

PLEASE POST

APPROVED MINUTES

CORAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE LAS VEGAS SPECIAL MEETING OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Meeting Information

Date: Wednesday, April 21, 2021
Time: 3:30 p.m.
Location: 8965 S. Eastern Ave. #280, Las Vegas, NV 89123 [but held electronically, per the Agenda, pursuant to Directive 006 and other Directives of the State of Nevada Executive Department]

Posting of Agenda:

This agenda was posted at the following locations:

Coral Academy of Science Las Vegas (“CASLV”) website at www.caslv.org, and Nevada Public Notice website at <http://notice.nv.gov>.

Format / Procedures / Rules:

[See Agenda for information regarding format, procedure, and rules governing the meeting]

Agenda

Call to order Ms. Diggins called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: Ms. Diggins (Ms. Diggins left the meeting at 5:00 p.m.), Ms. Kazelskis, Mr. Tandogan, Ms. Hayman, and Dr. Warren joined via video and conference call WebEx.

Mr. Zhang and Mr. Gibson were absent.

Non-Board Members in attendance, joined via WebEx conference call, included: Mr. Gardberg, legal counsel, Mr. Mark McGinty, Knit Architecture, Mr. Ercan, Mr. Nick, Mr. Gunozu, and Ms. Shepard.

Pledge of Allegiance

A. Public Comment (Information)

[Please see the Agenda for the procedures and rules regarding Public Comments.]

There were no public comments.

B. Discussion and Possible Action Items

1. Selection of a construction company and contract for pre-construction services under RFP#PWP-CL-2021-311 CMAR (For Possible Action)

Mr. Ercan stated there was a tremendous response to the RFP with eight well known, highly regarded companies submitting bids. The CASLV review team evaluated the responses and shortlisted three companies. These three companies were interviewed in-person. The reviewers included the project architect Mr. McGinty, CASLV Board Secretary, Ms. Kazelskis, Mr. Ercan, Mr. Nick, and Mr. Vu. Upon conclusion of the interview, Core Construction unanimously scored highest. Rafael Construction rated second, and Roche Construction was rated third. Mr. Nick presented the CORE Construction fly-through video to the board.

PLEASE POST

Mark McGinty presented detailed CMAR information, the interview process based on NRS 338, as well as the five prepared questions asked during the interviews. He also discussed the details of each question asked and the rankings that were given. He noted that because of our tight time-frame, it's important the selected company have a strong relationship with the City of Henderson.

The final rankings were uniform among the interviewers. Upon completion of the presentations, the committee felt CORE Construction had the best understanding of our project. Key factors for CORE and the committee's decision for CORE were reviewed/discussed. Mr. McGinty compared the other two company's ratings with the ratings CORE received. He also noted CORE is the 5th largest school builder in the country.

Ms. Diggins added it is clear that CORE has the experience in this market, particularly with schools. She questioned why the committee did not give them a perfect score of 500 after such an impressive presentation. Ms. Kazelskis said although their presentation was very polished and remarkable, they were the first to present which in her opinion was a slight disadvantage.

Dr. Warren asked about the final selection process. Mr. Gardberg responded that the board is approving a construction company for Phase 1. Upon selection, we will negotiate a final CMAR price/contract. If that falls through, then we would want a motion giving the project to the second bidder. We will repeat this entire process again in July. Mr. Ercan explained the CMAR process stating that this is CASLV's first CMAR experience. Mr. McGinty stated that Mr. Ercan was clear in the CMAR process. He also noted the benefit of a CMAR as they thoroughly review the project prior to construction which minimizes construction delays and change orders. Usually, the only change order in a CMAR is the change order that returns 90% of your savings back.

Ms. Diggins stated this sounds wonderful and added that CORE Construction has an impressive background and experience. They are very skilled in building schools here in Clark County and other states. This is a good process in place to vet/rate these companies and it seems like a very easy decision to go with CORE Construction. She asked for thoughts from the board. Ms. Kazelskis agreed and thinks CORE Construction is very qualified to complete within the timeframe. Ms. Hayman added she concurs and that they are very impressive. Mr. Tandogan agrees they are impressive and the best choice. (He also asked for confirmation that this project can be completed on time; Mr. McGinty confirmed that it can.) Dr. Warren added she agrees and likes the fact that they put the most energy and resources securing the bid.

Ms. Diggins moved to approve CORE Construction as the choice of CMAR, with discretion and authority on the part of Mr. Ercan to then proceed to Rafael Construction, and if necessary, to Roche Construction, in that order, if problems arise in finalizing the contract with the selected bidder, seconded by Dr. Warren.

ACTION: Motion unanimously carried.

2. Proposed revisions to the CASLV Mission Statement and adoption of new Vision Statement (For Possible Action)

Mr. Ercan explained that in 2017, CASLV Administration, Principals, and Assistant Principals workshopped a new mission statement. The new mission statement aimed to include "STEM" and strengthen the verbiage yet minimize the length of the statement. We recently asked all campuses' administrative teams to revisit this task

PLEASE POST

and submit a final proposed mission statement. Mr. Ercan also indicated that CASLV does not have a vision statement and various options were presented. He also requested to table this item to another meeting as there is no urgency. Our mission and vision statements are important and would prefer not to rush.

Ms. Hayman said she approves the proposed mission statement. In her opinion it is very important that we prepare students to think critically. She likes STEM inclusion while not neglecting the music and arts areas. She questioned if the vision statement is too focused on leaders/leadership, and recommended the verbiage be modified. Dr. Warren stated she agrees and likes a combination of options 2 and 3 of the proposed vision statements. Ms. Kazelskis likes the mission statement and a combination of 1, 3, and 4 of the vision statements. The board will email suggestions and modifications to Mr. Ercan. Mr. Tandogan added he thinks it looks good. Ms. Diggins added she would like Nevada also mentioned in the mission statement besides global.

This will be presented again at a future board meeting.

3. Request to amend the charter for the proposed revisions to the CASLV Mission Statement and adoption of new Vision Statement *(For Possible Action)*

This item was tabled.

C. Privileged & Confidential Attorney/Client Conference with CASLV Legal Counsel pursuant to NRS 241.015(3)(b)(2) *(Information, Deliberation)*. Note: per the Open Meeting Law ("OML), this constitutes a non-public meeting that is statutorily exempt from the OML.

The closed session took place from 4:30 p.m. to 5:03 p.m.

D. Potential Action(s), if any, re. the legal matters heard during the Closed Session. (Item G). *(For Possible Action)*. Note: this may consist, for example, of a decision to submit a written demand on a potential litigant (e.g., a cease-and-desist letter), to authorize litigation, to conduct further legal research, to propose a settlement to a litigant, or to tender a matter to insurance.

No action taken.

E. Public Comments *(Information)*

There were no public comments.

F. Adjournment *(Action)*

Ms. Kazelskis made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Hayman.

ACTION: Motion unanimously carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.