

**MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2022  
MEETING OF THE  
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
CAPITAL FUNDING PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

**1.01 Call to Order**

The meeting of the Capital Funding Protection Committee (CFPC) of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 4:17 p.m. at the Washoe County School District Central Administration building, 425 East Ninth Street in Reno, Nevada.

**1.02 Roll Call**

Chair Dave Solaro and Committee members Oscar Delgado, Charlene Bybee, Paul Anderson, Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair Justin Ivory, and Sophia Cardinal were present. Committee members Devon Reese, Bob Lucey, Andrew Diss, and Elise Bunkowski were absent.

Chair Solaro has taken some agenda items out of order, for additional time for the action items.

**3.01 General Public Comment**

Board of Trustee President Dr. Angela Taylor spoke to the Committee members to thank them for their time and their commitment, for the work that they do to provide an extra level of security to the community by ensuring that the district is doing what they promised to do when WC1 was passed. The existence of this committee was because of WC1, and this committee provides the trust and assurance to the public that the district would not spend any dollars before this committee approves the spending. As an example of the importance of this committee, Dr. Taylor says that if the Committee recommends something to the Board that the Board may not approve, that item would be returned to the CFPC first for their additional recommendations and then would be scheduled to go before the Board a second time. That is how important the role of this committee is.

The important work that the CFPC does has granted the district the opportunity to keep the promises made to the community. They are promises kept.

Trustee Jeff Church spoke and informed the committee that the views today are his own. He apologized to Board of Trustee President Dr. Angela Taylor. He was wrong in hindsight. The recommendations she made were the right ones, regarding spending.

Mr. Church states that it is time to stop building and to stop bonding. In deference to the new superintendent that will be starting in less than 30 days, we should be on a "hold" pattern for spending.

We are at a 75% capacity in our schools per our audit. Overall, even though some sites are over capacity, we are not overcrowded, we have misalignment issues.

He opposed WC1 at the last minute because it lasts forever and never ends. There is no way to call back or reduce WC1 other than to go before the legislature.

He believes that WC1 is hurting Washoe County because people are spending their money in other counties to avoid the higher WC1 tax.

He wants to have legislature reduce from 8.26% to 7.99% like Carson City and Lyon County, and since we have built all the schools that are necessary, he would further like to have WC1 funds be used for other important matters such as teacher pay, and bus driver pay, or other things that the Board of Trustees deems appropriate.

## **2.07 Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action on the current project schedule and budgeted costs associated with the future Debbie Smith Career & Technical Education Academy High School (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Tami Zimmerman, Deputy Chief Facilities Management Officer and the "Point Person" for the Debbie Smith CTE Academy. Ms. Zimmerman provides the committee a project update as follows:

- June 2020 Qualifications Based Selection of Q & D construction
- August 2021 the CFPC/Board of Trustees were given a presentation only of the project
- December 2021 the CFPC and Board of Trustees were given a budget range of \$98-\$102 million for construction portion of the project
- February 2022 asked for CFPC/Board of Trustees for approval of the \$112 million construction budget which included design, escalation, construction, and owner contingencies.

These budgets were independently estimated by O'Conner Construction Management so Capital Projects felt very confident in the budget estimates.

Bid results came in April 2022. Draft GMP was received in early May 2022 at \$142.8 million, which does not include the owner contingency; 31% over the budget approved in February 2022 for \$112 million.

Over budget bid results are due to a combination of factors, market uncertainty, resulting in higher escalation amounts, extreme supply chain issues plague many trades. The timing of the proposed 2022 work conflicted with many bidders not participating; at least four major scopes received 2 or fewer bids, and some were unable to bid due to escalation pricing scopes over bid limits. The required and

completed "critical path" demo and abatement bids were \$10 million over the original budget, which added to the over budget number.

As a preface to the Options presented to the CFPC, Mr. Adam Searcy, Chief Capital Projects & Facilities Management Officer, wanted to assure the CFPC that a multi-disciplinary team has worked over the past two years, using all the best industry practices and industry resources to develop the budget for this project. Bids were opened publicly and conducted competitively.

Regardless of these turns of events in the over budget, Mr. Searcy wants everyone on the panel to know that the WCSD remains fully committed to the mission and vision of this project.

Various options were discussed by the team considering the bid results.

The summarized options presented to the CFPC for discussion and consideration are:

Option 1: Award as opposed, however, is financially infeasible based on the planned budget vs. the actual bid results since the District does not have any remaining bonding authority to issue additional bonds to cover the \$35 million bid increase this school year. Additionally, no sweeping of savings or other appropriations to cover the additional costs are available currently.

Option 2: Pursue a phased delivery. Upside to this option is that phased construction can begin this calendar year. This option would allow for value engineering or other opportunities that the team has learned and incorporate those lessons and value in the future. This option also allows for larger financial adjustments that can be made by the WCSD to accommodate the escalated costs of this project. Downsides to this option include re-bidding of all scopes of the work, market conditions may worsen, and most importantly this option would delay the opening of this project to at least August 2025.

Option 3- Pause Indefinitely. We have a complete set of contract documents, we also have a scope of the project that balances the existing assets with the proposed demolition and new assets, which would essentially allow us to "put the project on the shelf". This option could allow for a more comprehensive redesign of the project, could allow the WCSD to time the new bidding to a future date which might be more economically favorable. The intent of this option would further delay the opening date beyond August 2025.

In closing, Mr. Searcy, tells the panel that these options are a good representation of the challenging and frustrating options that he and his team have had the poor fortune of having to debate over the past several weeks, and he and his team are disappointed and frustrated to be having this conversation today, as is the contractor, the architect, the superintendent, and everyone who has been involved, but this is not due to lack of

effort. These are truly uncertain times. We have been thrown a curve ball and we are looking at alternatives together, to keep this project moving forward.

This matter is brought to the CFPC for "Action", and in full transparency, requesting a vote of the CFPC. The suggested Superintendent's recommendation, including the verbiage for the possible motion, is to select Option 2, which is intentional in its specificity and but also in its vagueness; deferring immediate construction to best adjust and balance the financial constraints of the district and the commitments that the school district has made to the community, regarding this project.

Chair Solaro opens the discussion for questions from the committee.

Vice -Chair Justin Ivory asks what is the ceiling on bonding capabilities for Option #1 on this project? Short answer from Searcy is there have been multiple budget presentations on this project. Originally the project estimate was \$85 million, then \$100 million, then the final budget of \$112 million. Mr. Searcy advises that he and budget director, Mark Mathers have already "swept" a variety of revenue funds to fund the \$112 million budget, and there are simply no other resources to use.

Vice- Chair Ivory wants to know when we can re-calibrate our bonding capabilities? When is future money available?

Searcy reminds committee that we do have funding for \$112 million and we are able to issue multiple construction contracts using these approved monies in this calendar year, so that the project can begin in the phased approach option.

Regarding when future bonds can be issued, WCSD Chief Financial Officer, Mark Mathers, spoke to the committee, with a reminder that we have no remaining bonding authority for the current fiscal year, so we cannot issue any more debt currently. The previous committee meeting of today, the "Oversight Panel for School Facilities", just provided their approval for Mr. Mathers to authorize additional debt and approve the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$298 million for the upcoming fiscal year.

WCSD will go to the Debt Management Commission in late June, then back to the Board of Trustees. The sale date of any new bonds will likely be in September 2022. We can take the time between now and September to construct a phased approach if the committee chooses this option, and we would then be able to augment the budget for this project in the Fall.

Vice Chair Ivory asked about valued engineering in Option #2 and asks the question as to whether the valued engineering tool can be done throughout the entire construction project and Mr. Searcy replied yes, but they are always trying to get it "right" up to the concrete being poured so it is preferable to have the valued engineering in the bid documents, before it goes out for bid.

Vice Chair Ivory states that he is aware that in the case of this bid, and with every project prior, there was no escalation clause included. It is his opinion that the WCSD should begin including escalation clauses in all our future contracts. Would help us bring projects in on time and under budget and protects both the contractor and the school district.

Vice Chair Ivory inquires on Option #2. If we are adding an extra year to this project what are the added known costs?

Reply from Mr. Searcy is yes, there would be added costs in a phased delivery, likely a 30% increase in time, not construction dollars, for additional staff time to oversee and manage the professional services. Mr. Searcy believes that the original professional services portion of the budget was around \$8 million, and his estimate would be an additional \$3-\$5 million of additional overhead associated with these inefficiencies.

Charlene Bybee wants to understand why the phased option #2 would require re-bidding, she is concerned that we would lose contractors and we would not get any lower bids. Mr. Searcy replied that since the original scope of the project has changed now, those bids become invalid, and additionally, the timing necessary to obtain our financing would create too much of a time lag, between when the bids were provided and when we could execute those bids.

Charlene Bybee is concerned that the market conditions will not get better, and the community needs this school now. We promised the community this school, and we have a critical work force issue in our community that needs to be met now. She also inquired if we could save money by changing the ways we have always done business. Are there opportunities to look at the whole project again and determine if there are other ways to save money, for example in the demo of the building which has already exceeded the original budget.

Ms. Zimmerman stated this is part of the CMR process and advised the panel that when we demo a building there are air quality standards that must be met, along with challenging lead and asbestos procedures and standards which must be met, especially in this project. We have been an ongoing partner through this whole process with the CMR, the designers, and the builders and we are always meeting and adjusting the details of the project already to capture opportunities to adjust and change.

Ms. Bybee again reiterated her desire to get this project completed as soon as possible, because we promised the school to the community and the community needs it. Ms. Bybee brings up the question of possible deferral of projects already approved. If we are in fact at 75% occupancies in our schools, could new buildings be deferred and get this one done first?

She wants WCSD staff to know that she has been our champion; staff has done an exceptional job, because every school we have built has come in on time and under budget.

Sophie Cardinal wants to be certain that the future bonds that will be sought in September 2022, for \$298 million will be used for this project. Budget Director Mathers answered this by stating the \$298 million in bonds have already been “spoken for” for projects in the years 1, 2, and 3 of the 2023-2027 CIP. Therefore, we would have to shift, defer, or cancel other projects around in the year 1 (Which is FY 2023) of the 2023-2027 CIP. There have been no conversations regarding what projects might be deferred or cancelled.

Mr. Searcy advises that a significant amount of the money in the 2023-2027 CIP is for school modernization projects that are still “to be determined” and are not scheduled driven.

Follow up from Ms. Cardinal is why is staff recommending Option #2 vs Option#3?

Mr. Searcy recognizes that this is a unique project, but it is not the same as a new school project where we are building a school to relieve significant overcrowding at other school sites. The Debbie Smith project is needed but not due to an overcrowding standpoint. The downside to delaying the project indefinitely is that we will have a vacant campus soon, and there will be costs associated with managing the vacant campus, and politically, staff recommends Option #2 because of the commitment we have already made to the community.

Paul Anderson wants Mr. Searcy to expand on the overcrowding component of this project. How close are we to the point where we would need this school to avoid overcrowding? Mr. Searcy replied that this project is not needed because of overcrowding. The only area which will experience overcrowding will be North Valleys High School in 2025, and staff is projecting a new high school in Cold Springs area within the decade. This project has been designed for a different need.

Mr. Anderson makes the comment that he is not sure that Option #2 is the best option because of the lengthy nature of the project and the “piecing up” of the project. He understands Option #2 will keep the project moving forward but he does not view Option #2 as the best option.

Vice-chair Ivory asks if we at the end of the rope, or do we have other items out there that are accounted for, but we have not moved on so that we can defer those projects, and move forward with this project?

Mr. Mathers replies by saying that we have several issues, first we are at the end of this fiscal year. We cannot defer any projects that have been budgeted and planned for this fiscal year, because those projects have already been completed. The Debbie Smith

CTE Academy was budgeted in the 2022 CIP with a combination of WC1 tax sale revenues and existing savings from current projects, in the amount of \$85 million. As discussed earlier, staff then “swept” remaining monies from the 2022 Fiscal year and were successful in finding additional funds to bring the budget to \$112 million. We would have to violate state law to encumber a contract of \$147 million against our current budget, and we simply cannot do that. Mr. Mathers reiterated that we could defer projects in FY 2023 but not in the FY 2022, and we must defer in the 2023 FY.

Sophie Cardinal asked if it would be possible to wait to until July 1, 2022, to award the project, dedicate the new bonds from the FY 23 and bring the \$112 million from the FY 2022 budget. Mr. Mathers said that was possible, financially.

Mr. Searcy spoke on the procurement issues on this scenario. Bids were received in April 2022; it is debatable to know whether those bids could be accepted now because of timing.

Vice Chair Ivory asked whether the Q and D representative in the audience would honor their numbers from their April 2022 bid and allow the WCSD to award the bid in July, since we will have money by then? Why do we have to have the project re-bid? Chair Solaro invited the Q and D President to speak if he wished to do so.

Lance Semenko, President of Q and D Construction, agreed to answer this question. He indicated that there is a 90-day price hold for all the subs on this project. The 90 days started on the bid date in April.

Chair Solaro opens the discussion to **Public Comment:**

Lance Semenko spoke first. He indicated that Q and D wants to partner with the school district. Option #1 works for them. Escalation is built in. Our community needs a trained workforce, and our community needs this school.

Option #2 will also work for Q and D; however, the scary part of a phased approach is no guarantee that the subs won’t increase their bids. It will cost more in his opinion.

Len Savage from Savage and Sons. Fiduciary responsibility is not easy. Our price holds for two years. Indicates that this is a CMR delivery, not a hard bid delivery, which is good for the district because re- bidding is not good for anybody. We want what is the best for the students.

Mr. Savage is asking that the committee consider Option #1. Get more money after July 1. As a trusted contractor, Q and D is on board now and major sub-contractors like Savage and Sons are on board now. Last time Mr. Savage was at the Board room was with the families of Proctor Hug and Debbie Smith, and it was very emotional. Savage and Sons would be willing to do anything to make this project work.

Vice Chair Ivory wonders if the delaying of 2023 CIP core school improvements to support the Debbie Smith CTE project, would result in some schools not getting their improvements completed for more like 2 years, since work at schools is time sensitive, usually occurring over the summer.

Mr. Searcy agrees that the time sensitive projects should not be delayed or deferred but rather defer the other existing school investments that are yet to be identified, in the Capital Renewal portion of the 2023-2027 CIP.

Mathers referred the committee to page 2 of the Revised 2023-2027 CIP Project list. The only sizeable projects to defer or switch around are the ES, MS, and HS Core School Investments of 5.5 million and the great portion of the \$36 million for Capital Renewal.

Sophia Cardinal asked Adam Searcy if the reason he does not support Option #1 is that he feels very strongly that our core school improvements already identified should not be deferred. Additionally, the Capital Renewal programs would also cost us the 2023 summer construction window postponing the projects

Adam Searcy agrees that this is one of the more compelling reasons to reject Option #1, so that the core school investments of \$5.5 million and the Capital Renewal Programs of \$36 million are not delayed and we do not lose the summer of 2023, however he also states that several pages of the presentation were also dedicated to disappointments with bid results, lack of participation, schedule constraints, partners that were unable or unwilling to participate in the bids. Option#2 allows the bids to be redone, and Option #2 works better because it affords us more time to obtain funding through future bonding.

An additional consideration as outlined by Mark Mathers is that this is an opportunity cost. When you have an increase of \$35 million over the estimate, we must recognize that this amount represents an entire brand-new elementary school. Although we all assume that any new bids would be higher since costs seem so high now (recency bias) that may not be the case either. Because we have no bond resolution approved by the board at this time and no existing bonding authority Mr. Mathers cannot encumber the \$147 million project in the fiscal year 2023 unless he defers a great portion of the \$36 million in Annual Capital Renewal and Adam Searcy already explained the downside of this as we would lose the summer of 2023 for deferred projects and those projects would have to effectively wait until the summer of 2024, which would then negatively impact the projects in the 2023-2024, 2024-2025, and 2026-2027 school year projects.

Sophia Cardinal understands now and is in favor of Option#2. She understands the timing predicament and what it would impact to take money from other planned projects, so agrees that Option#2 is the best option.



Chair Solaro understands this type of work, as this is his day job as well. You never want to have to reject a bid. Absolutely this project will end up costing more money; the issue is funding. In his opinion, starting this project on a phased approach keeps the project moving forward, and not on the "back burner" which could potentially result in someone deciding to delay the project indefinitely. But it does "pain" him to ever reject any bids.

Given the facts, Per Chair Solaro, WCSD staff has done a great job on this presentation. If Q and D wants to come up to the podium and take \$35 million of their bid, we can start the project now. (Q and D did not comment to this suggestion) He hates to reject the bids, but he sees no other option for the school board.

Sophia Cardinal asks about the phased approach. How many phases do we anticipate? Could it be up to 8 phases? Mr. Searcy replies that we are generally anticipating a three-phase scenario, but not 8.

Mr. Ivory suggests that we strongly consider making sure we have an escalation clause in the next round of bids. He agrees that Option #2 will only work with an escalation clause in the contract because without we could be in the same spot again.

Ms. Bybee agrees with Mr. Ivory on the escalation clause and asks Mr. Ivory since he is a contractor if an escalation clause would help us retain and or get bids from contractors. She is concerned that we will not be able to get the contractors we need to get this project completed. Mr. Ivory states that it would be best to include an escalation clause in any new bids and not after. He used a sub-contractor as an example that would likely sue us if we had no escalation clause initially, but then added one later.

Oscar Delgado appreciates the work that staff has done and thanks the board's insight because he knows everyone wants this project to move forward. The northeast community will be frustrated with either of these options, but he is happy that we are not going to "table" the project indefinitely. Mr. Delgado asks when Mr. Searcy thinks we can begin the first phase of this project.

Mr. Searcy's reply is that the timeline would first have to include returning to the Board of Trustees, with the recommendations made today by this board. After BOT review, he anticipates one or multiple construction contracts, in this calendar year. The Board would have to award the new bids within the budget authority that we presently have.

Mr. Searcy suggests that perhaps in early 2023 staff would come back to this committee and provide an update on the project, and in that meeting perhaps ask for more budget authority to begin, hopefully, the third and final phase of the project. This is only a thought on how this might proceed.

Mr. Delgado asks when we would see the breaking of ground.

Mr. Searcy replied probably looking at September/November of 2022 to break ground on the first phase of this project in Option#2.

It was moved by Sophia Cardinal, and seconded by Chair Solaro, that the Board of Trustees recommends proceeding with Option 2 to pursue a Phased Approach to delivering the construction of the Debbie Smith CTE Academy High School, deferring immediate construction to best adjust and balance the financial constraints and commitments of the District with the need and commitment to this critical project. Before Chair Solaro could ask if all members were in favor of the motion, Ms. Bybee asked for more time to speak and reflect.

Charlene Bybee has an additional comment before the final vote. She is having a difficult time with making this decision. Option #3 is not an option she would consider. She would like to go with Option #1 but can't because of the money numbers. She wants to be assured that if this committee approves option #2 that we do not drag this project out for an extended period of time; move everything with lightning speed, from the bidding to the building. We can't wait for another year. This project is in the best interest of this community's work force issue. She will support the phased option but not happily.

Ivory asked Ms. Cardinal if she would consider adding an escalation clause language in a new motion so that escalation be included in any future contracts and furthermore Ivory asks staff to use latitude in adding more contingency money in any future re-bids (contracts) to avoid staff having to come back to this committee for more money in the future.

Ms. Cardinal asked Adam Searcy for his viewpoint on an escalation clause. Mr. Searcy says it is a very complicated subject, but Option # 2 does present an opportunity to include such escalation language since we must go through the bidding process and scope of job over again. This could likely be advantageous to the taxpayers.

Legal counsel interrupts and says that we must keep the new motion limited to the escalation clause language only not the second matter brought up by Ivory; adding more contingency money when they put the budget together for the phased approach.

Sophia Cardinal accepts the request to add some type of escalation clause language to any new bids and makes this part of her original motion. This motion to include the escalation was seconded by Chair Solaro and the motion passed unanimously. (Yea: Dave Solaro, Sophia Cardinal, Charlene Bybee, Oscar Delgado, Justin Ivory, and Paul Anderson)

While the committee has a quorum Chair Solaro would like to open Items 2.03, 2.04, 2.05, and 2.08 (Action Item) Chair is combining these items and the action will only pertain to Item 2.08.

### **2.03 Presentation and Discussion of the Fiscal Year 2023, Capital Renewal Plan in the amount of \$40,000,000 (FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ONLY)**

Presenting the 2023 Capital Renewal Program is Tami Zimmerman, Deputy Chief Facilities Management Officer who advises the committee that Capital Projects has designed and bid 113 Capital renewal projects over the past fiscal year (2022) for a total construction cost of \$26,310,975.00. On pace getting things done.

Capital Renewal goes through a systematic process to plan future capital renewals. Staff from E S & A (Environmental, Safety & Assessment) perform annual inspections of facilities and building assessments, and information learned from these inspections is inputted in the Facility Condition Index System (FCIS).

Working with maintenance technicians, construction managers, and planning managers, staff will determine priorities for the work that needs to be done, and the estimates of when the work can be scheduled.

The proposed FY23 Capital Renewal plan is outlined, including department requests that would not show up in the FCIS. Ms. Zimmerman outlined the plan's different components, and a color-coded pie chart on the last page of the plan helps breakdown the proposed spending for each component of the plan. The components are:

ADA, Asbestos/Lead, Carpentry, Department requests, Electronics (Fire and Burglar Alarm systems), Energy Conservation, Grounds, IT Infrastructure, MEP (Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing), Facility Utilization, Paving, Safety and Security projects, Underground tanks, Program contingencies, Construction Management Support, and Program Administration.

### **2.04 Presentation and Discussion of the Fiscal Year 2023, Information Technology Device Refresh Plan, in the amount of \$4,500,000 (FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ONLY)**

By way of introducing this item, Adam Searcy mentions that last fiscal year was the first year we included a separate allocation in our Capital Improvement Plan to address a very much needed device refresh program for student and teacher laptops.

Adam Searcy is joined by Dr. Chris Turner, Chief Information Officer of the WCSD Information Technology Department and Dr. Troy Parks, Chief Academic Officer of the WCSD.

Dr. Turner will speak on the background of the program, what we have accomplished academically (Dr. Troy Parks), how this would be financed (Mark Mathers), and the present proposal to the committee.

Overall strategic technology plan was approved in two segments, beginning two years ago (August 2020). Prior to this annual (district) refresh program, devices were purchased based on budget availability and resource availability at the school level. We had no internal program for refreshing computer devices districtwide.

Pandemic revealed how critical up to date computers are to education, and the device refresh proposal was driven by the inequities that surfaced when there was no predictable and sustainable program to refresh computer devices by the district.

This presented the district with some technology challenges but also created some centralizing opportunities.

Fiscally, our annual device refresh program has allowed us to order in large quantities with a better purchase price vs smaller quantities ordered at the site level.

Operationally, removes the principal from the equation, so that principal is not spending their budget and their time trying to locate best prices for computer devices. Want principals to collaborate with their staff and students, and not have to concern themselves with purchasing computer devices.

The device refresh program brings opportunities to learn. Our teachers and students were unevenly able to participate with technology in the classroom with a mix of well equipped and poorly equipped school sites.

On June 3, 2021, the Capital Funding Protection Committee approved the annual device sustainability program, and the Board of Trustees approved the plan on June 8, 2021.

In the 21-22 school year, 735 teacher laptops were purchased. These were budgeted for \$650.00 each but actual costs were \$621, with a savings of \$21,000. 8,913 student laptops were purchased and distributed to 97 schools. 1,020 iPads were ordered and delivered for use in the K-2<sup>nd</sup> grade classrooms. Lastly, nearly 9 thousand devices have been e-wasted.

There were also lessons learned. There were logistical issues with the addition of 10 thousand devices. We encountered storage issues in the warehouse and imaging issues with so many devices that must be unpacked, imaged, packed back up, and then lastly shipped to the school site.

In the future we may have the vendor image the devices and ship directly to the school sites. Capital projects also has some future storage capacities for the IT Department.

IT Department now has 5 interns, so thankfully, those interns are processing laptops for delivery to the school site and have been a real "boon" to IT's production.

Other lessons learned include, where are the laptops stored and charged? We have realized a cart security issue. We have about 1,000 laptops carts in the district and have

identified some grant opportunities to purchase more lap top carts as sites need safe storage and charging.

Moving damaged e-waste has been problematic at some sites, with some minor bottlenecks of pallets of e waste. Working through those challenges.

Lastly for lessons learned, we can now be prepared for students to be ready to work from home on inclement weather days. Principal can take inventory of computers and "lend" to the students with no devices at home.

In general IT is happy with the progress that this program has made but to be clear, there are gaps in this program. This program only renews computing devices for students and teachers. Classroom interactive displays, sound fields, and computer labs are not covered by the scope of this program.

Dr Troy Parks, Chief Academic Officer, thanks the panel for their hard work on this committee, especially the recent work involving the Debbie Smith CTE project.

While nothing will ever replace the quality teacher in front of a student, laptop technology provides many advantages to academic achievement and learning. Teachers, other staff, and students are very well adapted to using TEAMS, which stores curriculum, access to common assessments, and pacing. Laptop technology also provides advantages with digital citizenship of our students; helping our students avoid the pitfalls of what can happen online.

In visiting classrooms, you can see blended learning opportunities with laptops. For example, in an elementary "flipped classroom" students can work together with the technology at a center. An example of the "flipped classroom" at the high school is the students read an article on the laptop first and then the whole class discusses the article as a group.

Our current textbook adoption process allows students to access all new textbooks online, no need for the hard copy to be able to access the materials.

Learning can happen anywhere and at any time. This summer in addition to the brick-and-mortar summer school classes being offered, because of this new laptop technology we have come up with a "summer school challenge". Students who are at or above grade level can be given a laptop by school administrator to use over the summer and they can access online learning that adapts to their learning level. No expectation that the student attends a virtual summer school all day long but giving them some engagement opportunities over the summer. This will hopefully alleviate the summer learning loss some students experience.

In the future, and after the use of three contingency days, we can use the laptops to send home with students if we anticipate school will be cancelled.

WCSD Budget Director, Mark Mathers, reminds the committee that the funding source for the PC refresh program are property tax revenues, and almost all the \$4,556,671.00 transferred from the debt service fund has been used to purchase teacher and student laptops. In addition to the property tax funding, we also received 2 million in grants for FY 2022.

For FY 2023 \$4.5 million has been budgeted for the annual device refresh program with Dr. Turner describing the particulars. For FY 22-23 none of this money will be spent on teacher laptop refresh because we received the \$2 million FCC Grant money. The future plan is to order over 10,000 more student devices and 1,564 iPads for K-2 students, and Mr. Turner requests that the CFPC approve this proposal and award the \$4.5 million for year 2 of the 5 year Capital Projects Improvement Plan.

Chair Solaro opened this item up for questions.

Vice-Chair Ivory asks for data. How many students in the district and how many devices?

Answer from Dr. Turner is approximately 62 thousand students and in total 118,580 devices belonging to both staff and students. His inventory tool has not allowed the department to "drill down" to capture how many teacher devices are included in the 118,500, and this number includes all devices, desktops, laptops, and tablets. Additionally, approximately 28% of the 118,5080 devices are five years or older, with some being as old as 2013. We do not pay for e-waste to be removed. We are required by NRS to e-waste, and we must ensure data integrity, we shred the hard drive, and sell to an e-waste vendor. It does not make any money for us, however.

What are the costs to distribute the devices? Reply is that all members of IT including the 5 interns are paid out of the District's General fund.

Vice-Chair Ivory wants to caution the committee that this program was intended to be strictly for devices for students but not for any other classroom technology.

Mr. Ivory is concerned that as a district we are creating our own inequity by providing all students in any new school with a 1:1 laptop to student ratio while the students in the older schools do not have access to the same 1:1 ratio.

Per Dr. Turner, financially the district cannot support the 1:1 student to laptop ratio, and the initial device refresh program taught us that we must have a lot of staff to make this program succeed and we simply do not have enough staff at the IT Department to handle any other refresh type of programs for other technologies such as sound boards.

Vice Chair Ivory states that before the district starts to consider programs to support other technologies that we do a better job of getting all students closer to a 1:1 device

ratio throughout the district. Goal of this program is to have devices in each school that would support 80% of the student body. Clarification was offered by Ms. Zimmerman that when new schools open, they open with 85% devices and a 15% contingency for device failures. We do not order 100% devices for a 1:1 in the new schools. We are aligning this refresh program to the current practice for new schools, although the refresh program is seeking an 80% ratio and the new school openings with 85%.

**2.05 Presentation and discussion on the current concepts and full design phase budget associated with the Central Transportation Yard upgrades project, in the amount of \$2,500,000.00 (FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ONLY)**

Adam Searcy, Chief Capital Projects & Facilities Management Officer is joined by Peter Grove, Architect with Collaborative Design Studio.

Mr. Searcy provides the committee with some history of this item. In 2019 Collaborative Design Studio engaged in evaluations of the District's three main transportation yards, with the Central Yard being the largest of the yards and arguably considered the headquarters of the WCSD Transportation Department. In May 2020, a master plan study was completed, and as part of the evaluation, conceptual site plans were developed for all three of our transportation yards. Our proposed action for today is for the full design phase funding for major improvement to the Central Yard only.

Architect, Peter Grove, states they have been working on these projects for several years and in working with transportation staff, engineers, and contractors, many challenges were discovered, including, the site is in a flood zone, the buildings themselves are antiquated (main building is 50 years or older), with offices for staff in Quonset huts and the office spaces are non-functional. There is inadequate parking, inefficient circulation, \$2.5 million in backlogged maintenance issues, and environmental issues due to flooding and underground fuel tanks.

Moving forward the team looked at several options. The suggested scope of the project is to demolish the white fleet and bus fleet office buildings, construct a new consolidated office building to house staff, the maintenance shops, and bus wash area.

These improvements will create a more efficient place for vehicle circulation, parking for bus washing, fueling, and maintenance, as well as functional workspace for all staff, including bringing the dispatch staff from the South Yard to the Central Yard. Security will improve with the addition of lighting, radio upgrades, and CCTV. Environmental and sustainable improvements include removal of underground fuel tanks and the addition of electric charging stations for E busses.

Mr. Grove showed the committee 3 slides detailing the building proposals and the materials likely to be used in construction.

Mr. Searcy describes the proposal as a modernization of the existing site, not an expansion. For the committees' consideration is the design phase funding of \$2.5 million with an anticipated bid date for construction in the summer of 2023.

This design and construction budget was previously approved by the WCSD Board of Trustees in the Five-year CIP 2023-2027 for \$2.5 million (design) and \$15 million (construction).

Chair Solaro opened this item up for discussion.

Mr. Paul Anderson wants to make a statement that this project is awesome. To see the changes at the Central Yard will be great thing for the school district and the City of Sparks, since there are so many issues at the location, mostly safety and environmental.

Vice Chair Ivory wants to know if it is the intent to bring up the entire site to be above the flood zone or are we just considering bringing up the pad that the building is already built on. The reply from Mr. Grove is that the building pad is already above the flood zone so some additional fill will be required to extend the size of the new building pad, but we are not bringing in fill for the entire site.

**2.08 Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action to recommend approval of \$7,000,000.00 to the 2021/2022 "E" Major Projects Program for projects throughout the District (See Attachment A) and to forward the recommendation to a future meeting of the Board of Trustees for approval (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Adam Searcy, Chief Capital Projects & Facilities Management Officer shows the committee the Capital Funding Initiative List of Projects project balance status as of May 11, 2022 and seeks approval of this board for \$47 million for projects throughout the district; \$40 million for the FY23 Capital Renewal Program (2.03), \$4.5 million for the Technology Refresh (2.04), and \$2.5 million for the Transportation Central Yard Expansion/Modernization (2.05) for a total of \$47 million.

There were no questions or concerns from the committee and there was no public comment on this item.

Vice Chair Justin Ivory made a motion to approve the \$47 million to the 2021/2022 "E" Major Projects Program for projects throughout the District. Mr. Paul Anderson seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously. (Yea: Dave Solaro, Sophia Cardinal, Charlene Bybee, Oscar Delgado, Justin Ivory, and Paul Anderson)



**2.06 Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action to recommend approval of the modified Fiscal year 2023-2027, Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan, to the Washoe county School District Board of Trustees (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

WCSD Chief Financial Officer, Mark Mathers, provides the committee with some background for this item. In April this committee approved the 5-year CIP which was subsequently approved by the WCSD Board of Trustees. Staff comes today to request approval on some minor modifications to the 5-year CIP.

Since that time, there has been an explosion of new capital projects and expenditures, resulting in 5 times more purchasing transactions, for example. During final budget discussions, there was a request for 4 additional Capital Funded positions to meet this new workload demand. Historically the district has been very conservative when adding new staff, however staff proposed and the Board approved, the following 4 positions: 1 additional Buyer position, 1 more accountant, as we have only one bond accountant position, an additional Planner I position. These three positions are funded under the Program Administration line from Capital Projects. Lastly, a Project Coordinator position funded out of the Government Services Tax Fund. Total cost for all four positions is \$333,133.00 annually, however the three positions will be paid out of the Program Administration line by reducing the Annual Capital renewal line, for a net zero cost increase. We will see a cost increase in the GST funded Project Coordinator position.

An additional change to the previously approved 5-year CIP plan is a request to move Elementary school #5 in the Cold Springs area from year 2 of the CIP to year 1 of the CIP. This would allow design to begin in year 1 and allow us to embark in construction in the year 3 of the plan 2024/2025. There is no net change in costs.

Member Bybee seeks clarification of the net cost difference to the 5-year CIP. Essentially, it would be for the cost of the one GST funded position (Project Coordinator) for five years, total cost \$500,000.00.

Vic Chair Ivory wonders if staff might consider more positions like the one occupied by Norm Engebretson, in his opinion, we need more of this type of position, that way we could potentially eliminate the 3<sup>rd</sup> party Construction Managers in the future.

Mr. Searcy agreed that we might consider adding additional personnel in the future but that for now, 2 of the 4 additional positions we have added will somewhat accomplish the same duties as an additional Project Manager, the Planner I and the Project Coordinator.

No questions from committee and no public comment on this Action Item.

Vice Chair Ivory makes a motion to recommend approval of the modified Fiscal Year 2023-2027, Five Year Capital improvements Plan, to the Washoe County Board of Trustees.

Sophia Cardinal makes a second. The result of the vote was unanimous: Pass (Yea: Dave Solaro, Justin Ivory, Paul Anderson, Charlene Bybee, Oscar Delgado, Sophia Cardinal)

### **2.01 Approval of the minutes of the April 7, 2022, meeting of the Capital Funding Protection Committee (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

No questions from the committee and no public comments

Motion made by Paul Anderson to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2022, meeting of the Capital Funding Protection Committee. Charlene Bybee makes a second motion, and the result of the vote was unanimous: Pass (Yea: Dave Solaro, Justin Ivory, Paul Anderson, Charlene Bybee, Oscar Delgado, Sophia Cardinal)

### **2.02 Information and discussion on the anticipated cadence and workload for future meetings of the Capital Funding Protection Committee for the 2021-22 and 2022-2023 School Years (FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ONLY)**

The future is exciting. Mr. Searcy asks the committee to review the 2022/2023 Draft schedule and wants to point out the upcoming ribbon cutting(s) at Hug HS and O'Brien MS and Mr. Searcy would like to see this item on all the committee's calendars. Committee can review this draft schedule independently.

Mr. Searcy appreciates the shout out from Chair Solaro to Mr. Pete Etchart, who will be retiring in July 2022, and Mr. Searcy wants to thank committee member Sophia Cardinal for her service to this committee as this will likely be her last meeting. Appreciates Ms. Cardinal's service right up to the very end. This is what makes this committee great, all the diversity and talent. Best wishes to Ms. Cardinal.

Chair Solaro takes another moment to thank Pete Etchart and recognizes his upcoming retirement at the end of July. Mr. Etchart has been a stalworth for many years and a champion for schools and students, and a champion of this committee. Appreciates his leadership.

### **3.01 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **3.02 Announcement of Next Meeting**

TBD. Mr. Searcy will communicate the next meeting, as it may or may not happen in August, 2022 per the June 2, 2022, agenda.

### **3.03 Adjourn Meeting at 7:02 PM**