



Carson City School District

1402 West King Street, Carson City NV 89703
(775) 283-2000 - Fax: (775) 283-2090

Carson City School District Master Plan Committee

Meeting Notes #4 – January 28, 2010

Attendees: Janice Towns, Karen Abowd, Bill Miles, Ron Swirczek, Debbie McDonald, Joanna Wilson, Rich Stokes, LeAnn Saarem, Jason Zona, Richard Doede, Stacie Wilke, John McKenna, Mary Foster, Susan Keema, Ricky Medina, Darrin Berger, Dan Allison, Niki Gladys, Jonathan Young, Marty Johnson, Samantha Fagan, Kevin Monsey, Joe Cacioppo, Mark Korinek, Mark Rotter, Lee Plemel, Robert Prater, Bill Barbie, Steven Pradere, Evelyn Allred

The main purpose of this meeting was to re-connect after the Holidays; get an update from each of the sub-committees and discuss the DRAFT version of the initial assessment of schools

Old Discussion Items (items from last meet that were “informational only” – were deleted from future meeting note topics)

We did not review/discuss issues from the last meeting notes in general – so the following is summary of the new items:

New Discussion items:

- 4.1 Mike Mitchell provided a brief history of how the “facility needs” preliminary assessment was compiled. It was a combination of quick site tours of each facility, an on-site meeting/tour with site administrators/staff and inclusion of all projects being considered by Mark Korinek, staff and board as it relates to capital project needs. No priorities were given at this time. We are in process of doing more detailed site analysis and more refined budgets.
- 4.2 Mike then went thru the “science” of forecasting enrollment; method currently used by most districts is called “cohort survival” and widely recognized as most accurate. This method is what was used by Ricky Medina to forecast the next few years for Carson City. There are noted “limitations” when used for predicting up ticks and down ticks in enrollment. However, using the tools available, actual numbers and future year projections are as follows: 2007/2008 year – 8170 total students; 2008/2009 year – 8007 students; 2009/2010 year – 7597 students; 2010/2011 prediction – 7290 students; 2011 thru 2013 – prediction is another 700 students lost – for a count in 2012/2013 of roughly 6590 students.
- 4.3 It was duly noted that the above numbers are “projections” and there are numerous factors that could buck the trend – i.e. – better economy, student

retention with better programs, “marketing” efforts, new company’s to area (based on now more affordable housing and building climate), etc...

- 4.4 The preliminary needs of the district were reviewed in a broad sense. We have a list totaling at this point roughly \$65,000,000 of indentified needs in a number of categories. This list breaks down roughly as follows: Health/Safety related issues (\$7.5 million); Code compliance (\$500k); Building operational efficiency (\$12 million); Program Needs (\$1 million); Site Improvements (\$4 million); CTE facility (\$6.3 million); Performing Arts center (\$23 million) and replacement of portables (\$10 million). These are rough order of magnitude numbers and would be refined once facilities/program sub-committees help in prioritizing requirements as well as defining the potential projects. Further more refined and detailed assessments are in the works.
- 4.5 Jim Lemaire briefly discussed the pros’ of a CTE and Performing Arts curriculum, along with offering the cons” as he understands them from conversations with John McKenna. His take was offering CTE options helps retain students and keep them more interested in staying in school and competing with private/charter schools.
- 4.6 Marty Johnson of JNA consulting was then introduced. Marty had made a presentation to the finance sub-committee back on 1/21/2010 and it was felt a broad overview of how school districts obtain their operating and capital projects budget was in order for the entire group along with explanation of the current tax rate and potential bond options.
- Marty explained numerous items as it relates to the CCSD property tax assessments, how they work, how “abatement” has an affect on calculations and the overall “State Maximum” rates on property tax – made up of numerous taxing entities.
 - Marty further went on to explain that over the next 10 years, the CCSD will be paying down debt on existing bonds – which are covered in the current .47 cent rate. As this debt is paid down, without further bond approval – CCSD property tax rate will go down in steps – but the rate for an individual property owner most likely doesn’t go down – as Carson City could “capture” the lower CCSD rate or even if they don’t – due to abatement – most houses won’t go down for years – even if the reflected CCSD rate does goes down.
 - Marty further explained the type of bonds available – which include the following:
 - Traditional Bond – CCSD would go to voter – asking for a “set” dollar amount (i.e. \$25,000,000), something that wouldn’t raise the current .47 rate, but with specific projects – the future tax rate would go down over time without passing of future bonds. You need to have set list of projects and voter approval. Carson City has used these over the past few bonds
 - Rollover Bonds – CCSD would go to the voter – asking for them to “maintain” the current .47 rate, no specific dollar amount, but a list of needs that would be identified on an as needed basis. If this is approved – the voter caps the rate at .47 for the next 10 years, and this would generate roughly \$43 million over 10 years. You could sell

bonds in amount of about \$25 million in years 2011/2012, and then still have roughly \$18 million in Pay as Go money over the balance of years – or save it for another large bond sale. The voter is trusting the district to spend the money appropriately – in essence putting a great trust in the district. This process allows much more flexibility and you wouldn't lose taxing rate (nor gain) and you wouldn't have to go back to voter

- Capital Projects Tax – this is basically a Pay as you Go – bond – generating a certain amount of money each year – that may be pooled in consecutive years to do larger projects
 - Marty then explained time frames if going for a Traditional Bond – must decide on bond amount desired, get on the agenda with the Debt Management Board/Commission, then come back to the school board with approval, then develop the question to get on the ballot by 6/18/2010. With this process – would need to get on the April agenda with DMC (submitting in March)
 - If going after Rollover bond – the DMC step is initially eliminated as that isn't done until bond is “passed by voter” and when you want to sell bonds – you go to DMC for approval. Still need questions done by 6/18 – but time constraints aren't as bad
 - Since Rollover Bonds came into existence – only Carson City and Lincoln County have done traditional bonds – other districts were all doing rollover due to their flexibility.
 - Marty suggested – which ever bond you can pass – is the one that should be pursued – but leaving politics out – the rollover is the best scenario for the school district. You can use the first large sale of say \$25 million to tackle the immediate needs. The balance could be used in on-going capital projects or a large chunk could be sold again for a larger project – and tie that money in with possible grant money, federal money, cooperation with other agencies, etc... to do a larger project (i.e. performing arts).
 - Marty suggested that ideally the rollover bonds would focus on projects that will reduce operating budgets in the future (i.e. Mechanical systems, solar, energy upgrades, portables, etc..). Obviously life safety and student well being and curriculum needs that don't increase operating expenses also need to be considered.
- 4.7 Mike Mitchell then wrapped up the meeting, and indicated that each subcommittee chairman needs to make sure they inform their entire subcommittee on next meeting date and time – there has been some confusion and some people not getting invites. Chet Alexander also requested times/dates/locations to help facilitate.
- 4.8 Mike committed to get to a site by site floor/site plan with room numbers and function of rooms – to be used by facilities and program sub-committees

Next regular scheduled Master Plan Committee meeting is (Thursday – February 11th, 2010 at 11:30 a.m.) Lunch will be provided and will be held in the same location, District Office Board Room.

Thanks for all whom attended and committed their time and efforts to this extremely important process for the future of the CCSD.

Cc: Committee Members
Website – www.carsoncityschools.com/masterplan