeting in terms of an agenda item or Motions and Taskings to do a comparison on the particular issues that have been raised by this ordinance and others so that we can see as a group but I think the point is that one jurisdiction requires and others do not. Say that side whether they have a legal right to do it or not is not the question. The question is are they doing it? What in this draft ordinance if anything exceeds what is already being done by the District? I think that's something we can consider as a future agenda item rather than what you guys have presented at this point.

Ms. Garcia Vause: Really some of the genesis was we knew that there was no standards for school sitings and that's an issue that has come up repeatedly. So we were trying to also facilitate the process and Lisa mentioned this earlier. We know that whenever a use permit comes up, say it's for a school, for a church, it can be almost anything. When use permits come up you're subject to the public hearing process and having neighbors come out and you'll have neighbors that land on both sides. Neighbors that want to and neighbors that don't want to, We are trying to set some guidelines in an ordinance or some that would say these are the typical things that we will evaluate. We will evaluate these on a staff level if you meet this criteria so that you don't have to go through a use permit process that can sometimes get delayed.

Some discussion continued.

Ms. Lavelle. I don't mean to cut anybody off, we've been going since 11:30, those are issues that are a great concern to this committee and they are ongoing issues. I think they're outside the scope of this particular issue and I'm not saying that they shouldn't be discussed and re-discussed. Let's put it on Motions and Taskings if anybody needs further information with respect to this agenda item, the ordinance, discussion process, negotiations process.

### 3.09 QUESTIONS ON AND/OR REMOVAL OF ITEMS ON MOTIONS AND TASKINGS.

Ms. Lavelle: Let's talk about questions and/or removal of items on motions and taskings. Anything first of all to be removed?

Mr. Reynolds: There seems to be on the third one down in 2016 it says that the presentation was presented on February 16, 2017 on Building Performance and Evaluation. I move to remove that tasking.

*Motion to remove Building Performance Evaluation of Recently Built Middle and High Schools.*

*Motion: Reynolds*

*Second: Konrad*

*Vote: Unanimous*

Ms. Lavelle: Anything else to be removed?

Mr. Reynolds: The second item says it was presented this year. It says motion was approved for a semi-annual update on deferred maintenance following a discussion. I would just like kind of a question to the staff on those kinds of things. When you are going to do something regularly do we need to keep it on here?

Mr. Cumbers: May I offer that we condense and make a special place on the bottom of the agenda or the Motions and Taskings that we are to do this either twice a year or annually.



## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Mr. Konrad: I wanted to see a report that we discussed earlier of available property that the District owned that have either been recommended to be sold because it wasn't useful or the land that's been sitting for a certain amount of time. I don't know what that threshold would be but land that's been held since 1957 seems like it would fit that category but somewhere to look at designated land as being not useful or land that's been held for so long that it's basically not useful by category.

Mr. Lazaroff: There's an issue on that because a lot of the land was acquired for future use but the construction slowed down as always and now it's going back up.

Ms. Lavelle: So he's talking about just a report. So that's your motion?

Mr. Konrad: Yes

*Motion to have a report of District owned land that has been recommended to be sold.*

*Motion: Konrad*

*Second: Earl*

*Vote: Unanimous*

Ms. Lavelle: I raise the issue of an analysis of the extent to which the COH ordinance adds additional requirements with respect to anything, including but not limited to traffic studies and recreational requirements or anything else than what is already being done.

*Motion to have an analysis of the extent to which the COH adds additional requirements with respect to traffic studies, recreational requirements, or anything else than what has already been done.*

*Motion: Lavelle*

*Second: Reynolds*

*Vote: Unanimous*

### 3.10 AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS.

Ms. Lavelle: Anything else that did not add to Motions and Taskings? Anybody want to add anything?

### 4.01 COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATION.

Mr. Cumbers: We put this item in there. It's a similar item occurs at every BOST meeting and it's just an opportunity to make an announcement or make you aware of something. In this case my intention in this particular meeting was to advise you that next month in terms of the agenda our intent was to bring more financial information relative to what projects have been already approved by the BOST. I'll also be bringing forward the Sandy Valley High School project for your consideration in that context, as well as the price increases that we're anticipating with SECTA.

Ms. Lavelle: That will be on the agenda for next meeting?

Mr. Cumbers: Correct. Then one last thing that I wanted to say during this opportunity to speak with the committee and that is being sensitive of your time, would you express to us what target length of meeting you want to have. We had a couple of other items we anticipated putting on this

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- 4.01 COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATION. (cont.)  
meeting and being sensitive to you are all being professionals with doing other things. Could we try to limit the meeting to 2 hours or an hour and a half, what would be the best target for the committee?

Ms. Lavelle: I think 2 hours is a good time. We had an awful lot today and I think a lot of it has to do with the length of presentations, so maybe from now on in anticipation of the agenda preparation we could talk about how much time you have to do the presentation and how much time we're going to have for questions so that people have a clue. And it might require pushing some of this stuff off to another meeting so that we don't sit here forever. Does that make sense?

Mr. Reynolds: I agree to 2 hours.

- 5.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

- 6.0 ADJOURN

*Motion to adjourn meeting.*

*Motion: Lavelle*

*Second: Earl*

*Vote: Unanimous*

Meeting adjourned at 2:36.