

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER, ROOM 466
5100 W. SAHARA AVE., LAS VEGAS, NV 89146

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2014

11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Bruins, David	Lavelle, Eleissa
Davis, Al	Lazaroff, Gene
Haldeman, Joyce	Philpott, Steve
Hawkins, Frank	Tate, Cameron
Halsey, Jim	
Kubat, Charles	

Members Absent

Earl, Debbie
Lopez, George

A recording of this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Capital Program Office at 799-8710.

1.01 ROLL CALL.

Jim Halsey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

1.02 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

Motion was approved to adopt the Agenda for March 20, 2014.

Motion: Davis Second: Hawkins Vote: Unanimous

2.01 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

None.

3.01 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Approval of the Minutes for February 20, 2014, with a correction to be made on who made the motion and second for adjournment. (February 20, 2014, Minutes will be corrected to show the motion for adjournment was made by Al Davis and Second by Frank Hawkins.)

Motion: Davis Second: Hawkins Vote: Unanimous

3.02 CONSIDERATIONS FOR A FUTURE BUILDING CAMPAIGN.

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent of Community & Government Relations, provided copies of “Bond Oversight Committee, Discussion Topics to Consider in Preparation of a Future Building Program” and summarized the bullet points for (1) Number of seats/schools needed, (2) Existing schools, (3) Technology, (4) School replacement, (5) Discussion of ballot question amount, (6) Exploration of non-traditional solutions, and (7) Ongoing discussion of contingency plans related to needs.

Ms. Haldeman explained that the Board of School Trustees (Board) decided to wait until 2016 to launch a building program. Presentations and discussion on several topics will need to take place in order to prepare. An agenda item will be placed on future agendas for this committee’s discussion and review, and then a presentation will be taken to the Board for their consideration.

Ms. Haldeman explained that there is not a set date as to when these topics will be discussed and asked the committee members to review the list of topics to determine if other items should be included.

Ms. Haldeman explained how bond questions were formulated in the past and that the topic of having available seats for students is what drove all of the discussions for every building program since the 1980s.

Following this past winter break, enrollment increased by 1,200 new elementary students in a six-week time period. This is equivalent to two schools. Ms. Haldeman questioned if the District will have the luxury to upgrade older schools or will we be driven by the necessity for new schools. One of the recommendations that could come from this committee is how to balance the competing interests of taking care of our existing facilities and the need for new schools.

David Bruins suggested asking other school districts who are experiencing similar problems to assist the District with their solutions or best practices.

Jim McIntosh, Chief Financial Officer, explained that the District is a member of the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS) whose focus this year is deferred maintenance. There are several school districts that are experiencing deferred maintenance issues due to the recession and reductions to budgets. Mr. McIntosh stated that he will be attending a chief operating officers conference with other school districts where there are schools much older and with a much higher facility condition index score; such as, Boston with 100-year-old buildings. In reference to bond issuances, there are several other schools districts that receive bonds. Association of School Business Officials also provides the District a source for outreach.

3.02 CONSIDERATIONS FOR A FUTURE BUILDING CAMPAIGN (continued).

Charles Kubat questioned how staff will get the information out to the public. Mr. Kubat suggested highlighting a particular school's condition/issues and illustrate the topics from the list that was provided. The more that you can make the issues visible, the more it will connect with the public. Mr. Kubat also suggested having the committee meetings at school locations to identify with a particular issue.

Frank Hawkins questioned the methodology of selecting school sites; if the District could partner with companies that are providing kindergarten services; and if there is going to be a leader hired for the program. Mr. Hawkins suggested staff identify best practices to eliminate some costs; mitigate the technology equity; sell/trade District (vacant) property that is not going to be utilized in order to obtain emergency funds; and explore non-traditional solutions to provide seats for students. Mr. Hawkins also commented on the need to replace the aging portables, and requested Mr. McIntosh report on how other schools are handling deferred maintenance. Mr. Hawkins stated that the District needs to reestablish trust with the community to be successful with another bond.

Eleissa Lavelle explained that until the need is identified and forecast, you cannot solve the problem. Until there is funding for what is going to be identified, this work will not occur. Ms. Lavelle stated we can spend monthly meetings going over the list of topics without making any progress and suggested we have a facilitated discussion where topics are addressed and explored to come to a conclusion about an appropriate recommendation. Ms. Lavelle also stated the message is not getting to the people who need to hear it and will be paying for it, and questioned how will we get the retired voters to care about schools. We can talk to the public all we want; however, pictures are critical.

Following a brief conversation on how the process should flow to achieve recommendations, Ms. Haldeman explained the purpose of outlining the list of topics and suggested a facilitator could be brought in after the list of topics have been discussed in order to shape the best recommendations. Once a topic is presented to the Board, a "white paper" will be developed to establish the direction and have the document ready to go. Ms. Haldeman stated that the price tag will far exceed the amount of money that will be available and there will have to be a prioritization of projects.

Gene Lazaroff expressed the need to identify successes to show that we are on the right path of doing something positive; what we are doing to maintain and operate the existing facilities at a certain standard that is acceptable to the public; and questioned the educational need for a school's special purpose room. Mr. Lazaroff also recommended brainstorming solutions with outside individuals, such as, parents and senior citizens; examine the need and purchase of technology that only has a five-year life cycle; suggested the District be run like a business, utilize cost benefit analysis, and achieve a return on investment; investigate the use of leases versus purchases; and involve the community into the campaign to gain their support.

3.02 CONSIDERATIONS FOR A FUTURE BUILDING CAMPAIGN (continued).

Steve Philpott stated that he was at Orr Middle School and the Smart boards that were installed were being moved to a different wall so that the teacher could utilize the equipment. Mr. Philpott questioned why the District spends thousands of dollars and installs equipment in the wrong place without any input from the teacher in that room.

Al Davis stated that the District needs a plan before they need a leader so the District can tell the leader what the plan is; the District is running out of bond funds and there needs to be a clear direction from the Trustees as to what they are looking for from “Facilities.” Mr. Davis also stated that the District needs a better plan before the money is spent; and expressed that if the message isn’t publicized within this year, it will not pass again.

3.03 PAST PERFORMANCES OF THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK CONTRACTING METHOD.

Ruby Alston, Director of Facilities and Bond Fund Financial Management, provided copies and explained the information contained in “Information Request, Chronological history, CCSD use of Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Project Delivery.”

Al Davis questioned if the money was not used that was set aside for the site issues on the Southeast Career and Technical Academy (SECTA), would the percentage for the GMP be affected. Mr. Davis also questioned if more than 50 percent of the work is being performed by more than one discipline.

Frank Hawkins questioned if the CMAR has the ability to move the money around because the contract is for a lump sum; did the District save taxpayers’ money utilizing the CMAR process; and how much time passed between the bid date and the start date in comparison to a normal bid-build process.

Charles Kubat questioned why the smaller projects were running over budget. Ms. Alston explained the budgets on the low voltage projects were based on historical bid amounts, and questioned if these costs are the normal and if the CMAR process is right for these types of projects.

Eleissa Lavelle questioned the reason for the overage on the low voltage projects; what created the problem and would the same circumstances cause a similar overage for a design-bid-build process; and questioned if the CMAR participates in the development of a budget.

3.03 PAST PERFORMANCES OF THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER-AT-RISK CONTRACTING METHOD (continued).

Gene Lazaroff questioned if the timeline is based upon the notice to proceed that is given to the contractor to start his work, or is it based upon when the contract is approved; and questioned why the contractor would be responsible for site issues on the SECTA project if the District provided the geo-tek to the contractor.

Jim Halsey asked for a comparison of costs for similar projects prior to the use of CMAR.

3.04 APPOINTMENT OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Jim Halsey appointed Cameron Tate to be the liaison over the category of Site Selection.

3.05 REPORT BY STAFF AND/OR LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES.

Gene Lazaroff explained that the Operational Services Division provided a report to the Board of School Trustees and suggested the report be given to this committee.

Following a suggestion by Mr. Lazaroff for liaisons to visit their area of responsibility and provide a report, members discussed the purpose and responsibilities of liaisons.

3.06 QUESTIONS REGARDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS.

None.

3.07 REPORT BY THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES LIAISON.

Trustee Linda Young explained that she is a member of the Southern Nevada Economic Council Board. One of their programs is called Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) and recommended this committee hear from SNS on education and building schools. Trustee Young also mentioned a couple of programs to assist with getting the message out, such as, Nevada Partners has a program called Promised Neighborhood, and the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community.

Trustee Young stated that she will be attending the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS.org) that provides educational programs and conferences for a membership of 66 large urban school districts, and recommended a couple of committee members attend the conference in October 2014.

Trustee Young also explained the behavioral and alternative educational program in the District and their need for enhanced construction and program development.

