# In The Matter Of:

State of Nevada Public Works Division Video Conference Board Meeting

January 27, 2017

Capitol Reporters 208 N. Curry Street

Carson City, Nevada 89703

Original File january 27 2017.txt Min-U-Script® with Word Index

| Page 1         Page 3           1         PTATE OF NEWLADA         Page 3           2         PUBLIC WORKD DIVISION VIDEO CONFRMICE ROADD METZION   | run | one works Div      | ision video Conference Doard Meeting        |     | January 27, 2017  |
|---|-----|--------------------|---|-----|---|
| 2         PERIC WARD PUTTE OF NEW ADDA         2         -00-           3         PERIC WARD DEVISION VIEW CONFERENCE ROAD MEETING         -00-         -00-           4         PERIC WARD DEVISION VIEW CONFERENCE ROAD MEETING         -00-         -00-           5         2:00 F.K.         -00-         -00-           6         2:00 F.K.         -00-         -00-           7         CARSON CITY, NUMPY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           6         2:00 F.K.         -00-         -00-           7         CARSON CITY, NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           7         CARSON CITY, NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           7         CARSON CITY, NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           7         CARSON CITY, NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           10         PADMINSTRATOR NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           11         BADMINSTRATOR NUMPY, TANUARY 27, 2017, 200 PM.         -00-           12         CARSON CITY, NUMPY, INDIPY, IND  |     |                    | Page  | 1   | Page 3  |
| 3         PUBLIC MORE DIVISION VIDEO CONFERENCE SOAD DEFINIC<br>PREDAX, JANUARY 27, 2017  |     |                    | STATE OF NEVADA                             | 1   | CARSON CITY, NEVADA; FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2017; 2:00 P.M.  |
| 4       PRIDAY, JANDARY 27, 2017         5       2:00 P.M.         7       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         9       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         9       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         9       THE BOARD:         10       THE BOARD:         11       CORSON CITY, MEVADA         12       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         13       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         14       CARSON CITY, MEVADA         15       CORSON CITY, MEVADA         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       CHARG CLUTYS, MEMAGY         18       MEMDER MEMORY         19       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Chairman Bryce Clutrs?         10       THE BOARD:         11       Steward Clutry, MEMORY         12       MEMDER MEMORY         13       CHARG CLUTYS, MEMAGY         14       MEMDER MEMORY         15       FOR THE BOARD:         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       MEMDER MEMORY         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       MEMDER MEMORY         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       MEMDER HAND: MEMORY         16       FOR THE BOARD:   |     |                    |   |     | -000-   |
| 5       PRIMY, JANUMY 27, 2017         6       2:00 P.M.         7       CARGON CITY, NEVRAN         8       CARGON CITY, NEVRAN         9       DAME STORMAT, Chair Carbon         10       THE BOARD:         11       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         12       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         13       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         14       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         15       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         14       CHAIR CLUTTS: This is the time and place for 5 the State Public Works Board meeting for Friday, January 6 27th, 2017, al 2:00 p.m. First item of business, roll         16       PORT THE BOARD:       DEVEC CLUTTS: Chair Carbon         17       CHAIR CLUTTS: MERCHAIR CLUTTS: Chair Carbon       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Tito Tiberti?         18       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Patrick Cates?       THE BOARD:         19       REFORTHE PARTICLES Comment       THE PARTICLES Comment         10       DEPENT MAICCOT, PERT MERICOCT, Carbon Carbon       DEPENT MAICCOT, Carbon         10       PARTIP MARCACA, PERT MAIR CLUTTS: Chair Carbon       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Patrick Cates?         11       DEPENT MAIRCOCT, MERICACA, PERT MAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of 2 Lake, Scan and Tho may be coming, so I'll mark them in 2         12  |     | PUBLIC WO          | RKS DIVISION VIDEO CONFERENCE BOARD MEETING | 4   |   |
| 6       2100 P.M.         7       CARGON CITY, NEVAIN         9       CARGON CITY, NEVAIN         9       THE BOARD:         10       THE BOARD:         11       CONTROL CLUTTS: Chairs         12       CONTROL CLUTTS: Chairs         13       CARGON CITY, NEVAIN         14       CONTROL CLUTTS: Vice-Chair Sean         15       FOR THE BOARD:         16       CONTROL CLUTTS: Member Clutts: Vice-Chair Sean         17       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thesent.         18       MADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Wice-Chair Sean         19       CONTRUCT:         10       Pepter Mainterate         11       Step State Public Works Board Imeeting in the Main Intermolecture of the State Public Works Board Imeeting in the State Public Works Board Imeeting Immuno Main Public Imeeting Immuno Main Public Works Board Imee   |     |                    | FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2017                    |     |   |
| 7     CABSON CTY, NWARA     6     7 Ch. 2017, at 2:00 p.m. First item of business, roll<br>7 call       9     THE BOARD:     BEYCE CLOTTS, Chair<br>2017, at 2:00 p.m. First item of business, roll<br>7 call       10     THE BOARD:     BEYCE CLOTTS, Chair<br>2017, at 2:00 p.m. First item of business, roll<br>7 call       11     BEYCE CLOTTS, Chair<br>2017, at 2:00 p.m. First item of business, roll<br>7 call       12     MENDER CLUTTS: Present.       13     Down NUSTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Tito Tiberti?       14     Member Adam Hand?       15     FOR THE BOARD:       16     FOR THE BOARD:       17     General Structure, Construction Law Counsel       18     BEFORTED W:       19     AUMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Microphane Partick Cates?       10     THE BOARD:       10     THE MERICUCT;<br>BEFORTED W:       11     Structure, Construction Law Counsel       12     MEMBER ENTLEY: Mon NUNEZ: Microphane Office T       13     ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Microphane Office T       14     Member Adam Hand?       15     FORTER MERICUCT;       16     ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Microphane Office T       17     MEMBER ENTLEY: No. NONE:       18     Reformer Counserse       14     Member Cates: Numer Counserse       15     FORTE MERICUCT;       16     MEMBER ENTLEY: No. None. <th></th> <td></td> <td>2:00 P.M.</td> <td></td> <td></td>  |     |                    | 2:00 P.M.                                   |     |   |
| 8       CARRON CITY, REVARA       7         9       7       call         9       8       CARRON CITY, REVARA         9       10       THE BOARD:       BOTCE CUTTS; Chair<br>Constructions: Resource         11       11       Constructions: Resource       CARRON CUTTS; Present.         12       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director         13       CARRON CONST. Member, Director       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director         14       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director         15       CONSTRUCT, Member, Director       CARRON CUTTS; Member, Director         16       FOR THE BOARD:       CONSTRUCT, Member, Construction Law Counsel         17       DEF NET MEMORY, MEMBER, CATES; Present.       CARNON, NUNEZ: Member Patrick Cates?         16       FOR THE BOARD:       CONSTRUCT, MEMBER, CATES; Present.       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you Very much.         21       CARNON, CARNON, CONSTRUCT, MEMBER, CATES; Present.       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you Very much.         21       CARNON, CARNON, NUNEZ: Member Attern       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you Very much.         21       CARNON, CARNON, NUNEZ: Member Attern       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you Very much.         23       REFORTED BY:       Secon Clify, Mewaas       Seno Clify Non None. <th>-</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>   | -   |                    |   |     |   |
| 10       THE BOARD:       BEVER CUTTS; Chain is tratter of the following of the text of the text of the following of t   | 8   |                    | CARSON CITY, NEVADA                         |     | call.   |
| 11       0100000000000000000000000000000000000  | 9   |                    |   |     |   |
| 11       OUD SUMMEY, Main Streator<br>Deputy Matrix Streator<br>PATRIX CONTEX, Meaning Freedow<br>PATRIX Context Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Patrix<br>Pat | 10  | THE BOARD:         |   | -   |   |
| 12       Deputy Administrator, Director<br>ADM HAD, Nember<br>CLAYP BENTLEY, Member       IMEMBER BENTLEY; Present.         14       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Tito Tiberti?         15       Gastruction Law Counsel         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       Gastruction Law Counsel         18       DEFUNCT,<br>Deputy Attorney General         19       RATH PASCIAR,<br>Program Officer I         10       DEFUNCT,<br>Deputy Attorney General         11       Charter Law Counsel         12       LARB, ADAR,<br>Program Officer I         10       Deputy Attorney General         11       Carter Reported BY:         20       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you very much.         21       CARDA ADAR, BAR, BAR,<br>Program Officer I         22       Carson City, Nevada 89705         24       AGENDA/INDEX         25       Carson City, Nevada 89705         26       Page 2         1       AGENDA/INDEX         3       AGENDA/INDEX         4       Program Carles and Approval<br>of Fublic Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         5       Program Carles and Approval<br>of Fublic Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         6       Program Carles and Approval<br>of Fublic Comment       Page 2         1       AGENDA/INDE   | 11  |                    | GUS NUNEZ, Administrator                    |     |   |
| 13       ADMM RND, Kember         14       CLAPY BERTLE, Member         15       Image: Clapse Bertleviction Law Counsel         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       Term METLELION Law Counsel         18       Term METLECOLF,<br>Term METLECOLF,<br>Program Officer I         19       MEMBER CATES: Present.         10       THE BACKERS,<br>Program Officer I         11       Charton Berthers,<br>Program Officer I         12       MEMBER CATES: Present.         13       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Attrick Cates?         14       MEMBER MADD. Present.         15       Charton Officer I         16       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Patrick Cates?         17       MEMBER CATES: Present.         18       Charton Attriant         20       Chart Cate Stream         21       MEMDA ITEM         24       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of         25       Cater Patrick Stream         26       Cater Patrick Stream         27       MEMBER CATES: Present.         28       Patrick Stream         29       Cater Stream         20       Cater Stream         21       ADEMENDA ITEM         22       Pat  | 12  |                    | Deputy Administrator                        |     | •   |
| 14       14         15       15         16       FOR THE BOARD:         17       SUBAN STEWART,<br>Construction Law Counsel         18       Deputy Attorney General         19       XATTI PASCIAK,<br>Progress Officer I         20       Carlot Assistant         21       Carlot Assistant         22       Carlot Assistant         23       CAPITOL REPORTERS<br>BY: Michie Sanden,<br>BY: Michie   |     |                    | ADAM HAND, Member                           |     |   |
| 16       FOR THE BOARD:       THE BOARD:       THE BOARD:         17       Construction Law Counsel       JUNE Y MONICOUCT.         18       Deputy Micromery General       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Member Patrick Cates?         19       XATUL PACTAM.       16         20       Catrical Assistent       18         21       Catrical Assistent       20         22       Catrical Assistent       20         23       Catrical Assistent       21         24       Catrical Assistent       22         25       Catrical Assistent       23         24       Catrical Assistent       24         25       Catrical Assistent       23         26       Catrical Assistent       23         27       Catrical Assistent       24         28       Catrical Assistent       24         29       Catrical Assistent       23         20       Catrical Assistent       24         21       Catrical Assistent       25         22       Page 2       Page 2         23       Ademoard Trave       24         24       Ademoard Trave       25         25       Page 2       MEMBER Catrical Assistent   |     |                    |   | 14  |   |
| 17       JEFF MENTCOCCT,<br>Deputy Attorney General       16       ADMINSTRATOR NUNEX: Member Paintex Cales /<br>MEMBER CATES: Present.         19       RATH: PASCINA,<br>Program Officer I       16       ADMINSTRATOR NUNEZ: Mr. Chairman, you have         20       LAREA ADATE,<br>Clerical Assistant       20       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you very much.         21       CANTO, REFORTES<br>TO<br>CARSON CLEY, Newada 89706       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of<br>23 here if they come in.         24       MEXAMPA ADATE,<br>Clarical Assistant       21       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: If anybody comes in<br>23 here if they come in.         25       CANTO, REFORTES<br>Carson CLY, Newada 89706       21       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: If anybody comes in<br>23 here if they come in.         24       MEMBER CATES: Present.       21       ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: If anybody comes in<br>23 here if they come in.         25       CANTO, REFORTES<br>Carson CLY, Newada 89706       22       Late, Sean and Tito may be comment. Is there         26       Page 2       Page 4       24       1       24         27       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 4       1       3         3       1. Roll Call       3       2       10       10         4       Proge 1       1       10       10       10       10         5       Por Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>0   | _   |                    |   | 15  | MEMBER HAND: Present.                                     |
| 18       JEFP MENICUCCT, General         19       Fegura Citar Control of Citar T         20       LATER ADATE,<br>Clerical Assistant         21       Clerical Assistant         23       CAPITOL REPORTERS<br>BY: Micola Ransen,<br>TX Micola Ransen,<br>Carson City, Nevada 89706         24       MARNA TRM         25       CAPITOL REPORTERS<br>BY: Micola Ransen,<br>TX Micola Ransen,<br>Carson City, Nevada 89706         26       AGENDA/INDEX         27       AGENDA/INDEX         2       Page 2         2       Page 2         2       Page 2         2       Page 2         2       Page 4         3       . Foll Call         3       . For Pagelle Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>6       -         4       . For Pagelle Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>6       -         5       . For Pagelle Action: Legislative<br>Update       -         1       . For Pagelle Action: Legislative<br>1       -         1       . For Pagelle Action: Legislative<br>1       -         1       . For Pagelle Action: Legislative<br>1       -         1       . For Pagelle Action: Board comment and<br>1       -         1       . For Pagelle Action: Board comment and<br>1       -         1 <td< td=""><th></th><td>FOR THE BOAR</td><td></td><td>16</td><td></td></td<>   |     | FOR THE BOAR       |   | 16  |   |
| 19       Immit pactrax.<br>Program officer I<br>20       Program  |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 20       LAURA AARR,<br>Clerical Assistant         21       LAURA AARR,<br>Clerical Assistant         22       Clerical Assistant         23       Clerical Assistant         24       Clerical Assistant         25       CAPTOL REPORTERS<br>BY: Micros Hateen,<br>123 West Nye Jane<br>Carson City, Nevada B9706         26       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of<br>21 latt, Sean and Tito may be coming, so I'll mark them in<br>23 here if they come in.         26       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of<br>25 business, Agenda Item No. 2, public comment. Is there         27       AGENDA/INDEX         28       Page 2         29       Page 4         1       any public comment down south?         2       AGENDA/INDEX         3       Page 4         1       any public comment down south?         2       MEMBER BENTLEY: No. None.         3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Idon't see any         4       here up north. No public comment. Moving on to Agenda         5       Por Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>0 contractor Qualifications         6       Por Possible Action: Deard comment and<br>10 record, Member Cates. Just a couple of spots here. I'm         11       page 4 S. Tithink that it would be helpful to<br>1 recurs to be included in future agenda<br>1 war." With an "E," it means every two years, and w  |     |                    |   | -   |   |
| 21       Linker ADJLS,<br>Clercical Assistant         22       Clercical Assistant         23       MEMORTED BY:         24       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         25       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         24       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         25       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         26       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         27       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         28       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         29       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         20       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         24       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         25       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         24       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         25       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         24       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         25       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         26       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         27       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         28       DATIOL REPORTED SY:         30       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval Contractor Qualifications         31       For Possible Action: Correview of SPND       Socontractor Qualifications         32       Per Possible Action: Legislative       To repossible Action: Legislative         33       For Possible Action: Legislative       To repossible Action: Legislative  |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 22       REPORTED BY:       CAPITOL REPORTERS<br>BY: Nicole Hansen,<br>Marda CCR #446       22         24       Discussion       Discussion       24         25       Discussion       Page 2         26       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         1       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         1       Reported its       Page 2         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         3       . Roll Call       S         4       . Public Comment       Mark them in in its         5       . Public Comment       Mark them in its         6       . Public Comment       Page 2         6       . Route its       AGENDA/INDEX         1       agenda       Its         4       . Public Comment       Mark them in in its         5       . Public Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         3       . Public Comment       Bartin the its         6       . Public Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         7       . Public Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         8       . Public Comment       AGENDA/INDEX         9       . Public Comm  | -   |                    |   |     |   |
| 23       REPORTED BY:       CAPTIOL REPORTERS         24       District Rangen,<br>District Rangen,<br>123 West Nye Lane       23         25       Carson City, Nevada 89706       24         26       AGENDA/INDEX       23         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 2         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 4         2       AGENDA/INDEX       Page 4         2       AGENDA/INDEX       2         3       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       3         4       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       4         6       For Possible Action: Overview of SPND       5         10       Contractor Qualifications       7         11       Seed action: Legislative       7         12       Pro Possible Action: Legislative       7         13       For Possible Action: Legislative       7         14       Themas too in cluded in future agendas       15         15       For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion       4         14       Page 4       13         15       For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion       4         16       For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion       4         15  |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 24       Nevada CCR #446<br>123 West Mye Lane<br>Carson City, Nevada 89706       24       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. The second item of<br>25 business, Agenda Item No. 2, public comment. Is there         25       AGENDA / INDEX       Page 2       Page 4         1       AGENDA / INDEX       1       any public comment down south?       2         2       AGENDA / INDEX       1       any public comment down south?       2         3       1. Roll call       3       GP public Works Board Meeting Minutes:       3         4       2. Fublic Comment       Acceptance and Approval       4         5       . For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       4         6       6       Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:       6         0       October 10, 2016       Possible Action: Overview of SPND       5         9       MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the<br>10 record, Member Cates. Just a couple of spots here. I'm<br>11 on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28         12       there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next<br>13 biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an<br>14 "A." With an "E," it means every two years, and with an<br>15 "A," it means twice a year. And on page 45, this is line<br>16 5 on page 45, "I think that it's very<br>17 include in the letter, and I think that it's very<br>18 inconsistent with the motion." I think, I hope I said,<br>19 "Consistent." And that's all I have.<br>20 CHAIR CLUTTS: Anot you Member Cates. Is<br>21 there any other comments? A  |     | REPORTED BY:       |   |     |   |
| 23       Carson City, Nevada 89706       25       business, Agenda Item No. 2, public comment. Is there         24       Page 2       Page 2       Page 4         1       AGENDA ITEM       Page 2       Page 4         2       AGENDA ITEM       Page 3       1       any public comment down south?       2       Page 4         3       1.       Roll Call       3       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       2.       Public Comment       3       GHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       4       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       6       6       Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:       7         6       7       Of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:       7       10       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       6         6       9       Por Possible Action: Coverview of SPND       5       9       MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the       10         11       5.       Por Possible Action: Proposed Legislation       49       14 </td <th></th> <td></td> <td>Nevada CCR #446</td> <td></td> <td></td>   |     |                    | Nevada CCR #446                             |     |   |
| 1       AGENDA ITEM       PAGE         2       AGENDA ITEM       PAGE         3       1. Roll Call       3         4       2. Public Comment       3         5       Public Comment       3         6       3. For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:<br>October 10, 2016       4         6       3. For Possible Action: Overview of SPND<br>Contractor Qualifications       5         1       5. For Possible Action: Overview of SPND<br>Contractor Qualifications       5         10       -       For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update       7         11       5. For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update       7       10         12       -       -       -         13       6. For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       6       -         14       -       -       -       -         15       -       For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       6       -         14       -       -       -       -         15       -       For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       -       -         16       -       -       -       -       -         17       -       -   |     |                    |   | 25  |   |
| 1       AGENDA ITEM       PAGE         2       AGENDA ITEM       PAGE         3       1. Roll Call       3         4       2. Public Comment       3         5       Public Comment       3         6       3. For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:<br>October 10, 2016       4         6       3. For Possible Action: Overview of SPND<br>Contractor Qualifications       5         1       5. For Possible Action: Overview of SPND<br>Contractor Qualifications       5         10       -       For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update       7         11       5. For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update       7       10         12       -       -       -         13       6. For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       6       -         14       -       -       -       -         15       -       For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       6       -         14       -       -       -       -         15       -       For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion       -       -         16       -       -       -       -       -         17       -       -   |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 2 AGENDA ITEMPAGE31. Roll Call34.2. Public Comment35. Public Comment63. For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>to Crobinic Works Board Meeting Minutes:<br>OC Public Works Board meeting minutes for the following<br>T meeting dates: October 10th, 2016, and November 1st,<br>8 2016.64. For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD<br>Contractor Qualifications594. For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update7115. For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Dupdate7136. Por Possible Action: Proposed Legislation<br>Board Comment<br>Board Comment516- Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion517- For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion6418- Ream Co be included in future agendas<br>- Lemm Co   |     |                    | Page  | 2   | Page 4  |
| 2       AGENDA ITEM       PAGE       2       MEMBER BENTLEY: No. None.         3       1. Roll Call       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       2. Public Comment       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       2. Public Comment       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         6       3. For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       6       of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:         7       October 10, 2016       6       PUBLIC Comments       6         8       November 1, 2016       7       meeting dates: October 10th, 2016, and November 1st, 8         9       4. For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD       5       9       MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the 10         10       Contractor Qualifications       7       10       on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28         12       Update       1       10 on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28         13       biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an 15       "A," With an "E," it means every two years, and with an 15         14       - Everiew of action iftems for SPMD management       15       5 on page 45, 'T think that it would be helpful to 17         15       - Review of action iftems for SPMD management       15       5 on page 45, 'T  | 1   |                    | AGENDA/INDEX                                | 1   | any public comment down south?                            |
| 3       1. Roll Call       3       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       2.       Public Comment       3       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       2.       Public Comment       3       3       CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. I don't see any         4       4       here up north. No public comment. Moving on to Agenda       5         5       .       For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval       6       6         7       October 10, 2016       .       .       6         8       .       For Possible Action: Overview of SPND       5       .         10       Contractor Qualifications       5       .       9       MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the         10       record, Member Cates. Just a couple of spots here. I'm       1       0 npage 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28         12       Update       .       11       0 npage 45, "I think that it would be helpful to         14       .       .       .       .       .         15       For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion       .       .       .         14       .       .       .       .       .         15       .   | 2   | AGENDA ITEM        | PAG   | 7   | • •   |
| 42.Public Comment34 here up north. No public comment. Moving on to Agenda53.For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval<br>of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes:<br>October 10, 201647October 10, 2016668November 1, 2016694.For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD<br>Contractor Qualifications594.For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update7115.For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update71210nage 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28<br>12 there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next136.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion64147.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion64157.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion6416- Board Comments on any agenda item<br>- Set future meeting date if needed6417- Review of action items for SPMD management<br>- Set future meeting date if needed6418- Wilce comment6419Nublic comment6419- Adjournment65219.Adjournment222324   | 3   | 1. Roll Ca         | 11  | 3 3 |   |
| <ul> <li>For Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes for the following of Public Works Board meeting minutes for the following meeting dates: October 10th, 2016, and November 1st, a 2016.</li> <li>For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD Contractor Qualifications</li> <li>For Possible Action: Legislative Update</li> <li>For Possible Action: Proposed Legislation Board Input.</li> <li>For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion encluded in future agendas reserved action items for SPWD management - Set future meeting date if needed</li> <li>Public comment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>Methed and approval for possible Action: Acceptance and Approval for public Works Board meeting minutes for the following meeting dates: October 10th, 2016, and November 1st, a 2016.</li> <li>MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the creating date if needed</li> <li>In on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28 is beincluded in future agendas item - items for approval item store a year. And on page 45, this is line 15 'A," it means twice a year. And on page 45, this is line 16 5 on page 45, "I think that it's very 18 inconsistent with the motion." I think, I hope I said, 19 "Consistent." And that's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Cates. Is 21 there any other comments? Any other comments? Hearing 22 none, I'll entertain a motion for approval.</li> <li>MEMBER CATES: Socond</li> </ul>  |     | 2. Public          | Comment                                     | 3 4 |   |
| of Public Works Board Meeting Minutes?7October 10, 20168994. For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD<br>Contractor Qualifications7105.115.12111212136.141515For Possible Action: Droposed Legislation<br>Board Input.1414157.16- Board comments on any agenda item<br>- Items to be included in future agendas<br>- Set future meeting date if needed17- Set future meeting date if needed18- Set future meeting date if needed198.2021219.222323242424   | -   |                    |   |     | i Item No. 3 for possible action: Acceptance and approval |
| 894.For Possible Action: Overview of SPWD<br>Contractor Qualifications59MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the<br>10 record, Member Cates. Just a couple of spots here. I'm<br>11 on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28<br>12 there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next<br>13 biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an<br>1414157.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion<br>- Board Comments on any agenda item<br>- Board comment49157.For Possible Action i Emes to be included in future agendas<br>- Review of action items for SPWD management<br>- Set future meeting date if needed64198.Public comment6420219.Adjournment20232423242424CHAIR CLUTTS: Second?  | -   | of Publ            | ic Works Board Meeting Minutes:             | 6   | e e   |
| 94.For Possible Action: Overview of SFWD<br>Contractor Qualifications59MEMBER CATES: I have some comments. For the<br>10 record, Member Cates. Just a couple of spots here. I'm<br>11 on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28<br>12 there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next136.For Possible Action: Proposed Legislation<br>Board Input.4914713 biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an<br>14 "A." With an "E," it means every two years, and with an<br>15 "A," it means twice a year. And on page 45, this is line<br>16 5 on page 45, "I think that it would be helpful to<br>17 include in the letter, and I think that it's very<br>18 inconsistent with the motion." I think, I hope I said,<br>19 "Consistent." And that's all I have.20219Adjournment219Adjournment642223242424   |     | October<br>Novembe | r 10, 2016<br>r 1, 2016                     |     | -   |
| 10115.For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update711 on page 27. I'm sorry, page 28, little block of 28<br>12 there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next136.For Possible Action: Proposed Legislation<br>Board Input.49147.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion64157.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion6416- Board comments on any agenda item<br>- Items to be included in future agendas<br>- Review of action items for SPND management64198.Public comment64202020219.Adjournment2223242424MEMBER CATES. Finact solutions. For the finance solution is an experiment   |     | 4 For Der          | tible Action. Overview of CDUR              |     |   |
| 115.For Possible Action: Legislative<br>Update710101010101011101110111011 <th< td=""><th></th><td></td><td></td><td>2</td><td></td></th<>   |     |                    |   | 2   |   |
| Update121113141214131412there. About mid page, it has the term, "In the next136.For Possible Action: Proposed Legislation4913biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an141413biennial budget." Biennium with an "E" rather than an1414"A." With an "E," it means every two years, and with an157.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion6416- Board comments on any agenda item<br>- Items to be included in future agendas6417- Review of action items for SPWD management<br>- Set future meeting date if needed6418- Set future meeting date if needed64198.Public comment6420219.219.Adjournment6522232424  |     | 5. For Pos         | sible Action: Legislative                   |     |   |
| <ul> <li>13 6. For Possible Action: Proposed Legislation<br/>Board Input.</li> <li>14</li> <li>15 7. For Possible Action: Board comment and<br/>Discussion</li> <li>16 - Board comments on any agenda item<br/>- Items to be included in future agendas</li> <li>17 - Review of action items for SPWD management<br/>- Set future meeting date if needed</li> <li>18 Public comment</li> <li>20</li> <li>21 9. Adjournment</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>24</li> <li>25 For Possible Action: Board comment and<br/>Discussion</li> <li>26 Included in future agendas<br/>- Review of action items for SPWD management<br/>- Set future meeting date if needed</li> <li>26 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Cates. Is</li> <li>21 there any other comments? Any other comments? Hearing</li> <li>22 Discussion</li> <li>23 MEMBER HAND: So moved.</li> <li>24 MEMBER CLUTTS: Second?</li> <li>25 MEMBER CLUTTS: Second?</li> <li>26 MEMBER CLUTTS: Second</li> </ul>   |     |                    | Degiblative                                 |     |   |
| 141414 "A." With an "E," it means every two years, and with an157.For Possible Action: Board comment and<br>Discussion6416- Board comments on any agenda item<br>- Ttems to be included in future agendas<br>- Set future meeting date if needed6417- Review of action items for SPWD management<br>- Set future meeting date if needed64198.Public comment2020CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Cates. Is219.Adjournment2223242424MEMBER HAND: So moved.2424MEMBER CATES: Second   |     | 6. For Pos         | sible Action: Proposed Legislation 4        |     |   |
| <ul> <li>15 7. For Possible Action: Board comment and Discussion</li> <li>Board comments on any agenda item</li> <li>Items to be included in future agendas</li> <li>Review of action items for SPWD management</li> <li>Set future meeting date if needed</li> <li>Public comment</li> <li>Public comment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>Adjournment</li> <li>MEMBER HAND: So moved.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Second</li> <li>MEMBER HAND: So moved.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Second</li> </ul>  | 14  |                    |   |     | -   |
| Discussion16- Board comments on any agenda item<br>- Items to be included in future agendas17- Review of action items for SFWD management18- Set future meeting date if needed18- Set future meeting date if needed198. Public comment20- Adjournment219. Adjournment22- Adjournment23- Adjournment24- Adjournment24- Adjournment24- Adjournment24- Adjournment25- MEMBER HAND: So moved.26- MEMBER CATES: Second   | 15  |                    |   |     |   |
| 17- Items to be included in future agendas17- Review of action items for SPWD management18- Set future meeting date if needed1819198. Public comment20642019 "Consistent." And that's all I have.2020219. Adjournment226523232424242525MEMBER HAND: So moved.262627282929202021222324   | 16  | - Board            | comments on any agenda item                 | 16  |   |
| 1818Inconsistent with the motion." I think, I hope I said,198. Public comment6419 "Consistent." And that's all I have.2020CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Cates. Is219. Adjournment6521 there any other comments? Any other comments? Hearing222323MEMBER HAND: So moved.242425MEMBER CATES: Second   | 17  | - Revie            | w of action items for SPWD management       |     |   |
| 2020CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Cates. Is21 9. Adjournment6521 there any other comments? Any other comments? Hearing2222 none, I'll entertain a motion for approval.2323MEMBER HAND: So moved.2425MEMPER CATES: Second  | 18  | - Set f            | uture meeting date if needed                |     |   |
| 219. Adjournment6521 there any other comments? Any other comments? Hearing222323232324242425MEMBER HAND: So moved.  | 19  | 8. Public          | comment 6                                   | 19  |   |
| <ul> <li>22 none, I'll entertain a motion for approval.</li> <li>23 24 22 none, I'll entertain a motion for approval.</li> <li>23 MEMBER HAND: So moved.</li> <li>24 CHAIR CLUTTS: Second.</li> <li>25 MEMBER CATES: Second.</li> </ul>   | 20  |                    |   | -   | -   |
| 2323MEMBER HAND: So moved.2424CHAIR CLUTTS: Second.25MEMBER CATES: Second.  | 21  | 9. Adjourn         | nent 6:                                     |     |   |
| 24 CHAIR CLUTTS: Second?  |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 25 MEMBER CATES: Second   |     |                    |   |     |   |
| 25 MEMBER CATES. Second.  |     |                    |   |     |   |
|   | 25  |                    |   | 20  |   |

|  | Page 5  |  | Page 7   |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | CHAIR CLUTTS: All of those in favor?  | 1  | participated in one of those appeals. It's very  |
| 1  | THE BOARD: Aye.   |  | straightforward. We have a time frame within which we  |
| 2  | CHAIR CLUTTS: Any opposed? Thank you.   |  | must respond. We have a time frame within which we have  |
|  | Agenda Item No. 4 for possible action: Overview of State  |  | to set the hearing and give them notice. The applicant   |
|  | Public Works Division Contractor Qualifications Governing   |  | has the burden of proof in the hearing, and of course the  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Statutes and Regulations, State Public Works Department   |  | statute sets forth how this Board can handle evidentiary   |
|  | Application and Scoring. Mr. Nunez?   |  | matters that are presented, and then the statute   |
| 8  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you,   |  | specifically requires the Board to make a decision at the  |
|  | Mr. Chairman. I'll be going over the actual   |  | hearing. So those are your statutes. Those are your  |
|  | qualification forms and the scoring procedure, but before   |  | governing statutes.  |
|  | that, I'm going to have Susan Stewart go over the current   | 11   | 1 0  |
|  | law and regulations with you first.   |  | implementing those statutes, and if you look on the next   |
| 13   | CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?   |  | page in your packet, you'll see relevant regulations, and  |
| 14   | COUNSEL STEWART: Thank you. For the record,   |  | copies of the statutes are also attached here for you.   |
|  | Susan Stewart. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This will be a  |  | And this is, very broadly, NAC 338.150, through 338.290,   |
|  | 10,000-foot view of the statutes and the regs, and I  |  | and what this does is it puts some, if you will, meat on   |
|  | welcome any questions at any time you want to drill down  |  | the bones of what those statutes say. So it defines  |
|  | further. This is just to kind of give you a general   |  | bidder, principal, personnel. It establishes cost  |
| 19   | framework of what we do, and then we can go from there.   | 19   | categories.  |
| 20   | CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay.   | 20   |  |
| 21   | COUNSEL STEWART: First, you'll see what I've  | 21   | Division statute was implemented where contractors under   |
| 22   | been there's a list under the "discussion," and the   | 22   | a hundred thousand dollars seeking qualification had a   |
| 23   | first set of documents you have is just a brief summary   | 23   | very streamlined qualification process to encourage them   |
| 24   | of the statutes and regulations. 338.1375, that is the  | 24   | to get experience doing Public Works, so that process is   |
| 25   | statute that tells us what exactly we are able to take  | 25   | very streamlined compared to the over a hundred thousand   |
|  |   |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Page 6  |  | Page 8   |
| 1  |   | 1  |  |
|  | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's  |  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set   |
| 2  | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.  | 2  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set forth in the regs. The process for submitting the   |
| 2<br>3   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly  | 2<br>3   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into   | 2<br>3<br>4  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into  | 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>12   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>13<br>14   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board. The staff are required to investigate the application,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.<br>The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.<br>The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor initiated   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                    | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.<br>The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor been the subject of an  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.<br>The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights and the time frames that will   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor been the subject of an<br>arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board. The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights. We actually cut and paste   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor initiated<br>litigation? Had that contractor been the subject of an<br>arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that<br>expands 338.240. And so going forward, that's something,   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board. The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights. We actually cut and paste the statute right into the letter.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor initiated<br>litigation? Had that contractor been the subject of an<br>arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that<br>expands 338.240. And so going forward, that's something,<br>once that gets approved by the legislature, we'll need to              |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.<br>The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights. We actually cut and paste the statute right into the letter.<br>Then in 338.1381, that is the appeal | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor been the subject of an<br>arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that<br>expands 338.240. And so going forward, that's something,<br>once that gets approved by the legislature, we'll need to<br>amend the qualification application and the scoring to |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.<br>You'll see there that there's a fairly straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.<br>The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us the process that the contractor and the Public Works Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board. The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights. We actually cut and paste the statute right into the letter.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | dollar application. So those cost categories are set<br>forth in the regs. The process for submitting the<br>application is set forth, and then the criteria.<br>And if you look, it drills down as far as<br>what the you know, we require a certified statement<br>from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the<br>past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes<br>through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're<br>required to provide for us. The appeal process is also<br>spelled out in greater detail and then also, the<br>consideration of the contractor evaluations.<br>One thing I did want to point out is we have<br>a regulation that this Board has approved and the<br>legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall<br>one of the things we expanded in the past performance is<br>we decided that the Board wanted to take into<br>consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious.<br>And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach<br>of contract, but had that contractor initiated<br>litigation? Had that contractor been the subject of an<br>arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that<br>expands 338.240. And so going forward, that's something,<br>once that gets approved by the legislature, we'll need to              |

| 1  | The Works Division Wheel Conference Dourd Meeting  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Page 9   |  | Page 11  |
| 1  | I think, unless there's any questions at that  | 1  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we asked for a  |
|  | point, once we kind of walk through how it is actually   |  | certified statement from their bonding company. And  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | applied, it might be helpful to go back if there's any   |  | basically, what we asked them to do is to indicate in  |
|  | questions on the statute. But that's all I had, unless   |  | that letter their single limit and their aggregate limit.  |
| 5  | there were any questions.  |  | And so, in fact, we're using the surety company and the  |
| 6  | CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Miss Stewart. Any   |  | review of the financial information by a surety company,   |
| 7  | questions before we move on? And we can come back.   | 7  | have them do that for us instead of us doing it, and   |
| 8  | Mr. Nunez?   | 8  | therefore, that establishes for us the maximum amount  |
| 9  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you. Gus Nunez,   | 9  | that we would consider a bid from a prime.   |
| 10   | for the record. What I'd like to do is if you go past  | 10   |  |
|  | all of the pages here under the statutes and the NAC and   |  | can see here, as you go over here on part one, financial   |
|  | get over to the page that begins with the application for  |  | ability, under the scoring system, the valuation, the  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | qualifications on general projects for a period of two   |  | bonding is a pass/fail in this category. If you cannot   |
|  | years, and what I'd like to do, probably be best as we're  |  | bond a project, obviously, you can't bid. So bonding is  |
|  | going through that, if you don't mind breaking the   |  | a pass/fail.   |
|  | package a bit, and on this particular tab, taking the  | 16   | 1  |
|  | last five pages on this tab which is the scoring system,   |  | current State of Nevada contractor's license pursuant to   |
| 18   | and it says, "Qualifications committee evaluation of   | 18   | Chapter 625. Again, you can see here, part 1B,   |
| 19   | application for a two-year period" and have it basically   | 19   | licensure. And again, that's a pass/fail. I don't think  |
|  | sitting side by side with the actual application. So as  |  | I need to go any further on that. And then the last one  |
|  | we go through, it would probably help a lot just to do it  |  | here: Has applicant ever filed as a debtor under the   |
|  | together at the same time. Here is the information, here   |  | United States Bankruptcy Code during the last 5 years  |
|  | is how we score it as we go on down. It will probably be   |  | immediately preceding the date of application? If yes,   |
|  | better and we'll probably understand it better, get the  |  | please attach a copy of the bankruptcy petition.   |
|  | gist of what each one of the parts mean on all of these  | 24   |  |
| 25   | gist of what each one of the parts mean on an of these   | 25   | And what we do here, we got two C and D  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Page 10  |  | Page 12  |
| 1  |  | 1  |  |
|  | sections.  |  | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last  |
| 2  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the   | 2  | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11   |
| 2<br>3   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your  | 2<br>3   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,   | 2<br>3<br>4  | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11 or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10 points.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this   | 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>12   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>5  | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of<br>really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant<br>work experience, years employed by the company and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of<br>really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant<br>work experience, years employed by the company and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of<br>really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so<br>what we chose to do was to ask for other information to<br>let us know about where the contractor should be at with   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant<br>work experience, years employed by the company and<br>licenses. And then the projects after that, the project   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of<br>really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so<br>what we chose to do was to ask for other information to<br>let us know about where the contractor should be at with<br>respect to what we would allow them to bid on Public | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant<br>work experience, years employed by the company and<br>licenses. And then the projects after that, the project<br>name, project scope, dollar amount and year of |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | sections.<br>So if everybody is ready, basically, on the<br>first page of the application, you need to provide your<br>contact information in here. And in addition to that,<br>you need to tell us whether you're applying for the<br>different categories, which is \$100,000 to \$1,000,000,<br>\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000, or more than \$5,000,000. You<br>also need to indicate whether you want to be considered<br>between \$25- and \$100,000 for contracts on this<br>particular one here. And that has to part of this has<br>to do with some of the manner in which you're scored<br>later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the<br>ones between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 to<br>\$5,000,000, and then over \$5,000,000.<br>If we move on to the next page, we get into<br>financial ability. And originally when we looked at this<br>thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where<br>they actually ask for financial statements. We here at<br>Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of<br>really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so<br>what we chose to do was to ask for other information to<br>let us know about where the contractor should be at with   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | addresses that we have. If it's a Chapter 7 in the last<br>five years, that's a pass/fail. If it was a Chapter 11<br>or 13 bankruptcy filing in the last 5 years, we deduct 10<br>points.<br>Then I'll move on to Part II under Principal<br>Personnel. It says here, "The applicant shall include in<br>the application submitted a description of the<br>professional qualifications and relevant experiences of<br>the principal personnel employed by applicant." And it<br>says, "NAC 338.220 defines 'Principal Personnel' as the<br>owner of any corporate officer or qualified employee<br>listed in the contractor's license of the applicant."<br>And then, "Lists 10 projects successfully<br>completed under the direction of the principal personnel<br>within the cost category or higher for which applicant is<br>seeking to qualify."<br>And then for each principal personnel, then<br>we ask them to list the projects here. So you can see<br>the name of the qualified employee, the title upon which<br>he had in doing that particular project, years relevant<br>work experience, years employed by the company and<br>licenses. And then the projects after that, the project   |

|    | Page 13   |    | Page 15  |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1  | CHAIR CLUTTS: If I can interrupt you for a  | 1  | him up to \$3,000,000.                                     |
|    | second.   | 2  |  |
| 3  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: You bet.   |    | way the scoring is performed, is that we look at the       |
| 4  | CHAIR CLUTTS: I was waiting to see if you   |    | projects that are listed and the total amount of the       |
|    | mentioned that. So you said you're looking for projects   |    | contract. If it's between if it's below \$1,000,000,       |
|    | in the last five years. In this particular category, I  |    | then he would get a 1 point deduct. If it's between        |
|    | was trying to find where it's calling for that.   |    | \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000, which would be his limit, his |
| 8  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And I may have been off  |    | single bonding limit capacity, then it's prorated between  |
| -  | base on that. Typically, we're only looking at the last   |    | \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000 as to how much you deduct out  |
|    |   |    | of that point. If it's \$3,000,000 or more, he gets no     |
|    | five years, but in this particular category, you're   |    | 1  |
|    | correct. It doesn't say that.   |    | deduction. So again, the main thing is that we don't go    |
| 12 | CHAIR CLUTTS: So this particular Tab II is  |    | all the way to 5. One to five is the category, but if a    |
|    | not applicable to the last five years?  |    | contractor's limit is less than that because his license   |
| 14 | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct. Yes.  |    | may be whatever, but if he's only qualified up to \$3      |
| 15 | CHAIR CLUTTS: It's any projects at any time   |    | because of his bonding capacity, that's what we're going   |
|    | during the company, that principal personnel's  |    | to do. We just go by that.                                 |
| 17 | 1   | 17 | We typically use the smaller of either the                 |
| 18 | COUNSEL STEWART: Well   |    | license or the bonding capacity. We've had very            |
| 19 | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And you can see the  |    | seldom do we get someone here that says, well, the         |
|    | successful projects are within the last five years, but I   |    | bonding is \$10,000,000, but their license is \$5,000,000, |
|    | can see that it doesn't say that here, so maybe I missed  |    | but we've had that issue before, so that's what I'm        |
|    | one. Did you want to say something?   |    | saying is the least of the two. And so again, that's       |
| 23 | COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan  |    | if there's no questions on that, we would prorate that     |
|    | Stewart. Just let me double-check and see what the reg  |    | and then so we just list all of the projects.              |
| 25 | said because what the reg said would govern, and it may   | 25 | Now, if he doesn't list ten project, let's                 |
|    |   |    |  |
|    | Page 14   |    | Page 16  |
| 1  | not be accurately or clearly reflected in here.   | 1  | say he only lists five, the other five will be full        |
| 2  | CHAIR CLUTTS: And that was one of my  |    | 1-point deductions because we're asking for 10. So if he   |
| 3  | questions is I didn't go back and look at 338.220 in  |    | whatever he misses here, for instance, he'll list nine     |
|    | terms of principal personnel, but I was wondering if this   |    | projects. Well, he's going to at least get a 1-point       |
|    | particular part was different than subsequent parts, and  |    | deduction because he didn't list it. That's how we're      |
|    | so I just want to make sure there wasn't any confusion  |    | currently scoring this.                                    |
|    | there. It was confusing to me.  | 7  |  |
| 8  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. Susan will check   | 8  |  |
|    |   | 9  |  |
|    | through how we score this, and then Susan can be looking  |    | So what happens if a contractor has a \$10,000,000 single  |
|    | at that. So in I ask you to pull out the last five  |    | aggregate bonding capacity in whatever aggregate and       |
|    | pages, which includes the evaluation. If you go to the  |    | doesn't have, say, let's just assume for the moment that   |
|    | last page of the evaluation, you're going to see  |    | one or all of them are below the \$10,000,000 market that  |
|    | something that kind of looks like a spreadsheet, and in   |    | they're asking for. Will they still be considered for a    |
|    | here, what we do is so you can see it's got personnel   |    | \$10,000,000 qualification but still have 10 deductions on |
|    | and successful.   |    | this form? Do you follow me?                               |
| 17 | What this is for is that we'll take the   | 17 | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. Let's say okay,                 |
|    | principal personnel projects that are listed on their   |    | on a \$10,000,000, now you're in the 5 and above category. |
|    | Part II, and that will go under personnel here. And what  |    | And you're at \$10,000,000. So what we would do is if      |
|    | we'll do is we'll include the dollar amount of that   |    | your project that you're listing is below \$5,000,000,     |
|    | project. So let's say that someone is applying between  |    | that's a full point deduction. If it's \$10,000,000 or     |
|    | the \$1,000,000 and \$5,000,000 category, but their bonding   |    | more, that's zero deductions. And anything between five    |
|    | is only for \$3,000,000. So what we would do is now we're   |    | and ten, then we prorate.                                  |
|    | only going to so at that point, even though they're   | 24 |  |
|    | applying in that category, we're only going to consider   |    | \$10,000,000 bonding capacity and have deductions but      |
|    | $r_{r}$ , $m_{r}$ , $m$ |    |  |
|    |   | 1  |  |

|  | blic Works Division Video Conference Board Meeting   |  | January 27, 2017   |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Page 17  |  | Page 19  |
| 1  | still be considered for the above \$5,000,000 because your   | 1  | MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay. I understand that.   |
|  | bonding capacity is such as long as  |  | But it sounds to me as though even though this has been  |
| 3  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: If that's what you're   |  | approved prior to this, that it's just arbitrarily up to   |
|  | asking for.  |  | the scoring committee where they decide where the upper,   |
|  | -  |  |  |
| 5  | CHAIR CLUTTS: As long as your deductions are   |  | the middle and the lower ranges are.   |
|  | not don't add up below the 120.  | 6  | , 5  |
| 7  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.  |  | arbitrarily. Actually, the Board has made a judgment   |
| 8  | CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay.  |  | call on all of these, and this is the direction that   |
| 9  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes. So actually, you   |  | we've gone from the Public Works Board. And these are  |
|  | technically your principal personnel could have no   |  | the limits that they have established for us to work   |
| 11   | experience in the 5 to 10 and no successful projects in  | 11   | with. We score it based on what is submitted.  |
|  | the five to ten, so that's a full 10 plus a full 20, so  | 12   | We will assist let's say if someone for  |
| 13   | that's 30 points. So if you have no other blemishes or   | 13   | some reason submitted an application and it just happens   |
| 14   | point deductions in this criteria, you would still pass.   | 14   | that instead of submitting ten projects on one of these  |
| 15   | You would pass right at 120 points because you start with  |  | categories, they only submitted five, and that caused  |
|  | 150 points, and then we deduct from that. 120 or more is   |  | them to fail. We'll call them up and say, "Here's the  |
|  | where is a passing grade or score is 120 points.   |  | current situation right now. Here's where you're at.   |
| 18   | CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.   |  | You're getting a certain number of deductions because you  |
| 19   | MEMBER BENTLEY: I have a question. Member  |  | didn't submit enough projects. Do you have other   |
|  | Bentley. What criteria do you use to establish the   |  | projects that you could submit ?"  |
|  | ranges for upper range, middle range and lower range?  | 20   |  |
| 22   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: In the \$5,000,000 or   |  | make a final determination and kind of help them out in  |
|  |  |  | -  |
|  | more category, what we do is and we're going to score  |  | getting there, so there is some communication and back   |
|  | either principal personnel actually, you do the same   |  | and forth before we just fail them and say, "Okay. You   |
| 25   | thing for successful projects but let's say you have a   | 25   | don't qualify." That's about the extent that we do, but  |
|  | Page 18  |  | Page 20  |
|  | Page To  | 1  | Fage 20  |
|  |  |  | -  |
|  | limited license, and your single bonding that you have   |  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system  |
| 2  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single   |  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.  |
| 2  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single limit.  |  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is  | 2<br>3<br>4  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single limit.  | 2<br>3<br>4  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't. MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary? ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff. This is what we use. It's been determined that that is the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the range and everything else. MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay. ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe I don't understand your question. MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a percentage or something listed there that states and</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                    | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose<br>unless they actually requested it, we don't make it   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is<br>either the upper range would be a million dollars or your  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose<br>unless they actually requested it, we don't make it<br>available. We just say fill out the application, and   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is<br>either the upper range would be a million dollars or your<br>license or your bonding capacity, whichever is less.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose<br>unless they actually requested it, we don't make it   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is<br>either the upper range would be a million dollars or your<br>license or your bonding capacity, whichever is less.<br>That's set. Between \$1 and \$5 million, is we score it |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose<br>unless they actually requested it, we don't make it<br>available. We just say fill out the application, and   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is<br>either the upper range would be a million dollars or your<br>license or your bonding capacity, whichever is less.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | from your bonding company is \$80,000,000, your single<br>limit.<br>And so at that point, what we would do is<br>evaluate all of your projects between we stop at<br>\$30,000,000, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you<br>get a full deduction. Anything between \$5 and \$30<br>million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30<br>million, even though your license is unlimited and your<br>bonding capacity may be \$80, anything above \$30 million,<br>we give you no deduction. Does that<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere<br>where this criteria is in writing so the person knows<br>what the criteria is?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is<br>what the applicant or the contractor would look at and<br>submit. The scoring criteria is a public document<br>because they've both been approved by the Board. All of<br>this, both the application form and the scoring system<br>has been brought to prior boards and have been approved<br>in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose<br>unless they actually requested it, we don't make it<br>available. We just say fill out the application, and<br>then we score it in accordance with what the Board has | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system<br>and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not<br>arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the<br>Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.<br>This is what we use. It's been determined that that is<br>the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the<br>range and everything else.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite maybe<br>I don't understand your question.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in<br>a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a<br>percentage or something listed there that states and<br>differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range.<br>Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I<br>like this for upper range or I like this for middle<br>range. I like this for lower range."<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that.<br>It said the in-between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 is<br>either the upper range would be a million dollars or your<br>license or your bonding capacity, whichever is less.<br>That's set. Between \$1 and \$5 million, is we score it |

| 1  | ubile works Division video Conference Board Meeting   | January 27, 2017   |
|--|---|--|
|  | Page 21   | Page 23  |
|  | 1 based on the range that we use to see your license or   | 1 again, for the record. Explain to me why you prorate it.   |
|  | 2 your bonding limit, whichever is less.  | 2 If I've got a \$30 million single project bonding capacity   |
|  | 3 MEMBER BENTLEY: I understand.   | 3 and I've said I want to qualify for more than \$5 million,   |
|  | 4 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And the same thing with  | <ul><li>4 why am I being deducted at all and not and potentially</li></ul>   |
|  | •   |  |
|  | 5 five and above, and then we just basically go through the   | <b>5</b> not able to bid on projects between \$5 and \$30? That, I   |
|  | 6 math at that point. So we don't arbitrarily pick the  | 6 think, is the discretion, at least it concerns me, is why  |
|  | 7 limits. The limits are usually, as indicated on the very  | 7 are we prorating any deduction at all?   |
|  | 8 first page, the contractor picks which category he wants  | 8 If a bonding company says that the contractor  |
|  | <b>9</b> to be in. He'll pick between \$100,000 to and it's got   | <b>9</b> is qualified to do those projects, that is the part that  |
| 1  | • three categories here: A hundred to a million, a million  | <b>10</b> I'm concerned potentially is arbitrary, is the prorating   |
| 1  | 1 to five, and then five million. The contractor picks the  | <b>11</b> part where that's not described anywhere. That's   |
| 1  | <b>2</b> category he wants to be evaluated in, and then what we   | <b>12</b> something that has just been done.   |
| 1  | 3 use after that is his license or bonding limits to score  | 13 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And like I said, keep  |
|  | 4 it. Not whatever we pick. There's parameters for  | 14 in mind again that you can have the full 10 points  |
|  | 5 deciding  | <b>15</b> deducted under this category and then the full 20  |
|  | 6 MEMBER BENTLEY: I totally understand that,  | 16 deduction under the successful projects because you have  |
|  | 7 Gus, but my question is that within each one of those   | <b>17</b> you could have no projects in between the \$5 and the  |
|  | <ul><li>8 parameters, how do you determine what is upper, what is</li></ul>   | <b>18</b> \$30 in here in your application and still pass. That was  |
|  | 9 medium, and what is lower? It's not a set for the whole   | <b>19</b> something that the Board, when they approved this, wanted  |
|  | ·   | 20 to make sure that that was available, but at the same   |
|  | • thing. It has to be within each guideline. So what are  |  |
|  | 1 you using to decide that?   | <b>21</b> time, they also approved that if you're applying in a  |
|  | 2 CHAIR CLUTTS: Can I jump in and take a stab   | <b>22</b> certain category and your project was below the bottom   |
|  | 3 at this? I'm following you, Clint, all the way there,   | <b>23</b> limit that you would get a full deduction, that if you   |
|  | 4 and I think that I understand. So I want to just see  | 24 were at or above the limit, that you get no deduction,  |
| 2  | 5 because I didn't understand up until just a few minutes   | <b>25</b> and then everything in-between gets prorated. That was   |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
| -  | Page 22   | Page 24  |
|  |   |  |
|  | 1 ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you  | 1 what was agreed to.  |
|  | <ul><li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li><li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li></ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> </ol>  |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> </ol>   |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> </ol>   |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> </ol>   |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> </ol>  |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> </ol>   |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> </ol>  |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> </ol>   |
| 1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> </ol>   |
|  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> </ol>   |
| 1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> </ol>   |
| 1<br>1   | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> </ol>  |
| 1<br>1<br>1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> </ol>  |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1   | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> </ol>  |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>to you.</li> </ol>  |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> </ul>  | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>to you.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> </ol>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1   | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>to you.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> </ol>  |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> </ul>   | <ol> <li>what was agreed to.</li> <li>And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>to you.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> </ol>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1   | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> </ul>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2  | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>14 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> </ul>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>2<br>2                                    | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> <li>\$30 million. The projects that you put in here, if</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>14 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> <li>21 on time frame for this particular part of the</li> </ul>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2                               | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> <li>\$30 million. The projects that you put in here, if</li> <li>they're between \$5 and \$30 million, then we just prorate</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> <li>21 on time frame for this particular part of the</li> </ul>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2           | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> <li>\$30 million. The projects that you put in here, if</li> <li>they're between \$5 and \$30 million, then we just prorate</li> <li>it in-between there for the deduct. If it's \$30 or more,</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>14 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> <li>21 on time frame for this particular part of the</li> <li>22 qualification.</li> <li>23 And what we are asking for and this is</li> </ul>   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2           | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> <li>\$30 million. The projects that you put in here, if</li> <li>they're between \$5 and \$30 million, then we just prorate</li> <li>it in-between there for the deduct. If it's \$30 or more,</li> <li>then you get no deduct.</li> </ul>                                  | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>14 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> <li>21 on time frame for this particular part of the</li> <li>22 qualification.</li> <li>23 And what we are asking for and this is</li> <li>24 from the regulation, is and I'm going to paraphrase</li> </ul> |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2 | <ul> <li>ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle \$5 million, you</li> <li>want a limit you want to be qualified for more than \$5</li> <li>million, and your bonding capacity, single project</li> <li>capacity is \$20 million, is it correct to say that the</li> <li>lower limit is \$5 million and the upper limit is \$20</li> <li>million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct.</li> <li>THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity</li> <li>is \$30 million, the lower limit is \$5 million, the upper</li> <li>limit is \$30 million?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.</li> <li>What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the</li> <li>middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an</li> <li>upper.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle.</li> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no.</li> <li>The only thing that we would do let's say you're</li> <li>applying for \$5 or more, and your single bonding limit is</li> <li>\$30 million. The projects that you put in here, if</li> <li>they're between \$5 and \$30 million, then we just prorate</li> <li>it in-between there for the deduct. If it's \$30 or more,</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>1 what was agreed to.</li> <li>2 And of course, if you have they also</li> <li>3 wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that</li> <li>4 category but you had the bonding and the license, that</li> <li>5 you could still be qualified to do that as long as you</li> <li>6 didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other</li> <li>7 things in your record. That was the discussion during</li> <li>8 the adoption of this here and how it was approved.</li> <li>9 Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the</li> <li>10 Board in the future that says well, any projects in that</li> <li>11 category within the range, you get no deduction, that's</li> <li>12 up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has</li> <li>13 full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have</li> <li>14 full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed</li> <li>15 to you.</li> <li>16 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?</li> <li>17 COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify.</li> <li>18 For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does first of</li> <li>19 all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for</li> <li>20 principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation</li> <li>21 on time frame for this particular part of the</li> <li>22 qualification.</li> <li>23 And what we are asking for and this is</li> </ul>   |

|  | Page 25   |  | Page 27   |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Page 25<br>principal personnel of the prime contractor. The prime<br>must include in the application a description, as Gus<br>said, of the principal personnel's qualifications and<br>relevant experience of the principal personnel and list<br>not more than ten Public Works and private construction<br>projects or any combination within the cost category for<br>which the prime contractor is applying that have been<br>successfully completed.<br>So I think that the thinking behind the<br>scoring is we're looking for experience in a particular<br>cost category. And so if it's at that cost category,<br>well, then, there's no reductions. But then if there is,<br>if it's less than that cost category, then there may be<br>deductions. So that's right from the language of the<br>reg.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Member Hand?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | sense it's not written here necessarily or in any kind of<br>NAC or NRS. It was previously directed from the Board.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. We brought<br>various proposals. We went back and forth with the<br>Board, and this is where we finally landed. It's not<br>just something that we did in a vacuum.   |
| 17   | MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. So what's the<br>in the unlimited category case, right, if it's over \$5  | 17   | meetings. It took more than one meeting, believe me,<br>with the Board, and basically this is where we landed   |
| 19   | million, help me understand the proration in that situation. It's upper limit, right?   | 19   | with the Board, and basically this is where we landed<br>with the Board. And the only thing that's been done to<br>the original application that I correct me if I'm  |
| 20<br>21   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. There's two  |  | wrong. Kathy, you've been around this one for a while   |
|  | examples. To best understand the \$5 and above, it's  |  | and Susan, the only thing that we've added to the   |
|  | better to look at the examples. One of them would be<br>between for the purposes of scoring, one would be   |  | original application and this evaluation has been on the discipline by the State Contractor's Board. That's just  |
|  | between \$5 million and \$30 million, and one above   |  | something that came in after several sessions after the   |
|  | Page 26   |  | Page 28   |
|  |   |  |   |
|  |   | -  |   |
|  | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit   |  | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It was just added to it later on   |
| 2<br>3   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit in the \$5 and above   | 2<br>3   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.  |
| 2  | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.   | 2<br>3<br>4  | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million, so<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million. So<br>if your get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>12   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million, or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>5  | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million. So<br>if your get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                               | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80<br>million. We are then and then he lists these<br>projects. Again, anything below \$5 million is a full   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16                                     | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know<br>that? I mean, I think it's a fair maybe that's the<br>root of Clint's question, is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                         | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80<br>million. We are then and then he lists these<br>projects. Again, anything below \$5 million is a full<br>deduction. Anything between anything above \$30  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                         | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know<br>that? I mean, I think it's a fair maybe that's the<br>root of Clint's question, is<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                   | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80<br>million. We are then and then he lists these<br>projects. Again, anything below \$5 million is a full<br>deduction. Anything between anything above \$30<br>million, not the \$80 million bonding capacity, anything  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                   | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know<br>that? I mean, I think it's a fair maybe that's the<br>root of Clint's question, is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80<br>million. We are then and then he lists these<br>projects. Again, anything below \$5 million is a full<br>deduction. Anything between anything above \$30<br>million, not the \$80 million bonding capacity, anything<br>above \$30 million gets no deduction. Anything between \$5<br>and \$30 gets prorated. | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know<br>that? I mean, I think it's a fair maybe that's the<br>root of Clint's question, is<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>MEMBER HAND: is how do you because if<br>you've been through it once, you know the game. But if<br>you've not been through it and you want to try to figure |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | between \$5 million and above \$30 million. Because the<br>Board requested us to use \$30 million as an upper limit<br>in the \$5 and above<br>MEMBER HAND: Okay.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: in this scoring. So<br>let's say you're above \$5 million but at \$20 million. So<br>if your projects that you list here is at \$20 million or<br>more, you get no deduction. If you're below \$5 million,<br>below the lower threshold, you get a full the full<br>deduction. If you're between \$5 million and \$20 million,<br>you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the<br>project lands.<br>Now, that's one example. Now let's talk<br>about the one that the person that has an unlimited<br>license and has a their single limit bonding is \$80<br>million. We are then and then he lists these<br>projects. Again, anything below \$5 million is a full<br>deduction. Anything between anything above \$30<br>million, not the \$80 million bonding capacity, anything<br>above \$30 million gets no deduction. Anything between \$5                            | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | original prequalifications of bidders law started. It<br>was just added to it later on<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Right.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: when we picked up on<br>it.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and<br>II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now?<br>And is there any other question?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been<br>answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered.<br>Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.<br>MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my<br>follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an<br>application self-score themselves if they don't know<br>that? I mean, I think it's a fair maybe that's the<br>root of Clint's question, is<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>MEMBER HAND: is how do you because if<br>you've been through it once, you know the game. But if   |

| 1 ui   | blic works Division video Conference Board Meeting  |  | January 27, 2017  |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | Page 29   |  | Page 31   |
| 1  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Technically, unless you  | 1  | many approvals and rejections? And out of those   |
|  | ask specifically, "I want to see your scoring form,"  |  | rejections, how many were appealed to even know as a body   |
|  | which is public information, we would have to release it,   |  | whether we have a problem, whether something is broke or  |
|  | that would be the only way. Typically, we just we get   |  | whether it needs just a little maintenance?   |
|  | the application. Hopefully, it is straightforward and   | 5  | Because I've been here for a little while   |
|  | truthful and to the point, and then we just score it.   |  | now, and we've had a couple of appeals, and I imagine   |
|  | And like I said, we do go the extra mile to get back with   |  | that you all see a lot of applications. I don't know.   |
|  | an applicant and say, "Hey, you've got some prevailing  |  | So if I don't know if this is a small issue that comes  |
|  | wage deductions. You've got some deductions here. And   |  | up every now and then or if this is a much broader issue  |
|  | by the way, in your principal personnel and on your   |  | so that as a body, we can understand what it is that we   |
|  | successful projects, if you have other projects that you  |  | should be focused on.   |
|  | could include in this range or in this area that you can  | 12   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We look at about 300 a   |
|  | substitute, then that will eliminate those deductions and   |  | year, I would say. I know that when we were looking at  |
|  | you'll be able to pass."  |  | the reason we had a law that was passed that requires   |
| 15   | I mean, we help them and we go way out of our   |  | us to do our best effort in getting this form is so that  |
|  | way in trying to do our best in getting them over that  |  | they can be filled out and submitted electronically, and  |
| 17   | 120-point threshold. If they have it, if it comes to a  |  | so we were going through a process. In getting there, we  |
|  | point where they just don't have what it takes to get,  |  | ended up with a DocuSign company that actually provides   |
|  | you know, 120 points, and then we the only thing that   | 19   |   |
|  | we suggest to them at that point is well, if you go to a  |  | some mortgage closures lately, you've seen where they can   |
|  | lower category instead of going all the way to your   |  | do all of the signing electronically and remotely, and so   |
|  | maximum license and bonding limit, if you, instead of   |  | we've been using that.  |
| 23   | going at \$5 million, if you lower to \$3 million, you'll   | 23   | We had to come up with a well, how many   |
| 24   | gain all of these points and you'll pass. Do you want to  | 24   | are we going to do a year? How much is that going to  |
| 25   | lower your request? And a lot of times, they'll go, "Oh,  | 25   | cost? And just from a budgetary perspective because they  |
|  |   |  |   |
|  |   |  |   |
|  | Page 30   |  | Page 32   |
| 1  |   | 1  | -   |
|  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a   |  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what   |
| 2  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them   | 2  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,   |
| 2<br>3   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send   | 2<br>3   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to   | 2<br>3<br>4  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas. COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a<br>certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them<br>passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send<br>them a letter. We get together with them and explain to<br>them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have<br>projects in this area or if you lower what your request<br>is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we<br>can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record,<br>Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that<br>with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>12   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas. COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas. COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,<br>but other matters that have come before the Board. But  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my experience, and I've been here since 2008.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,<br>but other matters that have come before the Board. But<br>certainly, I cannot recall more than 10 or 12 at the<br>most.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So we're talking less than 1   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my experience, and I've been here since 2008.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Bruce Clutts, for the record. I'm a believer that if something is broke, you fix it. Otherwise, you just maintain it. And so the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,<br>but other matters that have come before the Board. But<br>certainly, I cannot recall more than 10 or 12 at the<br>most.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So we're talking less than 1<br>percent? Okay.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my experience, and I've been here since 2008.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Bruce Clutts, for the record. I'm a believer that if something is broke, you fix it. Otherwise, you just maintain it. And so the biggest question that I have is over the last, say, eight | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,<br>but other matters that have come before the Board. But<br>certainly, I cannot recall more than 10 or 12 at the<br>most.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So we're talking less than 1<br>percent? Okay.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: But that being said, we |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send them a letter. We get together with them and explain to them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have projects in this area or if you lower what your request is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we can on those areas.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record, Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here to appeal a qualification denial, it's very it's not adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to, you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public Works. That's what we see our role as, within the statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my experience, and I've been here since 2008.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Bruce Clutts, for the record. I'm a believer that if something is broke, you fix it. Otherwise, you just maintain it. And so the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | say, well, in this range, we'll charge you \$3 per what<br>they call envelope or per application that they process,<br>I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had<br>Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several<br>years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up<br>with a figure of about 300, is what I remember, that we<br>were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.<br>And I guess if I right now, I don't have<br>the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years<br>that we've had this thing going, how many appeals<br>qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's<br>less than a dozen over since we've had this whole<br>system going, I would guess I would be surprised if<br>it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the<br>exact number.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and<br>I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling<br>not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals,<br>but other matters that have come before the Board. But<br>certainly, I cannot recall more than 10 or 12 at the<br>most.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So we're talking less than 1<br>percent? Okay.   |

| Iu   | one works Division video Comerence Board Meeting   |  | January 27, 2017   |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Page 33  |  | Page 35  |
| 1  | some I discovered a typo. We are going to we do  | 1  | I saw was the contractor that did the construction on the  |
|  | have the new reg that's pending, so we will have to  |  | Las Vegas courthouse, and he submitted an application and  |
|  | revise the application.  |  | just attached the mediation decision or the arbitration  |
| 4  |  |  | decision, and we started to work with him and try and  |
|  | •  |  | -  |
| 5  | θ  |  | score it, and his attorney called me and said, "I can't  |
|  | and I did want to I know that there was some concern   |  | believe he submitted this without talking to me first."  |
|  | about the penalties that were or the deductions that   |  | And he withdrew his application, and I never heard from  |
|  | were made for the fines, and so I did want to give the   |  | him again. So that was the only issue that I've ever   |
|  | Board a clear understanding of how we got there so that  | 9  | seen with this one.  |
| 10   | because, you know, the contractor may come here, and   | 10   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't recall having   |
| 11   | they're not happy, and so, you know, they may find   | 11   | an issue there.  |
| 12   | something that they can latch onto. And whether it's   | 12   | COUNSEL STEWART: No.   |
| 13   | legitimate or not, who knows. But if the Board has a   | 13   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: So anyhow, unless you   |
| 14   | full understanding of exactly how because you weren't  | 14   | have some questions, and perhaps, you know, you might  |
|  | here when we, you know, had it approved by prior boards,   | 15   | want to look at this formula here later on and on your   |
|  | it just may be helpful for your general understanding.   |  | own time or whatever and think about it a bit, but that's  |
| 17   |  |  | kind of like what the staff and the Board came up with a   |
|  | questions before we move on? Part III.   |  | while back on that particular matter as to how to score  |
| 19   |  |  | that.  |
| _  | prior breach of contract. And basically, it just states,   | 20   |  |
|  | "If the applicant has been found to have been in breach  |  | record. What I would suggest is, if the Board is okay  |
|  | of contract by a court of competent jurisdiction during  |  | with it, is if you just run through it, and if there's a   |
|  |  |  | • •  |
|  | the 5 years immediately preceding the date of the  |  | question, we just pause and ask that question.   |
|  | application." And then, "For each such action, the   |  | Otherwise, we'll assume there isn't, if that works.  |
| 25   | applicant shall include below a description of: The  | 25   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. Move on. Then   |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Page 34  |  | Page 36  |
| 1  | -  | 1  |  |
|  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any  |  | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the  |
| 2  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the   | 2  | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was   |
| 2  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant  | 2<br>3   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to   | 2<br>3<br>4  | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17  | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18   | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,<br>and then you have taken 10. Then that gives you a   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an<br>issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major<br>deduct.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>20<br>21       | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,<br>and then you have taken 10. Then that gives you a<br>10-point deduction. One times 10 would be 10. That's   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an<br>issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major<br>deduct.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22            | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,<br>and then you have taken 10. Then that gives you a<br>10-point deduction. One times 10 would be 10. That's<br>how that looks like. Again, in going back since I've   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an<br>issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major<br>deduct.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan<br>Stewart. One of the ways the scoring is set up is that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,<br>and then you have taken 10. Then that gives you a<br>10-point deduction. One times 10 would be 10. That's<br>how that looks like. Again, in going back since I've<br>been here, we haven't seen too much of this. As a matter   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an<br>issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major<br>deduct.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan<br>Stewart. One of the ways the scoring is set up is that<br>no one area you could get all of the points deducted |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any<br>liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the<br>breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant<br>relating to the action." And then you're asked to<br>provide this information and a description here under<br>this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if<br>you have more than one.<br>And then with respect to how we score that,<br>if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take<br>the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract<br>amount, you multiply it times 10, and then you multiply<br>it times excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then<br>you multiply it times 10, and then that gives you a total<br>amount of deductions.<br>So, for instance, to give you an example, if<br>you take if you have a \$1 million judgment and a \$20<br>million contract, that would equal to if you divide<br>that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that<br>times 20, that equals 1. You multiply that 10 times 10,<br>and then you have taken 10. Then that gives you a<br>10-point deduction. One times 10 would be 10. That's<br>how that looks like. Again, in going back since I've<br>been here, we haven't seen too much of this. As a matter<br>of fact, I don't recall any in this particular area. | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the<br>Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was<br>disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to<br>the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more<br>sections to this, we found out today.<br>I went back and started reading this and<br>looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get<br>through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes,<br>the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to<br>138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping<br>stuff.<br>During in this case, "During the 5 years<br>immediately preceding the date of application, provide<br>the following information." And so if we if they<br>submit that, what we do is for each disqualification<br>here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point,<br>like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a<br>major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an<br>issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major<br>deduct.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan<br>Stewart. One of the ways the scoring is set up is that   |

|   | ione works Division video Comerence Doard Wreeting   | 1  | January 27, 2017  |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | Page 37  |  | Page 39   |
|   | <ul> <li>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, which we have</li> <li>seen.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page on the Past</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Page 39<br>deduct anything between 1 and 10 points per offense. The<br>amount of points deductible takes into consideration the<br>amount of projects completed by the applicant and<br>magnitude of the delay of the completion. So obviously,<br>just a 2-3 day delay, it scores pretty low. But if you<br>get into the 30 days plus, it's going to be scoring<br>pretty high.<br>The same thing here under the second item.<br>"If the applicant failed to complete any remaining<br>requirements of the contract within 90 days of<br>substantial completion," then we deduct 10 points per<br>offense. So if you didn't finish your punch list within<br>90 days, then we're going to deduct 10 points. And then<br>the last one. If the contractor failed basically to<br>complete the work and the remaining work had to be<br>completed by another contractor, then that's pretty<br>egregious. We deduct 20 points. Again, not one of these<br>will fail you. You have to lose 30 points before you get  |
| 1   | 9 Performance is Discrimination in Employment. So what it  | 19   | there.  |
|   | says here, it says, "Give a description of any civil   | 20   | CHAIR CLUTTS: So Bryce Clutts, for the  |
|   | 1 judgment, findings of fact, administrative proceedings or  |  | record. So my understanding am I understanding  |
|   | 2 criminal conviction relating to a violation of any law   |  | correctly that the maximum amount of points deducted for 5C could be 20?  |
|   | <ul><li>3 pertaining to discrimination in employment against or by</li><li>4 applicant or principal personnel of the applicant,</li></ul>  | 23<br>24   |   |
|   | 5 indicating that the applicant or principal personnel have  | 25   |   |
|   |  |  |   |
|   | Page 38  |  | Page 40   |
|   |  | 1  |   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> </ul>   | 2  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?   |
|   | violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to<br>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately   | 2<br>3<br>4  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?  |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently  |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada   |
| 1.<br>1.<br>1.<br>1.  | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada   |
| 1.<br>1.<br>1.<br>1.<br>1.<br>1.<br>1.  | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,   |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>14<br>14<br>14<br>14<br>14<br>14<br>14                                    | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding   |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine  |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> <li>here that are any that are in violation of any one of</li> <li>those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine<br>imposed pursuant to NRS 624.301 through 624.305,  |
|   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> <li>here that are any that are in violation of any one of</li> <li>those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine  |
| 10<br>11<br>11<br>10<br>11<br>11<br>11<br>11<br>12<br>22<br>22                              | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> <li>here that are any that are in violation of any one of</li> <li>those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to</li> <li>list it here.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine<br>imposed pursuant to NRS 624.301 through 624.305,<br>excepting 624.30175 must be disclosed." And then,<br>"Relevant documentation must be attached."   |
| 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> <li>here that are any that are in violation of any one of</li> <li>those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to</li> <li>list it here.</li> <li>The way we score that is under VC here,</li> <li>failed projects in the past five years. Again, if you</li> <li>did not complete the project within the contract time as</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine<br>imposed pursuant to NRS 624.301 through 624.305,<br>excepting 624.30175 must be disclosed." And then,<br>"Relevant documentation must be attached."<br>So we ask you to state it, disclose it in the<br>form here, and then if you go to Part VI here under the |
| 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | <ul> <li>violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to</li> <li>the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately</li> <li>preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to</li> <li>list that. Again, any violation in this category. If</li> <li>you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we</li> <li>deduct 2 points per violation.</li> <li>Moving on to the next page, still under</li> <li>Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.</li> <li>So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects</li> <li>which exceeded \$25,000 or more, "If the applicant failed</li> <li>to substantially complete the contract from the deadline</li> <li>for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by</li> <li>any change order or extension of time award, or if the</li> <li>applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements</li> <li>of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the</li> <li>contract and the remaining work on the project was</li> <li>performed by others," we ask you to list those projects</li> <li>here that are any that are in violation of any one of</li> <li>those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to</li> <li>list it here.</li> <li>The way we score that is under VC here,</li> <li>failed projects in the past five years. Again, if you</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days<br>and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of<br>those or would it be a maximum 20?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all<br>of those.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that<br>particular section, lose up to 40 points?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here,<br>which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently<br>to our application. Under VI under past performance is:<br>"Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>State Contractor's Board or other state or federal<br>agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State<br>whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada<br>Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency,<br>such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding<br>the date of the application. Any discipline or fine<br>imposed pursuant to NRS 624.301 through 624.305,<br>excepting 624.30175 must be disclosed." And then,<br>"Relevant documentation must be attached."<br>So we ask you to state it, disclose it in the  |

|  |   | 1  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | Page 41   |  | Page 43  |
| 1  | amount of the fine as to how many points we deduct. I'm   | 1  | does this read clearly to the Board, the requirement   |
|  | going to turn it over real quick over here to Susan, and  |  | that's here as far as past performance and the listing of  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | we this basically, in these categories that we got, 1   |  | what you have to list is clear? And I'm referring to   |
|  | through 10, basically came out of the NRS 624, which is   |  | section Part VI, Past Performance? Is there any  |
| 5  | the contractor's NRS. And, Susan, do you want to go over  | 5  | confusion that you have to report a fine or discipline   |
| 6  | that?   | 6  | from a federal agency, OSHA, and/or the Nevada State   |
| 7  | COUNSEL STEWART: Sure. So the law was   | 7  | Contractor's Board? Is that unclear in any way?  |
| 8  | passed that said we need to take into consideration   | 8  | CHAIR CLUTTS: Not to me.   |
|  | whether a contractor has been fined or disciplined by a   | 9  |  |
|  | state agency or OSHA or other federal agency for conduct  | _  | • •  |
|  |   | 11   | you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Move on to the next   |
|  | related to the performance of their work. So that was   |  |  |
|  | the statute. And from that, we developed a reg. And   |  | section, which is Part VII: Successful Projects. And   |
|  | from the regulation, we developed the scoring sheet that  |  | what we ask you here or ask here is that the applicant   |
| 14   | you have in front of you, as well as the language that's  |  | lists ten Public Works or private construction projects  |
| 15   | in the application.   | 15   | or any combination thereof that the applicant has  |
| 16   | And what I recall I did is I went to Chapter  | 16   | successfully completed during the 5 years immediately  |
| 17   | 624, which is the Contractor's Board statute, and they  | 17   |  |
|  | have a section entitled, 'Grounds for disciplinary  |  | of the project is within the cost category for which the   |
|  | action.' And it runs and it's reflected here in the   |  | application seeks qualifications to submit bids."  |
|  | application. It's NRS 624.301 through 305. And exempt   | 20   |  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | from the violations is specifically 624.30175, which  |  | we ask you to fill out this information that is asked  |
|  | relates to not paying child support. So it was my   |  | here. Now, as to when we go to then score this, if you   |
|  | opinion, and I presented it to the Board, that while that   |  | look at Item 7 under successful projects, we take each   |
| 24   | may be egregious, it is not necessarily related to a  | 24   | project and we deduct, as it says here, we deduct zero   |
| 25   | contractor's ability to perform their work. So that is a  | 25   | points for projects in the upper range of the cost   |
|  |   |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Page 42   |  | Page 44  |
|  |   |  | -  |
|  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this  |  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of  |
|  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this application.   | 2  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points  |
| 2<br>3   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the   | 2<br>3   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look   |
| 2<br>3   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this application.   | 2<br>3   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have   | 2<br>3<br>4  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with   | 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 2-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points<br>in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your<br>license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points<br>in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a<br>larger fine is because of the more egregious violation.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your<br>license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in<br>the \$5 million plus, you don't at \$30 million and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points<br>in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a<br>larger fine is because of the more egregious violation.<br>And so that was presented to the former board, and that | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your<br>license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in<br>the \$5 million plus, you don't at \$30 million and<br>above, you get no deduct at all no matter how high your |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points<br>in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a<br>larger fine is because of the more egregious violation.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your<br>license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in<br>the \$5 million plus, you don't at \$30 million and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this<br>application.<br>Then we I looked at the NAC, the<br>regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have<br>NAC and you guys have copies of these in front of you<br>NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and<br>the amount. And then it also talks about factors that<br>they take into consideration when fining: Has the person<br>exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of<br>these violations against a senior citizen or someone with<br>a disability? And so those are factors that the<br>Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're<br>assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor<br>that is fined has due process in front of the<br>Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.<br>So we took these amounts the lowest is 50,<br>the highest is \$50,000, and we simply listed those on<br>this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine<br>would result in a 20-point deduction, and \$50 to \$1,000<br>would result in a 2-point deduction and all points<br>in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a<br>larger fine is because of the more egregious violation.<br>And so that was presented to the former board, and that | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of<br>the cost category, and 2 points and deduct 2 points<br>for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look<br>again, going back to the last sheet that was in that<br>section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking<br>at before for the successful projects, we basically score<br>those the same way that we talked about under "Principal<br>Personnel," except this time, we use because there is<br>10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct<br>on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per<br>project.<br>So again, if you're below the range that<br>you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point<br>deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to<br>get a 2-point deduct. If you're at or above that<br>category that you're asking for, and/or again, and/or<br>your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if<br>you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.<br>And then if you're in-between, then you<br>prorate it from the bottom of the category to your<br>license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in<br>the \$5 million plus, you don't at \$30 million and<br>above, you get no deduct at all no matter how high your |

| Iut  | Duc works Division video Conference Board Meeting  |  | January 27, 2017  |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | Page 45  |  | Page 47   |
| 1  | successful projects except it's on a 2-point basis per   | 1  | before we wrap this part up and move on in the agenda   |
|  | project rather than one.   |  | with what's been presented so that we can process that  |
| 3  | And the last part that we score, and that is   |  | information and come back at the next Board meeting and   |
|  | a pass/fail. And if you go to Part VIII, basically it's  |  | provide any recommendations that we might have, if any?   |
|  | more of I guess you could call it an acknowledgment.   | 5  | MEMBER BENTLEY: I still have one question   |
|  | You're saying that you're being you didn't fail to   |  | -   |
|  |  |  | back on the scoring. I understand everything that's been  |
|  | disclose any material information or falsify any material  |  | said, but the very last statement that was made regarding   |
|  | information and that you're declaring under penalty of   |  | upper, middle and lower, if I understood you correctly,   |
|  | perjury that all information provided is complete and  |  | you stated that you did have a criteria established from  |
|  | correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and we   |  | the prior boards that you used. Is that in writing?   |
|  | ask you to sign and notarize that.   | 11   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I'm sure yes, I'm  |
| 12   | Because when you go to the scoring system, if  |  | sure we can go back through the minutes and find them.  |
|  | you fail to disclose that material, that's a pass/fail   | 13   | MEMBER BENTLEY: I would really like to see  |
|  | situation, or if you falsify any material information,   |  | anything in writing. If you could send that, I'd  |
|  | that also is a pass/fail. The prior Board that approved  |  | appreciate it.  |
|  | this, they were very adamant about this particular item  | 16   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: You bet.   |
|  | here, that we want to make sure that everything that was   | 17   | MEMBER BENTLEY: Thank you.  |
|  | all of the applications that were submitted that were  | 18   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I'm going to have to go  |
|  | full that there was a full disclosure and there was  |  | back many, many years, but we'll go dig. Actually, when   |
| 20   | nothing there that was falsified.  | 20   | I came to work here, that was one of the very first   |
| 21   | COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  | 21   | things. The law had been passed, and we didn't have the   |
| 22   | record. And you'll recall when I started my discussion,  | 22   | application or the scoring system put together yet, and   |
| 23   | one of the criteria that we're specifically charged with   | 23   | that was one of the first tasks that I tackled as a   |
| 24   | taking into consideration is the truthfulness of the   | 24   | deputy. I was a deputy manager at that time. So we'll   |
| 25   | application. So that follows along with the statute.   | 25   | have to go back to 2001, 2002. But I'm sure we can find   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  | Page 46  |  | Page 48   |
| 1  | -  | 1  |   |
| 1  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,   |  | them. It should be in our archives.   |
| 2  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually, a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first  | 2  | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.   |
| 2<br>3   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us  | 2<br>3   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.  | 2<br>3<br>4  | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>13<br>14  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the<br>record. Is my understanding correct that today was  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.<br>Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the<br>record. Is my understanding correct that today was<br>really about trying to get an understanding of the whole  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.<br>Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for<br>discussion: Legislate Update. Ms. Stewart?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the<br>record. Is my understanding correct that today was<br>really about trying to get an understanding of the whole<br>process, the Board digests that information, and that at  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.<br>Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for<br>discussion: Legislate Update. Ms. Stewart?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Yes, thank you. For the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the<br>record. Is my understanding correct that today was<br>really about trying to get an understanding of the whole<br>process, the Board digests that information, and that at<br>a subsequent meeting, provide potential recommendations | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.<br>Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for<br>discussion: Legislate Update. Ms. Stewart?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Yes, thank you. For the<br>record, Susan Stewart. Very briefly, just a legislative |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first actually,<br>a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first<br>contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us<br>and the Board, was because of this particular item here.<br>Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have<br>failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it<br>went. Actually, that went through the board. It was<br>appealed, and we had a hearing.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm<br>still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers<br>2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the<br>wording there?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each<br>project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes.<br>Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1, 2, and 3 for<br>each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the<br>record. Is my understanding correct that today was<br>really about trying to get an understanding of the whole<br>process, the Board digests that information, and that at  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | them. It should be in our archives.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now;<br>correct?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what<br>we've been using since the very beginning except for that<br>last item that we and the Contractor's Board, which<br>was added to the law later on.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do,<br>moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and<br>if you have further questions or recommendations at the<br>next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss<br>those and take action if necessary. And then if you<br>could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well<br>as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the<br>number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.<br>And if we could have that information prior to the<br>meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other<br>questions or actions before we move on? Okay.<br>Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for<br>discussion: Legislate Update. Ms. Stewart?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Yes, thank you. For the  |

|  | The works Division video conterence Doard Meeting   |  | 5undury 27, 2017   |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | Page 49   |  | Page 51  |
|  | the Division was going to put forth recording the   | -  | CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.   |
|  | the Division was going to put forth regarding the   | 1  |  |
|  | administrator's qualifications, delete the Board's review   | 2  | 5 85   |
|  | of local revisions to the Uniform Plumbing Code, delete   | 3  |  |
| 4  | the Division's responsibility through their facility  | 4  | her.   |
| 5  | group to inspect UNR and UNLV, exempt amendments to our   | 5  | 5  |
| 6  | professional services agreements I'm sorry, from the  | 6  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes. And she will be  |
| 7  | Board of Examiners, and allow the building official to  | 7  | taking roll call next meeting.   |
| 8  | issue permits directly to private contractors.  | 8  | MS. ADAIR: I wasn't sure about that. Okay.   |
| 9  | As of printing, it could have changed. I  | 9  | Thank you.   |
|  | haven't checked the website today, but as of printing,  | 10   |  |
|  | the following BDRs are moving forward, and they've  |  | With that, I guess, I'm sorry, I guess we can move on to   |
|  | actually been assigned bill numbers, and AB 41 revises  |  | the next item here.  |
|  | the administrator's qualifications back to what they were   |  |  |
|  | · · ·   | 13   | 8 8  |
|  | prior to the last session. It also tweaks, if you will,   |  | Number VI, again, Ms. Stewart.   |
|  | the qualifications for the Board members as well,   | 15   | 5  |
|  | allowing for the appointment of a Board member that is a  |  | Susan Stewart. The Public Works Division has been  |
|  | licensed contractor or were licensed in the past. SB 44,  |  | presented with a couple of pieces of proposed  |
|  | the building official, will issue permits to private  |  | legislation, and hopefully you have copies of those.   |
| 19   | contractors, removing Public Works from oversight of  | 19   | They should have been in front of you. One is entitled,  |
| 20   | local governments, revisions to the Uniform Plumbing  | 20   | "Contracts Involving Construction Manager at Risk" and   |
| 21   | Code, and the final bill that's moving forward is that  | 21   | then the second one, you'll see in the middle of the page  |
| 22   | the Division will not be responsible for inspecting UNR   | 22   | is, "Proposed changes to NRS 338.141." There's also a  |
|  | and UNLV facilities. The revisions to or eliminating the  |  | proposed change to 338.0117.   |
|  | requirement that our amendments to professional service   | 24   |  |
|  | agreements from the Board of Examiners did not move   |  | action item, there's a proposal that the State Public  |
|  | agreements from the Board of Examiners are not move   |  | action noni, alere s'a proposar that the state r aone  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Page 50   |  | Page 52  |
|  | Page 50   |  | Page 52  |
|  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any  |  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list   |
|  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any questions.   | 2  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies  |
|  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.  | 2<br>3   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same  |
| 2  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any questions.   | 2<br>3   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.  | 2<br>3<br>4  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Anything you need, feel  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Anything you need, feel  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, I was going to get to<br>that next.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Anything you need, feel<br>free to call Laura or myself, obviously. And if I'm not   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, I was going to get to<br>that next.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. All right. |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any<br>questions.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping<br>real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart<br>joined us a while back, so I'm going to I can't recall<br>exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but<br>he should be marked<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: as being here.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe<br>the court reporter noted about an hour ago that<br>Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you.<br>Somebody's on the ball.<br>And then the other thing that I missed,<br>you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from<br>Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I<br>wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Anything you need, feel<br>free to call Laura or myself, obviously. And if I'm not<br>around, she can chase me down, I'm sure. So she has full | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list<br>that must be used by all local government public bodies<br>in their bid documents. There's also been the same<br>and that's this one the proposed changes to NRS<br>338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division<br>create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use<br>when they're applying for the bidder's preference.<br>You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and<br>it required if you want to receive the bidder's<br>preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide<br>an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded<br>the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside<br>in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is<br>that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for<br>all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came<br>to us?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and<br>Assemblyman Skip Dailey.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, I was going to get to<br>that next.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. All right. |

| Put  | lic Works Division Video Conference Board Meeting  |  | January 27, 2017  |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | Page 53  |  | Page 55   |
| 1  | primarily at the end of the bill, and what we had  | 1  | local government, and we would prefer not being the ones  |
|  | proposed in response to that was that the law require the  |  | that prepare this form. I'm sure that Susan may tell you  |
|  | use of the language that Public Works Division uses so   |  | well, she could be there could be concern with respect  |
|  | that local bodies would need to use certain language, but  | 4  | to liability, I don't know, because we're creating those  |
| 5  | it wouldn't be Public Works inserting themselves into the  | 5  | forms that they have to use.  |
| 6  | process. Do you want to talk about this one now and then   | 6  | 5   |
| 7  | we'll go to this one?  |  | way that we word our form and use the wording. Don't  |
| 8  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. I think that the  |  | and then not necessarily quote that you're going to use   |
|  | goal of the bill that the AGC is trying to be moving   |  | Public Works. So every time we because we may modify  |
|  | through is being sponsored by the legislature, and   |  | our form in the future if we find any problems with it.   |
|  | they're telling us that to try to minimize the number of   |  | And then that means that everybody now, we've got to  |
|  | protests that they get on bids. So as a result of that,  |  | notify everybody out there in the whole state of Nevada   |
|  | one of the areas that we get a lot of protests in is in<br>the listing of sublistings that are required, whether it  |  | that oh, by the way, we've changed our form and you've got to change your form because that's what the law says.  |
|  | is the 5 or 1 percent list or the 3 percent list.  |  | We don't want to be in that business at all. So that's  |
| 16   | The first thing that one of the ways that  |  | pretty much along those lines that we have suggested to   |
|  | they so they felt that they need to simplify it  |  | them.   |
|  | because the contractors are making a lot of mistakes in  | 18   | Susan has been working with their legal   |
|  | this area, and it leads to protests and basically some   | 19   | counsel and coming up with wording that they can use.   |
| 20   | bids that are actually rejected as being nonresponsive,  |  | There's also the issue that on some of these forms,   |
|  | and they want to minimize that. And so one of the first  |  | sometimes you have to notify them just because you're   |
|  | things they did is they are going to take out the 3  |  | using federal funds, grant funds. And they're requiring   |
|  | percent list because basically, nobody is using that.  |  | other things above and beyond what is required by state   |
|  | We've never used it, and I've never seen it used. I  |  | law, and they have to take care of that. So we brought<br>also that to their attention in this area. But am I   |
| 25   | don't know if anyone is using it, but it's not very  | 25   | also that to their attention in this area. Dut all I  |
|  |  |  |   |
|  | Page 54  |  | Page 56   |
| 1  |  | 1  |   |
|  | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using  | 1  | missing anything?   |
| 2  |  | 2  | missing anything?   |
| 2<br>3   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in  | 2<br>3   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                          | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we're not in the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same<br>lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we're not in the<br>business of providing or requiring forms for local  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same<br>lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy<br>perspective, that should give us some direction on that.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we're not in the<br>business of providing or requiring forms for local<br>government, and sometimes this is seen as any of these  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same<br>lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy<br>perspective, that should give us some direction on that.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: The second bill is this  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we're not in the<br>business of providing or requiring forms for local<br>government, and sometimes this is seen as any of these<br>things could be seen as, you know, Public Works is trying | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same<br>lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy<br>perspective, that should give us some direction on that.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: The second bill is this<br>is a bill that's been Assemblyman?                                      |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using<br>the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in<br>with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the<br>end of the bid opening.<br>And again, all of this is to prevent bid<br>shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular<br>law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you<br>know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed<br>under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work,<br>does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use,<br>we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some<br>mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms.<br>So they the group of contractors up here that are used<br>to bidding our projects we like to see everybody use<br>the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one<br>that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want<br>to use that. My input back to them was, thank you,<br>but<br>COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: we're not in the<br>business of providing or requiring forms for local<br>government, and sometimes this is seen as any of these  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | missing anything?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is<br>Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that<br>Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something<br>like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works<br>does things through the reg process, so it would be very<br>involved if we were directed to do something like that.<br>So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if<br>the language in the form is working, then, you know, just<br>mandate that the form include the language that makes the<br>form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of<br>actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works<br>out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there<br>action being requested of the Board at this time?<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another<br>bill to talk about.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same<br>lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy<br>perspective, that should give us some direction on that.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: The second bill is this<br>is a bill that's been Assemblyman?<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Skip Dailey. |

| 1 | r ui   | blic Works Division Video Conference Board Meeting   |  | January 27, 2017   |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | Page 57  |  | Page 59  |  |
|   |  | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Assemblyman, yeah.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: Skip Dailey reached out to<br>Gus and is proposing a number of revisions to the CMAR<br>statutes that are in NRS 338. And many of them are I   | 2<br>3   | goes through what we call their scrubbing process to make<br>sure they got apples to apples all the way through to<br>determine who the low bidder is on all of the trades,<br>that process, we keep track of all of that, and   |  |
|   |  | would say don't impact Public Works' ability to contract   |  | documentation is given to us and all of that, so we  |  |
|   |  | via the CMAR process. One that was one proposed  |  | oversee the process, the whole process.  |  |
|   |  | change that was problematic, Gus and I both agreed, was<br>the bill proposes that, for example, if Carson City wants   | 7  | We typically have at least two and usually<br>three project managers at the contractor's office when   |  |
|   |  | to contract using the CMAR process, there's a request for  |  | the bids are open. And again, this so the cost of the  |  |
|   |  | a proposal, and then there's an interview and a selection  |  | work, you might say it's an open book-type process.  |  |
|   |  | committee. And this bill proposes that employees with  |  | During the selection process, we know the fee, our   |  |
|   |  | Carson City could not sit on the selection committee,<br>that Public Works Division employees would have to sit on   |  | general overhead and profit, we know what the GCs are<br>going to be, and at the end, we get the cost of the work.   |  |
|   |  | Carson City's selection committee.   |  | So pretty much I look at it as an open book-type contract  |  |
|   | 15   | And Gus and I felt that that was problematic   | 15   | at that point. We have knowledge of everything. There  |  |
|   |  | for many reasons, primarily that that's not our job. And   |  | is nothing left.   |  |
|   |  | it would be very difficult for Public Works, from a practical standpoint, and legally, for them to, I mean,  | 17<br>18   | And I guess in other jurisdictions because of<br>what they ask or don't ask for, you see some fees that  |  |
|   |  | it would be quite a departure from our stated program as   |  | will come in kind of low and get an advantage at that  |  |
|   |  | it is.   |  | point and then certain contractors that then are using   |  |
|   | 21   | ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And again, I'd hate to  |  | either their GCs or other things as a profit center and  |  |
|   |  | be the one so we recommend something to a public body.<br>Here's the ranking and they use it, and maybe the  | 22   | playing games with that, basically.<br>So Skip, Mr. Dailey, likes the way that   |  |
|   |  | contractor doesn't perform and, you know, and it's not   |  | the type of information in our process, so he's trying to  |  |
|   | 25   | our if you look at the 341 and why we were created in  | 25   | first of all, he tried to put in there that we use our   |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  | Dago 58  |  | Page 60  |  |
| - |  | Page 58  |  | Page 60  |  |
| - |  | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or   |  | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,   |  |
| - | 2  | -  | 2  | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again, let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms   |  |
| - | 2<br>3<br>4  | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to   | 2<br>3<br>4  | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul><li>341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or participating with local government in their contracting and practices.</li><li>I think the other area that they wanted to include in there was the information required for the</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now  |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul><li>341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or participating with local government in their contracting and practices.</li><li>I think the other area that they wanted to include in there was the information required for the selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul><li>341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or participating with local government in their contracting and practices.</li><li>I think the other area that they wanted to include in there was the information required for the</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now  |  |
|   | 2<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed  |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14                                     | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15                               | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut  |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16                              | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I  |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18             | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19       | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20 | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they<br>give us a GNP, that they do go through a bid process, and  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are<br>doing with respect to the construction management at   |  |
|   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>112<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>9<br>20<br>21 | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are   |  |
|   | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22  | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they<br>give us a GNP, that they do go through a bid process, and<br>at the bid opening, the bids are submitted in a closed<br>envelope, and we're there at the bid opening, and we<br>oversee everything and get copies of everything.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are<br>doing with respect to the construction management at<br>risk.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Gus, where is or Susan,<br>where is the information? In 338.1693, where do I find   |  |
|   | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they<br>give us a GNP, that they do go through a bid process, and<br>at the bid opening, the bids are submitted in a closed<br>envelope, and we're there at the bid opening, and we<br>oversee everything and get copies of everything.<br>As the bids are opened, copies are made. We | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are<br>doing with respect to the construction management at<br>risk.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Gus, where is or Susan,<br>where is the information? In 338.1693, where do I find<br>the language? On which page? The language that's |  |
|   | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24   | 341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or<br>participating with local government in their contracting<br>and practices.<br>I think the other area that they wanted to<br>include in there was the information required for the<br>selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a<br>certain extent, successful due to the information that is<br>required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as<br>we're scoring and going through the short list and then<br>the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask<br>for sufficient information so that everything is<br>disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in<br>obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and<br>profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they<br>provide certain information so that their costs of their<br>general conditions can be calculated from and determined,<br>and then of course the only thing left at that point is<br>the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of<br>the process on the preconstruction services, that they<br>give us a GNP, that they do go through a bid process, and<br>at the bid opening, the bids are submitted in a closed<br>envelope, and we're there at the bid opening, and we<br>oversee everything and get copies of everything.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,<br>let's say why don't you then take a look at our forms<br>and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in<br>the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board<br>forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now<br>for that to be used in this. And you'll see the<br>comments that we've put together and sent back with them<br>there along these lines in here.<br>So having said all of that, the main<br>direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the<br>I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed<br>to get he still kind of insists that they want to use<br>Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I<br>would I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some<br>direction from our Board because our feeling, gut<br>feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I<br>told him I would get back with him and see what the<br>thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public<br>Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are<br>doing with respect to the construction management at<br>risk.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Gus, where is or Susan,<br>where is the information? In 338.1693, where do I find   |  |

| Put  | olic Works Division Video Conference Board Meeting   |  | January 27, 2017   |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Page 61  |  | Page 63  |
| 1  | COUNSEL STEWART: I'm sorry. It's on page 5.  | 1  | restate the motion, I can do that.   |
| 2  | CHAIR CLUTTS: How do I know what is proposed   | 2  |  |
|  | language and what is existing language?  | _  | restated?  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4  | COUNSEL STEWART: Yes. So I apologize. I  | 4  |  |
|  | should have put a little legend in there. My proposal,   |  | Is there a second?   |
|  | my proposed additions, are underlined. And then  | 6  |  |
|  | everything else that's stricken or highlighted are   | 7  | J 1  |
|  | Mr. Dailey's proposals.  |  | All of those in favor?   |
| 9  | CHAIR CLUTTS: So can I all of this is  | 9  | 5  |
|  | added language. Yours is underlined.   | 10   | 2 11   |
| 11   | COUNSEL STEWART: All of?   | 11   | carries.   |
| 12   | CHAIR CLUTTS: If it's not underlined, is it  | 12   | 5  |
|  | Assemblyman Dailey's language, and if it is underlined,  | 13   | ,  |
| 14   | it's yours? Or is there an original language and then  | 14   | record. And what I will do is I will provide the Board   |
| 15   | Assemblyman Dailey's language and then your language?  | 15   | with a clear marked-up copy of what's what. That's okay.   |
| 16   | COUNSEL STEWART: Right. Sorry.   | 16   | And I will send it to each of you individually for your  |
| 17   | CHAIR CLUTTS: How do I differentiate between   | 17   | reference. Please do not discuss it among yourselves.  |
| 18   | those?   | 18   | It's just for your reference. And then I suspect that  |
| 19   | COUNSEL STEWART: So the highlighted text, as   | 19   | this will come up again, and we can discuss it in the  |
| 20   | you're going page 1, these deletions here on page 3  | 20   | future, but then you'll have a clear picture. And I  |
| 21   | and the highlighted text.  | 21   | apologize that you didn't get the highlighted copy.  |
| 22   | CHAIR CLUTTS: Nothing that we have is  | 22   |  |
| 23   | highlighted.   | 23   | actually, probably the next time we see these things,  |
| 24   | COUNSEL STEWART: Oh, it's not? Oh. My  |  | it's actually going to be in a bill form, and we'll send   |
| 25   | apologies. Susan Stewart, for the record.  |  | it back out to the Board with any of our comments. I'll  |
|  |  |  | 5  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Page 62  |  | Page 64  |
| - 1  | -  | 1  | -  |
| 1  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really  |  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get   |
| 2  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really nice, Bryce.   | 2  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the  |
| 2<br>3   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's  | 2<br>3   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.   | 2<br>3<br>4  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>12   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>13<br>14  | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.<br>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much<br>appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.<br>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I<br>would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much<br>appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to<br>influence the Board in any way, but  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get some approval as to how to testify depending on how the bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I said, I still need approval from administration as to how to testify on these things.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6? Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any further Board comments or discussion related to today's agenda items?</li> <li>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number 8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up down there?</li> <li>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.</li> <li>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up here.</li> <li>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar. This room is freezing. I don't know if maybe my legs</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much<br>appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to<br>influence the Board in any way, but<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So thank you, Mr. Stewart. Is                   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.<br>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I<br>would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar.<br>This room is freezing. I don't know if maybe my legs<br>are icicles.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much<br>appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to<br>influence the Board in any way, but<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So thank you, Mr. Stewart. Is<br>that a motion? | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.<br>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I<br>would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar.<br>This room is freezing. I don't know if maybe my legs<br>are icicles.<br>COUNSEL STEWART: I'm very comfortable. Is |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really<br>nice, Bryce.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's<br>hard to read from here.<br>VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while<br>we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably<br>have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is<br>asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State<br>Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of<br>Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they<br>want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they<br>want to if they want to have a standardized form<br>statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with<br>that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape,<br>or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely<br>don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of<br>every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That<br>would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in<br>a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.<br>ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much<br>appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to<br>influence the Board in any way, but<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: So thank you, Mr. Stewart. Is                   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | have to get some through Patrick, I'll have to get<br>some approval as to how to testify depending on how the<br>bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion<br>and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll<br>follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I<br>said, I still need approval from administration as to how<br>to testify on these things.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions<br>or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?<br>Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for<br>possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any<br>further Board comments or discussion related to today's<br>agenda items?<br>Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number<br>8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up<br>down there?<br>MEMBER BENTLEY: No.<br>CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up<br>here.<br>MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I<br>would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar.<br>This room is freezing. I don't know if maybe my legs<br>are icicles.  |

|  | Page 65  |
|--|--|
| -  | MEMBED CATES. In it inst ma?   |
| 1  | MEMBER CATES: Is it just me?   |
| 2  | CHAIR CLUTTS: I think you're on your own on  |
| 3  | this one.  |
| 4  | MEMBER CATES: I'd like to withdraw my  |
| 5  | comments from the record then. I'm sorry. Go ahead.  |
| 6  | CHAIR CLUTTS: We'll adjourn the meeting at   |
| 7  | 3:45 p.m. Thank you.   |
| 8  | -000-  |
| 9  |  |
| 10   |  |
| 11   |  |
| 12   |  |
| 13   |  |
| 14   |  |
| 15   |  |
| 16   |  |
| 17   |  |
| 18   |  |
| 19   |  |
| 20   |  |
| 21   |  |
| 22   |  |
| 23   |  |
| 24   |  |
| 25   |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Page 66  |
| 1  | Page 66<br>state of nevada )   |
| 2  | STATE OF NEVADA ) )  |
| 2<br>3   | STATE OF NEVADA )  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | STATE OF NEVADA ) )  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | STATE OF NEVADA ) )  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the<br>State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the<br>State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the<br>State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby<br>Certify:   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | STATE OF NEVADA )<br>)<br>CARSON CITY. )<br>I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the<br>State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby<br>Certify:<br>That on the 27th day of January, 2017, I was |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16                                     | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                               | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                         | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                   | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20             | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | <pre>STATE OF NEVADA )</pre>   |

|                                   | - absolutely (1)                | 20:4,11,20;21:4;22:7,                   | 10:23;49:7                                    | applied (1)                          |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| \$                                | 46:16                           | 11,15,18;23:13;25:21;                   | allowing (1)                                  | 9:3                                  |
| *                                 | Acceptance (1)                  | 26:5,24;27:3,10,14;                     | 49:16   | applies (1)                          |
| \$1 (3)                           | 4:5                             | 28:4,24;29:1;31:12;                     | along (7)                                     | 44:25                                |
| 20:24,25;34:16                    | access (1)                      | 33:4,19;35:10,13,25;                    | 45:25;55:16;56:14,                            | apply (1)                            |
| \$1,000 (1)                       | 50:24                           | 37:1,16;39:24;40:4,8,                   | 19;60:8;62:21;64:5                            | 6:22                                 |
| 42:19                             | accordance (1)                  | 10;43:11;46:1,13,18;                    | amend (1)                                     | applying (8)                         |
| \$1,000,000 (9)                   | 18:24                           | 47:11,16,18;48:5;50:4,                  | 8:24  | 10:5;14:21,25;22:20;                 |
| 10:6,7,13,13;14:22;               | accordingly (1)                 | 10,14,21;51:2,6,10;                     | amendments (2)                                | 23:21;25:7;44:21;52:7                |
| 15:5,7,9;20:21                    | 64:5                            | 52:16,19,23;53:8;                       | 49:5,24                                       | appointment (1)                      |
| \$10,000,000 (8)                  | accurately (1)                  | 54:20;56:12,19,24;                      | among (1)                                     | 49:16                                |
| 15:20;16:10,13,15,                | 14:1                            | 57:1,21;62:20;63:12,<br>22              | 63:17   | <b>appreciate (2)</b><br>47:15;62:21 |
| 18,19,21,25                       | acknowledgment (1)<br>45:5      | administrator's (2)                     | <b>amount (13)</b><br>11:8;12:23;14:20;       | appropriate (1)                      |
| <b>\$100,000 (5)</b>              | 45.5<br>action (8)              | 49:2,13                                 | 15:4;30:2;34:10,11,14;                        | 20:8                                 |
| 10:6,9,13;20:21;21:9              | 4:5;5:4;33:24;34:4;             | adopt (1)                               | 39:2,3,22;41:1;42:7                           | approval (4)                         |
| \$ <b>20</b> (6)                  | 48:13;51:25;56:16;              | 6:6                                     | amounts (1)                                   | 4:5,22;64:2,6                        |
| 22:4,5;26:6,7,10;                 | 64:11                           | adopted (1)                             | 42:16   | approvals (1)                        |
| 34:16                             | action' (1)                     | 7:11                                    | and/or (3)                                    | 31:1                                 |
| \$ <b>25-</b> (1)                 | 41:19                           | adoption (1)                            | 43:6;44:16,16                                 | approve (1)                          |
| 10:9                              | actions (1)                     | 24:8                                    | animosity (1)                                 | 8:14                                 |
| <b>325,000 (1)</b><br>38:10       | 48:19                           | advantage (1)                           | 30:15   | approved (15)                        |
| <b>38</b> :10<br><b>33 (3)</b>    | actual (2)                      | 59:19                                   | answered (3)                                  | 6:16,20;8:13,23;                     |
| 15:14;29:23;32:1                  | 5:9;9:20                        | adversarial (1)                         | 28:7,10,10                                    | 18:18,20,25;19:3;20:5;               |
| <b>3,000,000 (5)</b>              | actually (17)                   | 30:13                                   | apologies (1)                                 | 23:19,21;24:8;33:15;                 |
| 14:23;15:1,7,9,10                 | 6:22;9:2;10:18;17:9,            | affidavit (3)                           | 61:25   | 42:24;45:15                          |
| \$30 (18)                         | 24;18:22;19:7;31:18;            | 52:6,11,14                              | apologize (2)                                 | arbitrarily (3)                      |
| 18:7,8,10;22:9,10,21,             | 37:13;46:1,7;47:19;             | Again (25)                              | 61:4;63:21                                    | 19:3,7;21:6                          |
| 22,23;23:2,5,18;25:25;            | 49:12;53:20;56:13;              | 11:18,19;12:24;                         | apparent (1)                                  | arbitrary (4)                        |
| 26:1,2,18,20,21;44:22             | 63:23,24                        | 15:11,22;16:7;23:1,14;                  | 30:10   | 20:3,5;23:10;26:25                   |
| <b>\$30,000,000</b> (1)           | Adair (3)                       | 26:17;34:22;35:8;                       | appeal (5)                                    | arbitration (2)                      |
| 18:6                              | 50:18;51:5,8                    | 37:10;38:4,23;39:17;                    | 6:21,22,24;8:9;30:12                          | 8:21;35:3                            |
| \$5 (24)                          | Adam (1)                        | 44:4,12,16;51:14;54:5;                  | appealed (3)                                  | archives (1)                         |
| 18:7;20:24,25;22:1,               | 3:14                            | 56:8;57:21;59:9;60:1;                   | 24:14;31:2;46:8                               | 48:1                                 |
| 2,5,9,20,22;23:3,5,17;            | adamant (1)                     | 63:19                                   | appeals (6)                                   | area (8)                             |
| 25:18,22,25;26:1,3,6,8,           | 45:16                           | against (3)                             | 7:1;31:6;32:10,11,                            | 29:12;30:6;34:24;                    |
| 10,17,20;29:23;44:22              | add (6)                         | 34:3;37:23;42:10                        | 18;48:16                                      | 36:23,24;53:19;55:25;                |
| \$5,000,000 (9)                   | 17:6;36:4;40:2,4;               | AGC (6)                                 | apples (2)                                    | 58:4                                 |
| 10:7,7,14,14;14:22;               | 46:15,15                        | 52:18,19,24;53:9;                       | 59:2,2  | areas (3)                            |
| 15:20;16:20;17:1,22               | added (5)                       | 60:11;62:8                              | applicable (1)                                | 30:8;53:13;54:11                     |
| <b>550 (1)</b>                    | 27:22;28:2;40:11;<br>48:8;61:10 | <b>agencies (1)</b><br>10:17            | 13:13   | <b>argument (1)</b><br>42:21         |
| 42:19                             | addition (1)                    |   | <b>applicant (25)</b><br>6:19;7:4;11:21;12:6, | 42:21<br>around (3)                  |
| <b>50,000</b> (1)                 | 10:4                            | <b>agency (5)</b><br>40:15,17;41:10,10; | 9,12,15;18:16;29:8;                           | 20:13;27:21;50:23                    |
| 42:17                             | additions (1)                   | 40.13,17,41.10,10, 43:6                 | 33:21,25;34:3;36:2;                           | arrived (1)                          |
| <b>580 (3)</b>                    | 61:6                            | Agenda (10)                             | 37:24,24,25;38:2,9,10,                        | 10:25                                |
| 18:10;26:15,19                    | addresses (1)                   | 3:25;4:4;5:4;47:1;                      | 14,16;39:3,9;43:13,15                         | Assemblyman (8)                      |
| \$80,000,000 (1)                  | 12:1                            | 48:20;51:13;64:9,10,                    | applicants (1)                                | 52:20;56:23,25;57:1;                 |
| 18:2                              | adjourn (1)                     | 13,14                                   | 30:16   | 60:11;61:13,15;62:7                  |
| •                                 | 65:6                            | aggregate (3)                           | Application (39)                              | assessed (2)                         |
| Α                                 | adjusted (1)                    | 11:4;16:11,11                           | 5:7;6:16,17;8:1,3,24;                         | 42:15,18                             |
| <b>AB</b> (1)                     | 38:12                           | ago (4)                                 | 9:12,19,20;10:3;11:23;                        | assessing (1)                        |
| <b>49</b> :12                     | administer (1)                  | 7:20;22:1;50:12;                        | 12:7;18:15,19,23;                             | 42:13                                |
|                                   | 62:14                           | 52:8                                    | 19:13;23:18;25:2;                             | assigned (1)                         |
| ability (4)<br>10:16;11:12;41:25; | administration (1)              | agree (1)                               | 27:15,20,23;28:15;                            | 49:12                                |
| 10:16;11:12;41:25;<br>57:5        | 64:6                            | 62:10                                   | 29:5;32:2;33:3,24;                            | assist (1)                           |
| 57:5<br>ible (4)                  | administrative (1)              | agreed (2)                              | 35:2,7;36:13;38:3;                            | 19:12                                |
| 5:25;6:4;23:5;29:14               | 37:21                           | 24:1;57:7                               | 40:12,19;41:15,20;                            | assume (2)                           |
| <b>above (17)</b>                 | ADMINISTRATOR (80)              | agreements (2)                          | 42:2;43:17,19;45:25;                          | 16:12;35:24                          |
| 16:18;17:1;18:8,10;               | 3:8,10,13,16,18,21;             | 49:6,25                                 | 47:22   | assumption (1)                       |
| 21:5;23:24;25:22,25;              | 5:8;9:9;11:1;13:3,8,14,         | ahead (2)                               | applications (4)                              | 42:21                                |
| 26:1,3,6,18,20;44:15,             | 19;14:8;16:8,17;17:3,           | 48:2;65:5                               | 30:25;31:7;45:18;                             | attach (1)                           |
| 18,23;55:23                       | 7,9,22;18:15;19:6;              | allow (2)                               | 48:16   | 11:24                                |
| 10,23,33.23                       | , , , , ,                       |   |   |                                      |

| attached (3)                             | below (12)   | 40:14,17;41:17,23;                    | budget (1)                                       | categories (7)                |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 7:14;35:3;40:22                          | 15:5;16:13,20;17:6;  | 42:4,12,15,23;43:1,7;                 | 4:13   | 7:19;8:1;10:6,12;             |
| attention (1)                            |  |                                       | budgetary (1)                                    | 19:15;21:10:41:3              |
|  | 18:6;23:22;26:8,9,17;  | 45:15;46:3,4,7,22,25;                 |  |                               |
| 55:25                                    | 33:25;44:1,12  | 47:3;48:7,10,24,25;                   | 31:25  | category (28)                 |
| attorney (1)                             | Bentley (27)   | 49:7,15,16,25;56:16;                  | building (2)                                     | 11:13;12:15;13:6,10;          |
| 35:5                                     | 3:11,12;4:2;17:19,   | 60:4,15,18;62:9,13,22;                | 49:7,18  | 14:22,25;15:12;16:18;         |
| automatically (1)                        | 20;18:12;19:1;20:3,10,   | 63:2,9,14,25;64:4,11,                 | bullet (1)                                       | 17:23;21:8,12;23:15,          |
| 20:1                                     | 13;21:3,16;27:7,11;  | 12                                    | 38:20  | 22;24:4,11;25:6,11,11,        |
| available (2)                            | 28:7,9,18;46:9,17;47:5,  | boards (3)                            | burden (1)                                       | 13,18;29:21;37:12;            |
| 18:23;23:20                              | 13,17;48:2,3,14;63:6;  | 18:20;33:15;47:10                     | 7:5  | 38:4;43:18;44:1,2,16,         |
| avenue (1)                               | 64:17  | Board's (1)                           | business (4)                                     | 20                            |
| 31:19                                    | best (7)   | 49:2                                  | 3:6,25;54:21;55:15                               | Cates (9)                     |
|  |  |                                       | 5.0,25,54.21,55.15                               | 3:16,17;4:9,10,20,            |
| averaging (1)                            | 9:14;25:22;29:16;  | bodies (3)                            | C  |                               |
| 32:7                                     | 30:7;31:15;45:10;  | 52:2,15;53:4                          | С  | 25;64:20;65:1,4               |
| Award (3)                                | 54:15  | body (3)                              |  | caused (1)                    |
| 36:2,3;38:13                             | bet (3)  | 31:2,10;57:22                         | calculate (2)                                    | 19:15                         |
| awarded (1)                              | 13:3;32:11;47:16   | bold (1)                              | 20:2;28:23                                       | Cece (1)                      |
| 52:11                                    | better (3)   | 54:12                                 | calculated (1)                                   | 32:4                          |
| Aye (2)                                  | 9:24,24;25:23  | bond (1)                              | 58:16  | center (1)                    |
| 5:2;63:9                                 | beyond (1)   | 11:14                                 | calendar (1)                                     | 59:21                         |
| · · · · · ·                              | 55:23  | bonding (30)                          | 50:24  | certain (7)                   |
| В  | bid (13)   | 8:6;11:2,13,14;                       | call (8)   | 19:18;23:22;30:2;             |
| <b>D</b>                                 | 6:2;10:23;11:9,14;   | 14:22;15:8,15,18,20;                  | 3:7;19:8,16;32:2;                                | 53:4;58:7,15;59:20            |
| back (23)                                | 23:5;52:3,10;54:3,4,5;   | 16:11,25;17:2;18:1,2,                 |  | certainly (1)                 |
|  |  |                                       | 45:5;50:22;51:7;59:1                             | <b>certainly</b> (1)<br>32:20 |
| 9:3,7;14:3;19:23;                        | 58:20,21,22  | 10;20:23;21:2,13;22:3,                | called (1)                                       |                               |
| 27:4;29:7;32:4,14;                       | bidder (2)   | 8,20;23:2,8;24:4;                     | 35:5   | certified (2)                 |
| 34:22;35:18;36:6;44:4;                   | 7:18;59:3  | 26:15,19;29:22;44:17,                 | calling (1)                                      | 8:5;11:2                      |
| 47:3,6,12,19,25;49:13;                   | bidders (2)  | 21,24                                 | 13:7   | cetera (3)                    |
| 50:6;54:17;60:7,17;                      | 28:1;52:6  | bones (1)                             | calls (1)  | 48:16;52:13,13                |
| 63:25                                    | bidder's (2)   | 7:17                                  | 50:17  | CHAIR (65)                    |
| bad (1)                                  | 52:7,9   | book-type (2)                         | came (7)   | 3:4,9,20,24;4:3,20,           |
| 42:9                                     | bidding (1)  | 59:10,14                              | 27:25;32:5;35:17;                                | 24;5:1,3,13,20;9:6;           |
| ball (1)                                 | 54:14  | both (4)                              | 41:4;47:20;50:7;52:16                            | 13:1,4,12,15;14:2;16:7,       |
| 50:15                                    | bids (6)   | 18:18,19;57:7;60:11                   | can (40)   | 9,24;17:5,8,18;21:22;         |
| Bankruptcy (3)                           | 43:19;53:12,20;  | bottom (2)                            | 5:19;7:6;9:7;11:11,                              | 22:12,17,25;24:16;            |
| 11:22,24;12:3                            | 58:21,24;59:9  | 23:22;44:20                           | 18;12:18;13:1,19,21;                             | 25:16;26:22,25;28:6,          |
| base (1)                                 | biennial (1)   | boy (1)                               |  | 12;30:21;32:22;33:17;         |
|  | 4:13   |                                       | 14:10,15;16:7;21:22;                             |                               |
| 13:9                                     |  | 58:1                                  | 23:14;29:12;30:7,8,16;                           | 39:20,25;40:6,9;43:8;         |
| based (4)                                | Biennium (1)   | breach (6)                            | 31:10,16,20;32:14,25;                            | 46:19;48:2,9;50:3,9,          |
| 19:11;21:1;42:21;                        | 4:13   | 8:7,18;33:20,21;                      | 33:12;36:17;37:8;                                | 20;51:1,13;56:15;             |
| 64:3                                     | biggest (1)  | 34:1,3                                | 38:25,25;40:25;47:2,                             | 60:22;61:2,9,12,17,22;        |
| basically (18)                           | 30:24  | breaking (1)                          | 12,25;50:23,24;51:11;                            | 62:3,23;63:4,7,10;64:8,       |
| 9:19;10:2;11:3;21:5;                     | bill (12)  | 9:15                                  | 55:19;58:16;61:9;63:1,                           | 18;65:2,6                     |
| 27:18;33:20;39:14;                       | 48:25;49:12,21;53:1,   | brief (1)                             | 19   | Chairman (4)                  |
| 40:15;41:3,4;44:6,10,                    | 9;56:18,22,23;57:8,11;   | 5:23                                  | capabilities (1)                                 | 3:8,18;5:9,15                 |
| 24;45:4;46:5;53:19,23;                   | 63:24;64:3   | briefly (1)                           | 10:19  | change (6)                    |
| 59:22                                    | bills (1)  | 48:23                                 | capacity (14)                                    | 36:9;38:13,25;51:23;          |
| basis (1)                                | 60:13  | bring (1)                             | 8:6;15:8,15,18;                                  | 55:14;57:7                    |
| 45:1                                     | bit (4)  | 48:12                                 | 16:11,25;17:2;18:10;                             | changed (4)                   |
| BDRs (1)                                 | 9:16;24:25;35:16;  | broader (1)                           | 20:23;22:3,4,8;23:2;                             | 36:9;49:9;52:8;               |
|  | 9.10,24.25,55.10,<br>46:2  | 31:9                                  | 26:19  | 55:13                         |
| 49:11<br>basema (1)                      |  |                                       |  |                               |
| become (1)                               | blemishes (1)  | broadly (1)                           | capture (1)                                      | changes (4)                   |
| 62:9                                     | 17:13  | 7:15                                  | 8:18   | 36:8;51:22;52:4,25            |
| beginning (1)                            | block (1)  | broke (2)                             | care (1)   | Chapter (4)                   |
| 48:6                                     | 4:11   | 30:22;31:3                            | 55:24  | 11:18;12:1,2;41:16            |
| begins (1)                               | Board (75)   | brought (3)                           | carries (1)                                      | charge (1)                    |
| 9:12                                     | 3:5;4:6;5:2;6:6,6,15,  | 18:20;27:3;55:24                      | 63:11  | 32:1                          |
| behind (2)                               | 16057601101010   | Bruce (1)                             | CARSON (4)                                       | charged (1)                   |
|  | 16,25;7:6,8,11;8:13,16;  | Diuce (1)                             |  |                               |
|  |  | 30:21                                 |  | 45:23                         |
| 25:9;50:19                               | 18:18,24;19:7,9;20:6;  | 30:21                                 | 3:1;57:8,12,14                                   |                               |
| 25:9;50:19<br>belief (1)                 | 18:18,24;19:7,9;20:6;<br>23:19;24:10,12,12;                          | 30:21<br>Bryce (8)                    | 3:1;57:8,12,14<br>case (2)                       | chase (1)                     |
| 25:9;50:19<br><b>belief (1)</b><br>45:10 | 18:18,24;19:7,9;20:6;<br>23:19;24:10,12,12;<br>26:2,23;27:2,5,18,19, | 30:21<br>Bryce (8)<br>3:8;16:9;22:25; | 3:1;57:8,12,14<br><b>case (2)</b><br>25:18;36:12 | <b>chase (1)</b><br>50:23     |
| 25:9;50:19<br>belief (1)                 | 18:18,24;19:7,9;20:6;<br>23:19;24:10,12,12;                          | 30:21<br>Bryce (8)                    | 3:1;57:8,12,14<br>case (2)                       | chase (1)                     |

checked (1) 49:10 child (1) 41:22 chose (1) 10:21 circle (2) 20:14;22:1 circumstances (1) 34:1 citizen (1) 42:10 CITY (3) 3:1;57:8,12 City's (1) 57:14 civil (1) 37:20 clarification (1) 46:10 clarify (1) 24:17 clear (6) 28:10;33:9;43:3; 56:11;63:15,20 clearest (1) 54:16 clearly (3) 6:21;14:1;43:1 Clint (2) 3:11:21:23 Clint's (1) 28:17 closed (1) 58:21 closures (1) 31:20 CLUTTS (73) 3:4,8,9,20,24;4:3,20, 24:5:1,3,13,20:9:6; 13:1,4,12,15;14:2;16:7, 9,9,24;17:5,8,18;21:22; 22:12,17,25,25;24:16; 25:16;26:22,22,25; 28:6,12;30:21,21; 32:22;33:17;35:20; 39:20,20,25;40:6,9; 43:8;46:19,19;48:2,9; 50:3,9,20;51:1,13; 56:15;60:22;61:2,9,12, 17,22;62:3,23;63:4,7, 10;64:8,18;65:2,6 CMAR (4) 57:3,6,9;62:17 coaching (1) 30:2 Code (3) 11:22;49:3,21 cold (1) 64:25 combination (2) 25:6;43:15 comfortable (1)

64:24 coming (2) 3:22;55:19 comment (8) 3:25;4:1,4;62:5; 64:11,15,15,20 comments (9) 4:9,21,21;60:7;63:7, 25;64:9,12;65:5 committee (6) 9:18;19:4;20:17; 57:11,12,14 common (1) 54:1 communication (1) 19:23 company (8) 11:2,5,6;12:21; 13:16;18:2;23:8;31:18 compared (1) 7:25 competent (1) 33:22 complaint (1) 64:21 complete (8) 38:11,14,16,24;39:9, 15:40:2:45:9 completed (5) 12:14;25:8;39:3,16; 43:16 Completely (1) 37:1 completing (1) 28:14 completion (5) 12:24;38:12,15;39:4, 11 compliance (1) 52:11 concern (2) 33:6:55:3 concerned (1) 23:10 concerns (2) 23:6;56:3 conditions (1) 58:16 conduct (1) 41:10 confusing (1) 14:7 confusion (3) 14:6;43:5;54:7 connection (1) 34:2 consider (2) 11:9:14:25 consideration (9) 6:1.5;8:11,17;39:2; 41:8;42:8,12;45:24 considered (3) 10:8:16:14:17:1

Consistent (1) 4:19 construction (5) 25:5;35:1;43:14; 51:20:60:20 contact (1) 10:4 contract (19) 8:7,19;15:5;33:20, 22:34:10,17:36:2.3; 38:11,12,15,16,17,24; 39:10:57:5.9:59:14 contracting (1) 58:2 **Contractor (26)** 5:5;6:14,15;8:11,17, 19,20;10:22;16:10; 18:16;21:8,11;23:8; 25:1,7;32:18;33:10; 35:1;39:14,16;41:9; 42:13;46:3;49:17; 57:24;58:25 contractors (7) 7:21;30:11;49:8,19; 53:18;54:13;59:20 contractor's (16) 6:1;11:17;12:12; 15:13;27:24;40:14,17; 41:5,17,25;42:4,12,15; 43:7:48:7:59:8 contracts (2) 10:9:51:20 conviction (1) 37:22 copies (5) 7:14;42:5;51:18; 58:23,24 copv(4)11:24;58:25;63:15, 21 corporate (1) 12:11 correctly (2) 39:22;47:8 cost (15) 7:18;8:1;12:15;25:6, 11,11,13;31:25;43:17, 18,25;44:2;58:18;59:9, 13 costs (1) 58:15 COUNSEL (40) 5:14,21;13:18,23; 24:17;27:9;28:3;30:9; 32:16,24;33:5;34:25; 35:12;36:21;37:15; 41:7;43:9;45:21;48:22; 50:11;51:3,15;52:18, 21,24;54:19;55:19; 56:2,17,22,25;57:2; 61:1,4,11,16,19,24; 63:13:64:24 couple (5)

4:10:31:6:36:4; 51:17;52:8 course (4) 7:5;24:2;43:20; 58:17 COURT (5) 22:8;33:22;35:20; 50:12:63:2 courthouse (1) 35:2 create (3) 52:1,6,14 created (1) 57:25 creating (1) 55:4 criminal (1) 37:22 criteria (9) 6:7;8:3;17:14,20; 18:13,14,17;45:23; 47:9 current (4) 5:11;11:17;19:17; 36:7 currently (1) 16:6 cut (1) 6:22 czar (1) 64:21 D Dailey (6) 52:20;56:24;57:2; 59:23:60:11:62:7 Dailey's (3) 61:8,13,15 damages (1) 34:2 date (6) 11:23;33:23;36:13; 38:3;40:19;43:17 dates (1) 4:7 day (1) 39:5 days (7) 6:18;38:15;39:6,10, 13,25;40:1 deadline (1) 38:11 deals (1) 38:8 debtor (1) 11:21 decide (2) 19:4;21:21 decided (1) 8:16 deciding (1) 21:15

January 27, 2017

decision (4) 6:9:7:8:35:3.4 declaring (1) 45:8 deduct (23) 12:3;15:6,9;17:16; 22:23,24;36:16,20; 37:10:38:6:39:1.11.13. 17;41:1;43:24,24;44:2, 9,14,15,18,23 deducted (4) 23:4,15;36:23;39:22 deductible (1) 39:2 deduction (19) 15:11;16:5,21;18:7, 11;23:7,16,23,24; 24:11;26:8,10,11,18, 20;34:21;42:19,20; 46:14 deductions (13) 16:2,15,22,25;17:5, 14;19:18;25:14;29:9,9, 13;33:7;34:14 defines (2) 7:17;12:10 definitely (1) 62:15 delay (2) 39:4,5 delete (2) 49:2.3 deletions (1) 61:20 denial (1) 30:12 **Department** (1) 5:6 departure (1) 57:19 depending (3) 20:25;26:11:64:2 deputy (2) 47:24,24 described (1) 23:11 description (5) 12:7;25:2;33:25; 34:5;37:20 detail (2) 8:8,10 determination (2) 6:18;19:22 determine (2) 21:18;59:3 determined (2) 20:7;58:16 developed (2) 41:12,13 different (2) 10:6:14:5 differentiate (1) 61:17

| Public Works Division Vi  | deo Conference Board Me | eeting                |                      | January 27, 2017       |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| J:fformentictor (1)       | DecarStern (1)          | 27.10 22.29.5         | 22.14.50.7.(2.10     | 6.2                    |
| differentiates (1)        | DocuSign (1)            | 37:19,23;38:5         | 33:14;50:7;62:10     | 6:3                    |
| 20:16                     | 31:18                   | encourage (1)         | Examiners (2)        | faith (1)              |
| difficult (1)             | dollar (3)              | 7:23                  | 49:7,25              | 42:9                   |
| 57:17                     | 8:1;12:23;14:20         | encouraging (2)       | example (3)          | falsified (1)          |
| dig (1)                   | dollars (2)             | 60:5,10               | 26:13;34:15;57:8     | 45:20                  |
| 47:19                     | 7:22;20:22              | end (5)               | examples (2)         | falsify (2)            |
| digests (1)               | done (4)                | 10:24;53:1;54:4;      | 25:22,23             | 45:7,14                |
| 46:22                     | 23:12;27:19;31:19;      | 58:18;59:13           | exceeded (1)         | far (2)                |
| directed (3)              | 40:1                    | ended (1)             | 38:10                | 8:4;43:2               |
| 26:23;27:2;56:7           | <b>DOT</b> (1)          | 31:18                 | except (3)           | favor (2)              |
| direction (6)             | 10:17                   | enough (3)            | 44:8;45:1;48:6       | 5:1;63:8               |
| 12:14;19:8;56:21;         | double-check (1)        | 19:19;36:24;58:12     | excepting (1)        | federal (6)            |
| 60:10,15;64:4             | 13:24                   | entered (1)           | 40:21                | 38:1;40:14,17;41:10;   |
| directly (1)              | down (6)                | 34:3                  | exceptions (1)       | 43:6;55:22             |
| 49:8                      | 4:1;5:17;8:4;9:23;      | entertain (1)         | 30:11                | fee (2)                |
|                           |                         | 4:22                  |                      | 58:13;59:11            |
| disability (1)            | 50:23;64:16             |                       | excuse (2)           |                        |
| 42:11                     | dozen (2)               | entitled (2)          | 34:12,25             | feel (2)               |
| disciplinary (1)          | 32:12,14                | 41:18;51:19           | exempt (2)           | 36:18;50:21            |
| 41:18                     | draft (1)               | envelope (2)          | 41:20;49:5           | feeling (2)            |
| discipline (3)            | 48:25                   | 32:2;58:22            | exhibited (1)        | 60:15,16               |
| 27:24;40:19;43:5          | drill (1)               | equal (1)             | 42:9                 | fees (1)               |
| disciplined (3)           | 5:17                    | 34:17                 | existing (1)         | 59:18                  |
| 40:13,16;41:9             | drills (1)              | equals (1)            | 61:3                 | felt (2)               |
| disclose (4)              | 8:4                     | 34:19                 | expanded (1)         | 53:17;57:15            |
| 40:23;42:1;45:7,13        | due (2)                 | especially (1)        | 8:15                 | few (2)                |
| disclosed (2)             | 42:14;58:7              | 10:12                 | expands (1)          | 21:25;30:11            |
| 40:21;58:12               | duly (1)                | essence (1)           | 8:22                 | figure (2)             |
| disclosure (1)            | 50:9                    | 8:17                  | experience (7)       | 28:21;32:6             |
| 45:19                     | duplicate (1)           | Essentially (1)       | 7:24;12:21;13:17;    | filed (1)              |
| discovered (1)            | 34:6                    | 6:15                  | 17:11;25:4,10;30:20  | 11:21                  |
| 33:1                      | during (10)             | establish (1)         | experiences (1)      | filing (1)             |
| discretion (4)            | 11:22;13:16;24:7;       | 17:20                 | 12:8                 | 12:3                   |
| 6:9;23:6;24:13,14         | 33:22;36:12,12;38:2;    | established (2)       | Explain (2)          | fill (2)               |
| <b>Discrimination (3)</b> | 40:18;43:16;59:11       | 19:10;47:9            | 23:1;30:4            | 18:23;43:21            |
| 37:19,23;38:5             |                         | establishes (2)       | extension (1)        | filled (1)             |
| discuss (3)               | Ε                       | 7:18;11:8             | 38:13                | 31:16                  |
| 48:12;63:17,19            |                         | et (3)                | extent (2)           | final (3)              |
| discussed (1)             | effort (1)              | 48:16;52:13,13        | 19:25;58:7           | 19:22;49:21;58:10      |
| 27:16                     | 31:15                   | evaluate (1)          | extra (1)            | finally (1)            |
| discussion (8)            | egregious (3)           | 18:5                  | 29:7                 | 27:5                   |
| 5:22;24:7;45:22;          | 39:17;41:24;42:22       | evaluated (1)         |                      | financial (5)          |
| 48:21;50:7;51:24;         | eight (4)               | 21:12                 | F                    | 10:16,18,20;11:6,11    |
| 64:11,12                  | 30:24;32:9,9;48:15      | evaluating (1)        | _                    | find (7)               |
| Disqualification (2)      | either (4)              | 6:1                   | face (1)             | 13:7;27:8;33:11;       |
| 36:1,15                   | 15:17;17:24;20:22;      | evaluation (4)        | 50:19                | 47:12,25;55:10;60:23   |
| disqualified (2)          | 59:21                   | 9:18;14:12,13;27:23   | facilities (1)       | findings (1)           |
| 36:3;46:3                 | electronically (2)      | evaluations (1)       | 49:23                | 37:21                  |
| disqualify (1)            | 31:16,21                | 8:11                  | facility (1)         | fine (6)               |
| 36:25                     | eliminate (1)           | even (7)              | 49:4                 | 40:19;41:1;42:6,18,    |
| divide (2)                | 29:13                   | 14:24;18:9;19:2;      | fact (4)             | 22;43:5                |
| 34:10,17                  | eliminating (1)         | 22:13;31:2;50:24;56:4 | 6:12;11:5;34:24;     | fined (4)              |
| Division (10)             | 49:23                   | everybody (4)         | 37:21                | 40:13,16;41:9;42:14    |
| 5:5;7:21;49:1,22;         | else (3)                | 10:2;54:14;55:11,12   | factors (2)          | fines (3)              |
| 51:16;52:1,5,14;53:3;     | 20:9;61:7;64:25         | everyone (2)          | 42:7,11              | 33:8;42:13,15          |
| 57:13                     | e-mails (2)             | 6:25;58:14            | fail (8)             | fining (1)             |
| Division's (1)            | 50:17,19                | evidence (1)          | 19:16,24;30:1;37:11, | 42:8                   |
| 49:4                      | employed (2)            | 11:16                 | 14;39:18;45:6,13     | 42.8<br>finish (1)     |
| document (1)              | 12:9,21                 | evidentiary (1)       | failed (9)           | 39:12                  |
| 18:17                     | employee (2)            | 7:6                   | 38:8,10,14,16,23;    | <b>First (16)</b>      |
| documentation (2)         | 12:11,19                | exact (1)             | 39:9,14;40:2;46:6    | 3:6;5:12,21,23;10:3;   |
| 40:22;59:5                | employees (2)           | 32:15                 | fair (1)             | 21:8;24:18;35:6;37:3;  |
| documents (3)             | 57:11,13                | exactly (6)           | 28:16                | 46:1,2;47:20,23;53:16, |
| 5:23;18:21;52:3           | <b>Employment (3)</b>   | 5:25;8:8;27:11;       | <b>fairly (1)</b>    | 21;59:25               |
| 5.23,10.21,52.3           | Employment (3)          | 5.25,0.0,27.11,       |                      | 21,37.23               |

|                              | des Comerence Dourd M          | cetting                |                            | <i>Sumuri J 21, 2011</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| five (19)                    | 18:7;23:14,15,23;              | Grounds (1)            | 36:18                      | influence (2)            |
| 9:17;12:2,25;13:6,           | 24:13,14;26:9,9,17;            | 41:18                  | hope (2)                   | 54:24;62:22              |
| 10,13,20;14:11;15:12;        | 33:14;44:13;45:19,19;          | group (2)              | 4:18;30:10                 | information (23)         |
| 16:1,1,22;17:12;19:15;       | 50:23                          | 49:5;54:13             | Hopefully (2)              | 9:22;10:4,21;11:6;       |
| 21:5,11,11;32:9;38:23        | funds (2)                      | guess (7)              | 29:5;51:18                 | 29:3;34:5;36:14;43:21;   |
| fix (1)                      | 55:22,22                       | 28:13;32:8,13;45:5;    | hour (4)                   | 45:7,8,9,14;46:22;       |
| 30:23                        | further (5)                    | 51:11,11;59:17         | 37:3,9,13;50:12            | 47:3;48:14,17;58:5,7,    |
| focused (1)                  | 5:18;6:10;11:20;               | guidance (1)           | hours (1)                  | 11,12,15;59:24;60:23     |
| 31:11                        | 48:11;64:12                    | 30:18                  | 54:3                       | initiated (1)            |
| folks (1)                    | future (3)                     | guideline (1)          | housekeeping (2)           | 8:19                     |
| 54:1                         | 24:10;55:10;63:20              | 21:20                  | 36:10;50:4                 | input (1)                |
| follow (5)                   | 24.10,35.10,05.20              | Gus (11)               | hundred (3)                | 54:17                    |
| 6:15;8:25;16:16;             | G                              | 9:9;21:17;22:1;25:2;   | 7:22,25;21:10              | insane (1)               |
| 64:3,5                       | 0                              | 32:25;52:15;56:8;57:3, | 7.22,25,21.10              | 62:18                    |
| followed (1)                 | gain (1)                       | 7,15;60:22             | Ι                          | inserting (1)            |
| 6:12                         | 29:24                          |                        | 1                          | 53:5                     |
|                              |                                | gut (1)                |                            |                          |
| following (4)                | game (1)                       | 60:15                  | icicles (1)                | insists (1)              |
| 4:6;21:23;36:14;             | 28:20                          | guys (1)               | 64:23                      | 60:12                    |
| 49:11                        | games (1)                      | 42:5                   | identify (1)               | inspect (1)              |
| follows (1)                  | 59:22                          |                        | 48:15                      | 49:5                     |
| 45:25                        | gave (1)                       | Н                      | ignored (1)                | inspecting (1)           |
| follow-up (1)                | 32:3                           |                        | 42:9                       | 49:22                    |
| 28:14                        | GCs (2)                        | Hand (11)              | II (4)                     | instance (2)             |
| form (22)                    | 59:12,21                       | 3:14,15;4:23;25:16,    | 12:5;13:12;14:19;          | 16:3;34:15               |
| 16:16;18:19;29:2;            | general (6)                    | 17,17;26:4;28:13,13,   | 28:7                       | instead (5)              |
| 31:15;34:6;40:24;52:1,       | 5:18;9:13;33:16;               | 19,25                  | III (2)                    | 11:7;19:14;29:21,22;     |
| 6;54:15,15;55:2,6,7,10,      | 58:13,16;59:12                 | handle (1)             | 33:18,19                   | 56:12                    |
| 13,14;56:9,10,11;            | genesis (1)                    | 7:6                    | imagine (1)                | intent (1)               |
| 62:12,15;63:24               | 54:6                           | happens (2)            | 31:6                       | 46:24                    |
| former (1)                   | gets (5)                       | 16:10;19:13            | immediately (6)            | interested (1)           |
| 42:23                        | 8:23;15:10;23:25;              | happy (1)              | 11:23;33:23;36:13;         | 46:2                     |
| forms (12)                   | 26:20,21                       | 33:11                  | 38:2;40:18;43:16           | interrupt (1)            |
| 5:10;54:10,12,21,24;         | gist (1)                       | hard (1)               | impact (1)                 | 13:1                     |
| 55:5,20;60:1,2,5,13;         | 9:25                           | 62:4                   | 57:5                       | interview (2)            |
| 62:11                        | given (3)                      | hate (1)               | implement (1)              | 57:10;58:10              |
| formula (1)                  | 30:18;48:24;59:5               | 57:21                  | 6:6                        | into (14)                |
| 35:15                        | gives (2)                      | heard (1)              | implemented (1)            | 6:1,4,10,23;8:16;        |
| forth (7)                    | 34:13,20                       | 35:7                   | 7:21                       | 10:15;39:2,6;41:8;       |
| 6:8;7:6;8:2,3;19:24;         | glad (1)                       | Hearing (7)            | implementing (1)           | 42:8,12;45:24;53:5;      |
| 27:4;49:1                    | 62:19                          | 4:21;7:4,5,9;8:21;     | 7:12                       | 60:13                    |
| forward (5)                  | GNP (1)                        | 46:8;64:14             | imposed (2)                | investigate (1)          |
| 8:22;48:10;49:11,21;         | 58:20                          | help (6)               | 34:2;40:20                 | 6:17                     |
| 50:1                         | goal (1)                       | 9:21;19:22;22:12;      | in-between (5)             | involved (2)             |
| found (2)                    | 53:9                           | 25:19;29:15;30:2       | 20:21;22:23;23:25;         | 56:7;60:19               |
| 33:21;36:5                   | <b>goes (3)</b>                | helpful (4)            | 42:21;44:19                | <b>Involving (1)</b>     |
| <b>four (1)</b>              | 8:7;46:14;59:1                 | 4:16;9:3;33:16;        | 42.21,44.19<br>include (9) | 51:20                    |
| 3:19                         |                                | 48:18                  | 4:17;6:20;12:6;            | issue (11)               |
| <b>frame (4)</b>             | <b>Good (2)</b><br>46:18;50:14 | 48:18<br>Here's (6)    |                            | 15:21;31:8,9;35:8,       |
|                              | ·                              |                        | 14:20;25:2;29:12;          | 11;36:19;49:8,18;        |
| 6:19;7:2,3;24:21             | govern (1)                     | 19:16,17;20:1,2;       | 33:25;56:10;58:5           |                          |
| frames (1)                   | 13:25                          | 30:5;57:23             | includes (1)               | 55:20;62:11,13           |
| 6:21                         | Governing (2)                  | Hey (1)                | 14:12                      | item (17)                |
| framework (1)                | 5:5;7:10                       | 29:8                   | including (1)              | 3:6,24,25;4:5;5:4;       |
| 5:19                         | government (4)                 | high (2)               | 20:8                       | 39:8;43:23;45:16;46:4;   |
| free (1)                     | 52:2;54:22;55:1;               | 39:7;44:23             | inconsistent (1)           | 48:7,20;51:12,13,25;     |
| 50:22                        | 58:2                           | higher (1)             | 4:18                       | 64:9,10,14               |
| freezing (1)                 | governments (1)                | 12:15                  | indicate (2)               | items (1)                |
| 64:22                        | 49:20                          | highest (2)            | 10:8;11:3                  | 64:13                    |
| FRIDAY (2)                   | grade (1)                      | 42:17,18               | indicated (1)              | IV (1)                   |
| 3:1,5                        | 17:17                          | highlighted (5)        | 21:7                       | 36:1                     |
| front (4)                    | grant (1)                      | 61:7,19,21,23;63:21    | indicating (1)             |                          |
| 41:14;42:5,14;51:19          | 55:22                          | history (4)            | 37:25                      | J                        |
| full (18)                    | greater (1)                    | 8:7;37:9;38:8;46:2     | individually (1)           |                          |
| 16:1,21;17:12,12;            | 8:10                           | hit (1)                | 63:16                      | JANUARY (2)              |
| ,,- <b>-,,</b> ,- <b>-</b> , |                                | . (=)                  |                            |                          |

3:1.5

joined (1)

50:6

judgment (5)

30:15;40:2;57:16

job (3)

|                        | January 27, 2017   |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| 17:21;19:5;20:16,19;   | 30:9;33:10,11,16;  |
| 21:19;22:5,9,14,15;    | 41:24;55:2,9;60:18 |
| 26:9;29:21,23,25;30:1, | maybe (5)          |
| 6;47:8                 | 13:21;20:11;28:16; |
| west (1)               | 57:23;64:22        |
| 42:16                  | mean (6)           |
|                        | 9:25;20:5;28:16;   |
| Μ                      | 29:15;30:14;57:18  |
|                        | means (3)          |
| agnitude (1)           | 4:14,15;55:11      |
| 39:4                   | meantime (1)       |
| ain (2)                | 14:9               |
| 15.11.60.9             | meat (1)           |

| Judgment (5)  | 55:14,   |
|---|--|
| 19:7;34:3,10,16;  | laws (1)   |
| 37:21   | 38:1   |
| jump (1)  | leads (1)  |
| 21:22   | 53:19  |
| jurisdiction (2)  | least (4)  |
| 33:22;56:4  | 15:22;   |
| jurisdictions (2)   | 59:7   |
| 59:17;60:19   | left (2)<br>58:17;   |
| Κ   | legal (1)  |
|   | 55:18  |
| Kathy (1)   | legally (1   |
| 27:21   | 57:18  |
| Kathy's (1)   | legend (1  |
| 32:4  | 61:5   |
| keep (5)  | Legislate<br>48:21   |
| 10:12;23:13;24:12;<br>59:4;60:4   | legislatio   |
| kind (9)  | 51:18  |
| 5:18;9:2;14:14;   | legislativ   |
| 19:22;20:14;27:1;   | 48:23  |
| 35:17;59:19;60:12   | legislatu  |
| knowledge (2)   | 8:14,2   |
| 45:10;59:15   | legitimat  |
| knows (2)   | 33:13  |
| 18:13;33:13   | legs (1)   |
| L   | 64:22<br>less (8)  |
| L   |  |
|   | 15.13.   |
| landed (2)  | 15:13;<br>25:13;   |
| landed (2)<br>27:5,18   | 15:13;<br>25:13;<br>17   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12   | 25:13;<br>17<br><b>letter (4)</b><br>4:17;6  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability  |
| 27:5,18<br><b>lands (1)</b><br>26:12<br><b>language (15)</b><br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4  |
| 27:5,18<br><b>lands (1)</b><br>26:12<br><b>language (15)</b><br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4<br>license (1  |
| 27:5,18<br><b>lands (1)</b><br>26:12<br><b>language (15)</b><br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;   |
| 27:5,18<br><b>lands (1)</b><br>26:12<br><b>language (15)</b><br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br><b>larger (1)</b>  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;<br>18,20;   |
| 27:5,18<br><b>lands (1)</b><br>26:12<br><b>language (15)</b><br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensurg   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11;<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (1<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4;  |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11;<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4;<br>18:3;2   |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9<br>lately (1)  | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,11<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4;<br>18:3;2<br>10,20;;                                 |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9<br>lately (1)<br>31:20                                   | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,17<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4;<br>18:3;2<br>10,20;<br>26:2,17                       |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9<br>lately (1)<br>31:20<br>later (4)                      | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,17<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4<br>18:3;2<br>10,20;<br>26:2,17<br>21,24              |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9<br>lately (1)<br>31:20<br>later (4)<br>10:12;28:2;35:15; | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,17<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4;<br>18:3;2<br>10,20;<br>26:2,17<br>21,24<br>limitatio |
| 27:5,18<br>lands (1)<br>26:12<br>language (15)<br>25:14;41:14;53:3,4;<br>56:9,10;60:24,24;61:3,<br>3,10,13,14,15,15<br>larger (1)<br>42:22<br>Las (2)<br>10:25;35:2<br>last (21)<br>9:17;11:20,22;12:1,<br>3,25;13:6,9,13,20;<br>14:11,13;30:24;32:9;<br>39:14;44:4;45:3;47:7;<br>48:7,15;49:14<br>latch (1)<br>33:12<br>late (3)<br>3:22;39:25;50:9<br>lately (1)<br>31:20<br>later (4)                      | 25:13;<br>17<br>letter (4)<br>4:17;6<br>liability (<br>55:4<br>license (1)<br>11:17;<br>18,20;<br>21:1,17<br>29:22;<br>licensed<br>49:17,<br>licenses (<br>12:22<br>licensure<br>11:19<br>likes (1)<br>59:23<br>limit (22<br>11:4,4<br>18:3;2<br>10,20;<br>26:2,17<br>21,24              |

| 50:18,22;51:10             | 18:1                       |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
|                            | limits (4)                 |
| law (14)                   |                            |
| 5:12;28:1;31:14;           | 19:10;21:7,7,13            |
| 36:7;37:22;41:7;47:21;     | line (1)                   |
| 48:8;52:8;53:2;54:7;       | 4:15                       |
| 55:14,24;60:4              | lines (6)                  |
| laws (1)                   | 55:16;56:14,20;60:8;       |
| 38:1                       | 62:21;64:5                 |
| leads (1)                  | liquidated (1)             |
| 53:19                      | 34:2                       |
| least (4)                  | list (24)                  |
| 15:22;16:4;23:6;           | 5:22;6:4;12:18;            |
| 59:7                       | 15:24,25;16:3,5;24:19;     |
| left (2)                   | 25:4;26:7;37:5;38:4,       |
| 58:17;59:16                | 18,21;39:12;40:1;43:3;     |
| legal (1)                  | 44:14;52:1;53:15,15,       |
| 55:18                      | 23;54:1;58:9               |
|                            |                            |
| legally (1)                | listed (10)                |
| 57:18                      | 12:12;14:18;15:4;          |
| legend (1)                 | 20:15;42:17;44:3;          |
| 61:5                       | 46:14;54:8,8,10            |
| Legislate (1)              | listing (3)                |
| 48:21                      | 16:20;43:2;53:14           |
| legislation (1)            | Lists (4)                  |
| 51:18                      | 12:13;16:1;26:16;          |
| legislative (1)            | 43:14                      |
| 48:23                      | litigation (1)             |
| legislature (3)            | 8:20                       |
|                            |                            |
| 8:14,23;53:10              | litigious (1)              |
| legitimate (1)             | 8:17                       |
| 33:13                      | little (7)                 |
| legs (1)                   | 4:11;24:25;31:4,5;         |
| 64:22                      | 46:2;50:4;61:5             |
| less (8)                   | local (9)                  |
| 15:13;20:23;21:2;          | 38:1;49:3,20;52:2;         |
| 25:13;32:12,22;44:3,       | 53:4;54:21;55:1;58:2;      |
| 17                         | 60:19                      |
| letter (4)                 | lodge (1)                  |
| 4:17;6:23;11:4;30:4        | 64:21                      |
| liability (1)              | long (5)                   |
| 55:4                       | 17:2,5;24:5;58:1,1         |
| license (16)               | look (16)                  |
| 11:17;12:12;15:13,         | 7:12;8:4;14:3;15:3;        |
| 18,20;18:1,9;20:23;        | 18:16;25:23;31:12;         |
| 21:1,13;24:4;26:15;        |                            |
|                            | 32:4;35:15;37:3;43:23;     |
| 29:22;44:17,21,24          | 44:3;48:10;57:25;          |
| licensed (2)               | 59:14;60:2                 |
| 49:17,17                   | looked (2)                 |
| licenses (1)               | 10:16;42:3                 |
| 12:22                      | looking (11)               |
| licensure (1)              | 12:24;13:5,9;14:10;        |
| 11:19                      | 25:10;31:13;32:5;36:7;     |
| likes (1)                  | 44:5;58:1;62:6             |
| 59:23                      | looks (2)                  |
| limit (22)                 | 14:14;34:22                |
| 11:4,4;15:7,8,13;          | lose (3)                   |
| 18:3;21:2;22:2,5,5,9,      | 36:17;39:18;40:7           |
| 10,20;23:23,24;25:20;      | lot (7)                    |
| 26:2,15;29:22;44:17,       | 8:8;9:21;29:25;31:7;       |
| 20.2,13,29.22,44.17, 21,24 | 50:17;53:13,18             |
| limitation (1)             | low (3)                    |
|                            |                            |
| 24:20<br>limited (1)       | 39:5;59:3,19<br>lower (16) |
|                            |                            |

| 7,7,13   | 21:19;22:5,9,14,15;<br>26:9;29:21,23,25;30:1,<br>6;47:8<br>lowest (1)<br>42:16                  |
|--|---|
| 14,20;60:8;<br>5   | M   |
| 1)   | magnitude (1)<br>39:4   |
| 2:18;<br>16:3,5;24:19;<br>;37:5;38:4,<br>12;40:1;43:3;<br>1;53:15,15,<br>8:9 | <b>main (2)</b><br>15:11;60:9<br><b>maintain (1)</b><br>30:23<br><b>maintenance (1)</b><br>31:4 |
| 18;15:4;<br>17;44:3;<br>8,8,10   | major (3)<br>36:18,18,19<br>majority (1)<br>62:16<br>makes (1)                                  |
| 2;53:14  | 56:10<br>making (1)   |
| 1;26:16;   | 53:18<br>management (1)   |
| )  | 60:20<br>manager (2)<br>47:24;51:20<br>managers (1)   |
| 5;31:4,5;<br>;61:5   | 59:8<br>mandate (1)<br>56:10<br>manner (1)  |
| ,20;52:2;<br>1;55:1;58:2;  | 10:11<br>manpower (2)<br>62:15,16<br>many (11)<br>30:25;31:1,2,23;                              |
| 5;58:1,1   | 32:5,10;41:1;47:19,19;<br>57:4,16<br>mark (1)   |
| 4:3;15:3;<br>23;31:12;<br>5;37:3;43:23;<br>0;57:25;                          | 3:22<br>marked (1)<br>50:8<br>marked-up (1)   |
| 2  | 63:15<br>market (1)<br>16:13<br>material (4)  |
| 5,9;14:10;<br>13;32:5;36:7;<br>;62:6   | 45:7,7,13,14<br>math (1)<br>21:6<br>matter (3)  |
| 22<br>18;40:7  | 34:23;35:18;44:23<br>matters (3)<br>7:7;32:19;36:19   |
| 29:25;31:7;<br>13,18   | maximum (4)<br>11:8;29:22;39:22;<br>40:3  |
| ,19  | <b>may (15)</b><br>3:22;6:8;13:8,25;<br>15:14;18:10;25:13;                                      |

**meat** (1) 7:16 mediation (1) 35:3 medium (1) 21:19 meeting (11) 3:5;4:6,7;10:25; 27:17:46:23:47:3: 48:12,18;51:7;65:6 meetings (2) 27:17;50:24 Member (47) 3:11,12,13,14,15,16, 17;4:2,9,10,20,23,25; 17:19,19;18:12;19:1; 20:3,10,13;21:3,16; 25:16,17,17;26:4;27:7, 11:28:9,13,13,18,19, 25;46:9,17;47:5,13,17; 48:3:49:16:50:5:63:6; 64:17,20;65:1,4 members (1) 49:15 mention (1) 50:5 mentioned (1) 13:5 mentioning (1) 56:13 met (2) 52:15,24 mid (1) 4:12 middle (11) 17:21;19:5;20:16,18; 22:13,14,17,18;44:1; 47:8;51:21 might (4) 9:3;35:14;47:4; 59:10 mile (1) 29:7 million (43) 18:8,9,10;20:22,24; 21:10,10,11;22:1,3,4,5, 6,9,9,10,21,22;23:2,3; 25:19,25,25;26:1,1,2,6, 6,7,8,10,10,16,17,19, 19,20;29:23,23;34:16,

17;44:22,22

January 27, 2017

|   | N                      | 27:2;36:4,7,8;40:20;<br>41:4,5,20;51:22;52:4;<br>54:7;57:4 | 56:11;57:6,6,22;65:3<br>ones (2)<br>10:13;55:1 | Р                       |
|---|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 9:15;10:12;23:14;<br>24:12<br>minimize (2) NA |                        | 41:4,5,20;51:22;52:4;                                      | ones (2)                                       | Р                       |
| 24:12<br>minimize (2) NA                      |                        |  |  | Р                       |
| minimize (2) NA                               |                        | 54:7:57:4  | 10.13.55.1                                     |                         |
| 1111  |                        |  |  |                         |
| 53:11.21                                      | AC (7)                 | number (11)  | only (15)                                      | package (1)             |
|   | 7:15;9:11;12:10;       | 19:18;27:16;32:15;   | 13:9;14:23,24,25;                              | 9:16                    |
| minutes (3)                                   | 27:2;42:3,5,6          | 48:16;51:14;53:11;   | 15:14;16:1;19:15;                              | packet (1)              |
| 4:6;21:25;47:12 nam                           | me (2)                 | 54:25;57:3;64:9,10,14                                      | 22:19;27:19,22;29:4,                           | 7:13                    |
| Miss (1)                                      | 12:19,23               | numbers (3)  | 19;34:25;35:8;58:17                            | page (18)               |
| 9:6 nat                                       | ming (1)               | 36:9;46:10;49:12   | onto (1)                                       | 4:11,11,12,15,16;       |
| missed (2)                                    | 60:18                  | NUNEZ (83)   | 33:12  | 7:13;9:12;10:3,15;      |
| 13:21;50:16 nec                               | cessarily (4)          | 3:8,10,13,16,18,21;  | open (3)                                       | 14:13;21:8;37:18;38:7;  |
|   | 27:1;32:18;41:24;      | 5:7,8;9:8,9,9;11:1;  | 59:9,10,14                                     | 51:21;60:24;61:1,20,    |
|   | 55:8                   | 13:3,8,14,19;14:8;16:8,                                    | opened (1)                                     | 20                      |
| • • (1)                                       | cessary (2)            | 17;17:3,7,9,22;18:15;                                      | 58:24  | pages (3)               |
| <i>EC</i> 1                                   | 34:6;48:13             | 19:6;20:4,11,20;21:4;                                      | opening (3)                                    | 9:11,17;14:12           |
|   | ed (15)                | 22:7,11,15,18;23:13;                                       | 54:4;58:21,22                                  | panel (1)               |
| 50 10 51 10 IIII                              | 8:23;10:3,5,8;11:20;   | 25:21;26:5,24;27:3,10,                                     | opinion (1)                                    | 62:17                   |
| • • • • • • • •                               | 36:4,7;41:8;50:21;     | 14;28:4,24;29:1;31:12;                                     | 41:23  | parameters (3)          |
|   | 51:2;53:4,17;62:6;     | 33:4,19;35:10,13,25;                                       | opposed (2)                                    | 21:14,18;27:12          |
| 110 (1)                                       |                        | 37:1,16;39:24;40:4,8,                                      | 5:3;63:10                                      |                         |
|   | 63:2;64:6              | 10;43:11;46:1,13,18;                                       | order (3)                                      | paraphrase (1)<br>24:24 |
| IIII  | eded (1)               | 47:11,16,18;48:5;50:4,                                     | 37:11:38:13.25                                 |                         |
| 1 < 10  | 60:11                  | 10,14,21;51:2,6,10;  | original (4)                                   | part (25)               |
| nce   | eds (4)                | 52:16,19,23;53:8;  | 27:20,23;28:1;61:14                            | 10:10;11:11,18;12:5;    |
|   | 6:15;8:14;31:4;36:9    | 54:20;56:12,19,24;   | originally (1)                                 | 14:5,19;23:9,11;24:21;  |
|   | EVADA (9)              |  | 10:16  | 30:15,15;33:18,19;      |
| 10 7 15 10 16 00                              | 3:1;11:17;40:13,16;    | 57:1,21;62:20;63:12,                                       |  | 36:1;37:2,8;38:5;       |
|   | 43:6;52:13;55:12;      | 22   | OSHA (3)                                       | 40:10,11,24;43:4,12;    |
|   | 62:10,17               | 0  | 40:18;41:10;43:6                               | 45:3,4;47:1             |
|   | w (1)                  | 0  | others (1)                                     | participated (1)        |
| 32:14,20;34:7;36:4;                           | 33:2                   | <b>a</b> ( <b>a</b> )                                      | 38:18  | 7:1                     |
| 37:12,14;38:10;42:22; nex                     | xt (15)                | <b>000-</b> (1)  | Otherwise (3)                                  | participating (1)       |
| 45:5  | 4:12;6:13;7:12;        | 65:8   | 20:17;30:23;35:24                              | 58:2                    |
| mortgage (1)                                  | 10:15;11:16;37:18;     | Obviously (6)  | Ours (1)                                       | particular (16)         |
| 31:20   | 38:7;40:10;43:11;47:3; | 11:10,14;39:4;50:22;                                       | 62:1   | 9:16;10:10;12:20;       |
| most $(2)$                                    | 48:12:51:7.12:52:22:   | 54:2;58:13   | out (25)                                       | 13:6,10,12;14:5;24:21;  |
| 32:21;54:1                                    | 63:23                  | occurs (1)   | 8:10,12;14:11;15:9;                            | 25:10;34:24;35:18;      |
| motion (10)                                   | ce (1)                 | 26:22  | 18:23;19:22;27:8;                              | 36:24;40:7;45:16;46:4;  |
|   | 62:2                   | October (1)  | 28:22;29:15;30:13;                             | 54:6                    |
|   | ne (1)                 | 4:7  | 31:1,16;34:18;36:5;                            | parts (3)               |
|   | 16:3                   | off (1)  | 41:4;43:21;53:22;                              | 9:25:14:5:28:6          |
|   | body (1)               | 13:8   | 54:16;55:12;56:14;                             | pass (7)                |
|   | 53:23                  | offense (2)  | 57:2;60:5;62:16;63:25;                         | 17:14,15;23:18;         |
| 17 1 10 10 10 05                              | nadversarial (1)       | 39:1,12  | 64:3   | 29:14,24;30:7;37:14     |
|   | 30:19                  | office (1)   | outcome (1)                                    |                         |
| 1 (1)   | 50.17                  | 59:8   | 24:14  | pass/fail (7)           |
| 1.00  | ne (4)                 | officer (1)  | over (17)                                      | 11:13,15,19;12:2;       |
|   | 7.2,22,07.17,10        | 12:11  | 5:9,11;7:25;9:12;                              | 45:4,13,15              |
|   | nresponsive (1)        | official (2)   | 10:14;11:11;19:21;                             | passed (4)              |
| 10 10 00 10 11 01                             | 55.20                  | 49:7,18  | 25:18;27:16;29:16;                             | 30:3;31:14;41:8;        |
|   | rth (3)                | <b>once (3)</b>  | 30:24;32:4,12;37:11;                           | 47:21                   |
| 1 (0)   | 1.1,52.10,17           | 8:23;9:2;28:20   | 41:2,2,5                                       | passing (1)             |
|   | tarize (1)             | one (54)   | 41:2,2,3<br>overhead (2)                       | 17:17                   |
|   | TJ.11                  |  |  | past (11)               |
|   | tation (1)             | 6:8;7:1;8:12,15;   | 58:13;59:12                                    | 8:7,15;9:10;37:2,2,     |
|   | 50:13                  | 9:25;10:10;11:11,16,                                       | oversee (2)                                    | 18;38:23;40:12;43:2,4;  |
|   | ted (2)                | 20;13:22;14:2;15:12;                                       | 58:23;59:6                                     | 49:17                   |
|   | 50:9,12                | 16:13;19:14;21:17;   | oversight (1)                                  | paste (1)               |
| must (6) not                                  | tice (1)               | 25:23,24,25;26:13,14;                                      | 49:19  | 6:22                    |
| 7:3;25:2;37:11;                               | 7:4                    | 27:17,21;34:7,21;35:9;                                     | Overview (1)                                   | Patrick (2)             |
| 40:21,22;52:2 not                             | tify (3)               | 36:22,23,24;38:19;   | 5:4  | 3:16;64:1               |
| 10.   | 6:18;55:12,21          | 39:14,17;40:11;42:9,                                       | own (2)  | pause (1)               |
| myself (1)                                    | 0.10.33.12.21          |  |  |                         |
| myself (1)                                    |                        | 25;45:2,23;47:5,20,23;                                     | 35:16;65:2                                     |                         |
| <b>myself (1)</b><br>50:22 <b>No</b>          | wember (1)<br>4:7      | 25;45:2,23;47:5,20,23;<br>51:19,21;52:4;53:6,7,            | 35:16;65:2<br>owner (1)                        | 35:23<br>paying (1)     |

#### penalties (1) 33:7 penalty (1) 45:8 pending (2) 8:21;33:2 per (8) 32:1,2,7;38:6;39:1, 11;44:10;45:1 percent (9) 32:23;52:12;53:15, 15,23;54:1,2,2,3 percentage (1) 20:15 perform (3) 30:16;41:25;57:24 performance (11) 8:7,15;37:2,3,9,19; 38:8;40:12;41:11;43:2, performed (2) 15:3:38:18 performing (1) 54:9 perhaps (1) 35:14 period (3) 9:13,19;22:14 perjury (1) 45:9 permits (2) 49:8.18 perpetrated (1) 42:9 person (5) 6:8;18:13;26:14; 42:8,13 personnel (19) 7:18;12:6,9,14,17; 14:4,15,18,19:17:10, 24;24:20;25:1,4;29:10; 37:24,25;44:8,25 Personnel' (1) 12:10 personnel's (2) 13:16;25:3 perspective (2) 31:25;56:21 pertain (1) 38:1 pertaining (1) 37:23 petition (1) 11:24 phone (1) 50:17 pick (3) 21:6,9,14 picked (1) 28:4picks (2) 21:8,11

63:20 pieces (1) 51:17 place (1) 3:4 playing (1) 59:22 please (2) 11:24;63:17 Plumbing (2) 49:3,20 plus (3) 17:12;39:6;44:22 PM (3) 3:1,6;65:7 point (18) 8:12;9:2;14:24;15:6, 10;16:21;17:14;18:4; 21:6;29:6,18,20;36:16; 44:1;50:7;58:17;59:15, 20 points (28) 12:4;17:13,15,16,17; 23:14;29:19,24;36:16, 17,23;37:10;38:6,20; 39:1,2,11,13,17,18,22; 40:7;41:1;42:18,20; 43:25:44:2,2 policy (3) 24:9:56:20:60:14 position (1) 60:16 possible (3) 4:5:5:4:64:11 potential (2) 44:9;46:23 potentially (2) 23:4.10practical (1) 57:18 practices (1) 58:3 preceding (6) 11:23;33:23;36:13; 38:3;40:18;43:17 preconstruction (1) 58:19 predecessor (1) 32:4 prefer (1) 55:1 preference (2) 52:7,10 prepare (1) 55:2 prequalifications (1) 28:1Present (4) 3:9,12,15,17 presented (5) 7:7;41:23;42:23; 47:2:51:17 pretty (5)

39:5,7,16:55:16; 59:14 prevailing (4) 24:6:29:8:37:4.5 prevent (1) 54:5 previous (1) 26:23 previously (1) 27:2 primarily (2) 53:1:57:16 prime (7) 11:9;24:20;25:1,1,7; 54:9;58:25 principal (20) 7:18;12:5,9,10,14, 17;13:16;14:4,18; 17:10,24;24:20;25:1,3, 4;29:10;37:24,25;44:7, 25 printing (2) 49:9,10 prior (11) 18:20;19:3;33:15,20; 36:1;38:9;45:15;47:10; 48:17,25;49:14 private (4) 25:5;43:14;49:8,18 probably (7) 9:14,21,23,24;54:25; 62:6:63:23 problem (1) 31:3 problematic (2) 57:7,15 problems (1) 55:10 procedure (2) 5:10;6:25 proceedings (1) 37:21 process (27) 6:11,14;7:23,24;8:2, 9,25;30:19;31:17;32:2; 42:14;46:22;47:2;53:6; 56:6;57:6,9;58:6,19, 20;59:1,4,6,6,10,11,24 professional (3) 12:8;49:6,24 profit (3) 58:14;59:12,21 program (1) 57:19 project (24) 11:14;12:20,22,23; 14:21;15:25;16:20; 22:3;23:2,22;26:12; 38:17,24;43:18,20,24; 44:3,11:45:2:46:11,14, 16;52:12;59:8 projects (46) 9:13;10:24;12:13,18,

22,24;13:5,15,20; 14:18:15:4.24:16:4: 17:11,25;18:5;19:14, 19.20:22:21:23:5.9.16. 17:24:3,10,19:25:6; 26:7,17;29:11,11;30:6; 38:8,9,18,23;39:3; 43:12,14,23,25;44:6,9; 45:1;54:14 proof (1) 7:5 properly (1) 10:20 proposal (5) 51:25;52:13;57:10; 58:10;61:5 proposals (3) 27:4;58:8;61:8 proposed (11) 48:25;51:17,22,23; 52:4,5,25;53:2;57:6; 61:2.6 proposes (2) 57:8,11 proposing (1) 57:3 prorate (5) 15:23;16:23;22:22; 23:1;44:20 prorated (5) 15:8:18:8:23:25; 26:11.21 prorating (2) 23:7.10 proration (1) 25:19 protests (3) 53:12.13.19 provide (10) 8:9:10:3:11:16:34:5; 36:13:46:23:47:4: 52:10;58:15;63:14 provided (2) 45:9;58:8 provides (1) 31:18 providing (1) 54:21 Public (50) 3:5,25;4:1,4,6;5:5,6; 6:2,11,14;7:20,24; 10:19.23:18:17.21.21: 19:9;25:5;29:3;30:16; 43:14;49:19;51:16,25; 52:2,5,14,15;53:3,5; 54:15,23;55:9;56:4,5, 13,13;57:5,13,17,22; 60:1,4,13,18;62:9; 64:15,15,20 pull(1)14:11 punch (2) 39:12;40:1

#### January 27, 2017

purposes (1)
 25:24
pursuant (3)
 11:17;36:3;40:20
put (9)
 22:21;47:22;49:1;
 54:12;56:14;59:25;
 60:7;61:5;62:18
puts (1)
 7:16

## Q

qualification (8) 5:10;7:22,23;8:24; 16:15;24:22;30:12; 32:18 **Qualifications (12)** 5:5;6:2;9:13,18; 12:8;24:25;25:3;32:11; 43:19;49:2,13,15 qualified (7) 6:10;12:11,19;15:14; 22:2;23:9;24:5 qualify (4) 12:16;19:25;23:3; 30:16 quick (2) 41:2;50:5 quite (2) 20:11:57:19 quorum (1) 3:19 quote (2) 32:3;55:8

# R

range (17) 17:21,21,21;20:9,16, 18,19,19,22;21:1; 22:14;24:11;29:12; 32:1:43:25:44:1.12 ranges (2) 17:21;19:5 ranking (1) 57:23 rather (4) 4:13;30:1;45:2;55:6 reached (1) 57:2 read (2) 43:1;62:4 reading (1) 36:6 ready (1) 10:2 real (2) 41:2;50:5 really (4) 10:20;46:21;47:13; 62:1 reason (2)

picture (1)

| 19:13;31:14            | release (1)          |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| reasons (1)            | 29:3                 |
| 57:16                  | relevant (6)         |
| recall (9)             | 7:13;12:8,20;22:13;  |
|                        | 25:4;40:22           |
| 8:14;32:20;34:24;      |                      |
| 35:10;41:16;45:22;     | remaining (4)        |
| 48:24;50:6;52:8        | 38:14,17;39:9,15     |
| recalling (1)          | remember (1)         |
| 32:17                  | 32:6                 |
| receive (1)            | remotely (1)         |
| 52:9                   | 31:21                |
| received (1)           | removing (1)         |
| 54:25                  | 49:19                |
| recently (1)           | Reno (1)             |
| 40:11                  | 62:8                 |
| recollection (1)       | report (2)           |
| 46:6                   | 43:5;48:25           |
| recommend (1)          | reporter (1)         |
| 57:22                  | 50:12                |
| recommendations (4)    | request (4)          |
| 46:23,24;47:4;48:11    | 29:25;30:6;57:9;     |
| record (23)            | 58:14                |
| 4:10;5:14;9:10;        | requested (3)        |
| 13:23;16:9;23:1;24:7,  | 18:22;26:2;56:16     |
| 18;30:9,22;35:21;      | requests (1)         |
| 36:21;39:21;45:22;     | 48:25                |
|                        |                      |
| 46:20;48:23;50:11,13;  | require (5)          |
| 51:15;56:3;61:25;      | 8:5,6;53:2;58:18;    |
| 63:14;65:5             | 60:3                 |
| red (1)                | required (7)         |
| 54:12                  | 6:17;8:9;52:9;53:14; |
| reductions (1)         | 55:23;58:5,8         |
| 25:12                  | requirement (2)      |
| reference (2)          | 43:1;49:24           |
| 63:17,18               | requirements (2)     |
| referring (1)          | 38:14;39:10          |
| 43:3                   | requires (3)         |
| reflected (2)          | 6:5;7:8;31:14        |
| 14:1;41:19             | requiring (3)        |
| reg (8)                | 54:21;55:22;60:25    |
| 8:21;13:24,25;24:18;   | reside (1)           |
| 25:15;33:2;41:12;56:6  | 52:12                |
| regarding (3)          | respect (5)          |
| 36:19;47:7;49:1        | 10:23;28:6;34:8;     |
| regs (3)               | 55:3;60:20           |
| 5:16;8:2;30:18         | respond (1)          |
| regulation (3)         | 7:3                  |
| 8:13;24:24;41:13       | response (1)         |
| <b>Regulations (7)</b> | 53:2                 |
| 5:6,12,24;6:6;7:11,    | responsibility (1)   |
| 13;42:4                | 49:4                 |
| rejected (1)           | responsible (1)      |
| 53:20                  | 49:22                |
| rejection (1)          | restate (1)          |
| 48:16                  | 63:1                 |
| rejections (2)         | restated (1)         |
| 31:1,2                 | 63:3                 |
| related (4)            | result (3)           |
| 41:11,24;64:9,12       | 42:19,20;53:12       |
| relates (1)            | review (2)           |
| 41:22                  | 11:6;49:2            |
| relating (2)           | reviewing (1)        |
| 34:4;37:22             | 10:20                |
| 57.7,57.22             | 10.20                |

| revise (1)<br>33:3   |  |
|--|--|
| revises (1)  |  |
| 49:12<br>revisions (4)   | SCI  |
| 49:3,20,23;57:3<br>right (14)  | Se   |
| 6:23;17:15;19:17;<br>25:14,18,20;28:3;32:8;  | sec  |
| 43:9;50:18,18;52:23;<br>60:5;61:16   |  |
| rights (2)   | sec  |
| 6:21,22<br><b>Risk (2)</b>   |  |
| 51:20;60:21<br>role (1)  | sec  |
| 30:17  | Se   |
| roll (2)<br>3:6;51:7   | see  |
| <b>room (1)</b><br>64:22   | see  |
| <b>root (1)</b><br>28:17   | sel  |
| rules (1)<br>44:25   | sel  |
| run (1)  | SCI  |
| 35:22<br>runs (1)  | sel  |
| 41:19  | sei  |
| S  | sei  |
|  | 301  |
| same (10)  |  |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;  | sei  |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;   | sei<br>sei   |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1   |  |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6   | sei  |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17  | sei<br>sei   |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24   | sei<br>sei   |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)  | sei<br>sei<br>sei                                    |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)   | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses                             |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;  | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei                             |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,  | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses                             |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3   | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses<br>ses                      |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3<br>scored (1)   | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses<br>ses                      |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3<br>scored (1)<br>10:11<br>scores (1)  | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses<br>ses                      |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3<br>scored (1)<br>10:11<br>scores (1)<br>39:5<br>Scoring (33)  | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>ses<br>ses<br>set               |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3<br>scored (1)<br>10:11<br>scores (1)<br>39:5<br>Scoring (33)<br>5:7,10;8:24;9:17;<br>11:12;15:2,3;16:6; | sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei<br>sei |
| 9:22;17:24;21:4;<br>23:20;39:8;44:7,24;<br>52:3;54:15;56:19<br>saw (2)<br>10:17;35:1<br>saying (2)<br>15:22;45:6<br>SB (1)<br>49:17<br>schedule (1)<br>50:24<br>scope (1)<br>12:23<br>score (22)<br>9:23;14:10;17:17,23;<br>18:24;19:11;20:24,25;<br>21:13;24:13;28:22;<br>29:6;30:3;34:8;35:5,<br>18;38:22;42:18;43:22;<br>44:6,10;45:3<br>scored (1)<br>10:11<br>scores (1)<br>39:5<br>Scoring (33)<br>5:7,10;8:24;9:17;                       | sei<br>sei<br>ses<br>set<br>set<br>set               |

5;34:9;36:22;37:8; 39:6;40:25;41:13; 45:12;47:6,22;58:9,10 rubbing (1) 59:1 ean (3) 3:10,22;10:25 cond (10) 3:24;4:24,25;13:2; 39:8:51:21:56:11.22; 63:5,6 ction (7) 28:25;36:4;40:7; 41:18;43:4,12;44:5 ctions (2) 10:1;36:5 eeing (1) 64:18 eking (2) 7:22;12:16 eks (1) 43:19 ldom (1) 15:19 lection (7) 57:10,12,14;58:6,6; 59:11;62:17 lf-score (1) 28:15 nd (4) 30:3;47:14;63:16,24 nding (1) 62:16 nior (1) 42:10 nse (1) 27:1 nt (1) 60:7 rvice (1) 49:24 rvices (2) 49:6;58:19 ssion (1) 49:14 ssions (2) 7:20;27:25 et (7) 5:23;7:4;8:1,3; 20:24;21:19;36:22 ts (2) 6:8:7:6 veral (4) 6:11;7:20;27:25; 32:4 all (2) 12:6;33:25 ape (1) 62:14 are (1) 30:14 neet (4) 30:14;41:13;42:18;

44:4 shopping (1) 54:6 short (1) 58:9 show (1) 64:15 side (2) 9:20,20 sign (1) 45:11 signing (1) 31:21 simplify (1) 53:17 simply (1) 42:17 single (9) 11:4;15:8;16:10; 18:1,2;22:3,20;23:2; 26:15 sit (2) 57:12,13 sitting (2) 9:20;50:18 situation (3) 19:17;25:20;45:14 Skip (4) 52:20;56:24;57:2; 59:23 small (1) 31:8 smaller (1) 15:17 Somebody's (1) 50:15 someone (6) 6:9;14:21;15:19; 19:12;28:14;42:10 sometimes (2) 54:22;55:21 sorry (11) 4:11;27:9,11,14; 30:3;49:6;51:11;52:24; 61:1,16;65:5 sounds (1) 19:2 south (1) 4:1 specific (2) 54:11;60:18 specifically (5) 6:8;7:8;29:2;41:21; 45:23 specifics (1) 42:6 specified (1) 38:12 spelled (1) 8:10 sponsored (1) 53:10 spots (1)

January 27, 2017

| i ubile works Division vi                              | uu       |
|--|----------|
| 4:10<br><b>spreadsheet (2)</b><br>14:14;44:5           | st       |
| stab (1)<br>21:22                                      |          |
| staff (6)<br>6:17;20:6,6;35:17;<br>28 25 60 12         |          |
| 38:25;60:13<br>staffing (1)<br>10:19                   | st<br>st |
| staff's (1)<br>30:15                                   | st       |
| Stan (1)<br>24:18                                      | st       |
| <b>standard (2)</b><br>52:1,6                          | st       |
| standardized (1)<br>62:12                              | st       |
| standpoint (1)<br>57:18                                | st       |
| <b>start (1)</b><br>17:15                              | st       |
| <b>started (4)</b><br>28:1;35:4;36:6;                  | st       |
| 45:22<br>State (21)                                    | st       |
| 3:5;5:4,6;7:20;<br>11:17;27:24;38:1;                   | st       |
| 40:14,14,15,17,23;<br>41:10;43:6;51:25;                |          |
| 52:16;55:12,23;62:8,9,<br>17                           | st       |
| stated (3)<br>47:9;51:24;57:19                         | SU       |
| statement (4)<br>8:5;10:20;11:2;47:7<br>statements (1) |          |
| 10:18<br>States (3)                                    | SU       |
| 11:22;20:15;33:20<br>statewide (1)                     | SU       |
| 62:13<br>statute (13)                                  | st<br>st |
| 5:25;6:5,7,13,23;7:6,<br>7,21;9:4;30:18;41:12,         | st       |
| 17;45:25<br>Statutes (10)                              | st       |
| 5:6,16,24;7:9,10,12,<br>14,17;9:11;57:4                |          |
| <b>steps (1)</b><br>6:11                               | st       |
| <b>Stewart (66)</b><br>3:11;5:11,13,14,15,             | st       |
| 21;9:6;10:25;13:18,23,<br>24;24:16,17,18;27:9;         | st       |
| 28:3;30:9,10;32:16,24;<br>33:5;34:25;35:12;            | st       |
| 36:21,22;37:15;41:7;<br>43:9;45:21,21;48:21,           | st       |
| 22,23;50:3,5,11,13;<br>51:3,14,15,16;52:18,            | st       |
| 21,24;54:19;56:2,3,17,<br>22,25;57:2;61:1,4,11,        | st       |
|  |          |

16,19,24,25;62:1,3,5, 23.25:63:13.13:64:24 till (13) 8:14;16:14,15;17:1, 14:23:18:24:5:38:7: 46:10;47:5;60:12;64:5, 6 tipulate (1) 46:11 top (1) 18:5 traightforward (3) 6:4:7:2:29:5 treamlined (2) 7:23.25 tricken (1) 61:7 tuff (1) 36:11 ubcontractor (1) 52:1 ubcontractors (1) 52:12 ubject (1) 8:20 ublistings (1) 53:14 ubmit (6) 18:17;19:19,20; 36:15:43:19:52:10 ubmits (1) 6:16 ubmitted (9) 12:7;19:11,13,15; 31:16;35:2,6;45:18; 58:21 ubmitting (2) 8:2;19:14 ubsequent (2) 14:5;46:23 ubstantial (2) 38:15;39:11 ubstantially (1) 38:11 ubstitute (1) 29:13 uccessful (11) 13:20;14:16;17:11, 25;23:16;29:11;43:12, 23;44:6;45:1;58:7 uccessfully (3) 12:13:25:8:43:16 ufficient (1) 58:11 uggest (2) 29:20;35:21 uggested (3) 38:25;55:16;56:14 uggestion (1) 56:8 ummary (1) 5:23 upport (1)

41:22 suppose (1) 18:21 sure (20) 6:12;14:6;16:8; 23:20;24:3;25:21; 28:24;31:19;32:7;41:7; 45:17:47:11.12.25; 50:23;51:8;53:8;55:2; 56:12:59:2 surety (3) 8:6:11:5.6 surprised (1) 32:13 surrounding (1) 34:1 Susan (19) 5:11,15;13:23;14:8, 10;27:22;30:10;36:21; 41:2,5;45:21;48:23; 51:16;55:2,18;56:3; 60:22;61:25;63:13 suspect (1) 63:18 system (12) 9:17;11:12;18:19; 20:1,8;27:16;32:13; 34:9;37:8;40:25;45:12; 47:22 Т tab (3) 9:16,17;13:12 table (1) 63:4 tackled (1) 47:23 talk (4) 26:13;53:6;56:11,18 talked (1) 44:7 talking (2) 32:22;35:6 talks (2) 42:6,7 tasks (1) 47:23 technically (2) 17:10:29:1 telling (1) 53:11 tells (2) 5:25;6:13 ten (8) 15:25;16:23;17:12; 19:14;25:5;32:9,16; 43:14 term (1) 4:12 terms (1) 14:4testify (2)

64:2,7 therefore (1) 11:8 thereof (1) 43:15 thermostat (1) 64:21 thinking (1) 25:9 though (4) 14:24;18:9;19:2,2 thoughts (1) 60:18 thousand (2) 7:22,25 three (2) 21:10;59:8 threshold (2) 26:9:29:17 thrilled (1) 51:3 Tiberti (1) 3:13 times (8) 29:25;34:11,12,12, 13, 19, 19, 21 title (1) 12:19 Tito (2) 3:13,22 today (3) 36:5:46:20:49:10 today's (1) 64:12 together (4) 9:22;30:4;47:22; 60:7 told (4) 46:5;60:11,14,17 took (2) 27:17;42:16 top (1) 20:8 total (3) 15:4;34:13;44:9 totally (1) 21:16 track (1) 59:4 trades (1) 59:3 tried (1) 59:25 truth (1) 46:5 truthful (1) 29:6 truthfulness (1) 45:24 try (4) 28:21;30:7;35:4; 53:11 trying (10)

13:7:27:7.12:29:16; 30:2:46:21:53:9:54:23: 59:24;60:1 turn (1) 41:2 tweaks (1) 49:14 twice (1) 4:15 two (8) 4:14;9:13;11:25; 15:22:25:21:37:10; 54:3:59:7 two-year (1) 9:19 type (2) 34:6;59:24 Typically (5) 13:9;15:17;29:4; 56:5;59:7 typo (1) 33:1

## U

unclear (1) 43:7 under (28) 5:22;7:21;9:11; 11:12,21;12:5,14; 14:19;23:15,16;34:5; 36:1:37:2.8.8.9:38:7. 22;39:8;40:12,12,24; 43:23;44:7;45:8;46:10; 54:8.9 underlined (4) 61:6,10,12,13 understood (1) 47:8 Uniform (2) 49:3.20 United (1) 11:22 unless (6) 9:1,4;18:22;29:1; 35:13;50:1 unlimited (3) 18:9;25:18;26:14 UNLV (2) 49:5,23 **UNR (2)** 49:5.22 up (27) 4:4;8:25;15:1,14; 17:6;19:3,16;20:17; 21:25;24:12;28:4;31:9, 18,23;32:5;35:17; 36:17,22;40:7;47:1; 54:13:55:19:63:19: 64:3,5,15,18 Update (2) 48:21,24 upfront (1)

| 59.12                   | 10,42,1,22            | (2)                    | 1041 (1)             |                        |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 58:12                   | 19;42:1,22            | working (2)            | 10th (1)             |                        |
| upon (2)                | violations (5)        | 55:18;56:9             | 4:7                  | 3                      |
| 12:19;42:21             | 24:6;37:4,12;41:21;   | Works (36)             | 11 (1)               |                        |
| upper (14)              | 42:10                 | 3:5;4:6;5:5,6;6:2,11,  | 12:2                 | 3 (7)                  |
| 17:21;19:4;20:16,18,    |                       | 14;7:20,24;10:19,24;   | 12 (1)               | 4:5;46:11,15;53:15,    |
| 22;21:18;22:5,9,14,16;  | W                     | 19:9;25:5;30:17;35:24; | 32:20                | 22;54:1;61:20          |
| 25:20;26:2;43:25;47:8   |                       | 43:14;49:19;51:16;     | 120 (5)              | <b>3:45</b> (1)        |
| use (25)                | wage (7)              | 52:1,5,14;53:3,5;      | 17:6,15,16,17;29:19  |                        |
| 15:17;17:20;20:6,7;     | 24:6;29:9;37:3,4,5,9, | 54:23;55:9;56:4,5,13,  | <b>120-point</b> (1) | 65:7                   |
| 21:1,13;26:2;31:19;     | 13                    | 13;57:13,17;60:1,4,13, | 29:17                | 30 (6)                 |
|                         | -                     |                        |                      | 17:13;18:6;36:17;      |
| 44:8,25;52:6,15;53:3,   | waiting (1)           | 19;62:9                | 13 (1)               | 39:6,18,25             |
| 4;54:10,14,17;55:5,7,8, | 13:4                  | Works' (2)             | 12:3                 | 300 (2)                |
| 19;57:23;59:25;60:12;   | walk (1)              | 54:15;57:5             | 138.45 (1)           | 31:12;32:6             |
| 62:11                   | 9:2                   | wrap (1)               | 36:10                | 305 (1)                |
| used (6)                | wants (3)             | 47:1                   | 138.7 (1)            | 41:20                  |
| 47:10;52:2;53:24,24;    | 21:8,12;57:8          | writing (4)            | 36:9                 | 338 (1)                |
| 54:13;60:6              | warnings (1)          | 6:19;18:13;47:10,14    | 138.95 (1)           | 57:4                   |
| uses (1)                | 42:9                  | written (1)            | 36:10                |                        |
| 53:3                    | way (18)              | 27:1                   | 15 (3)               | 338.0117 (1)           |
| using (12)              | 15:3,12;21:23;29:4,   | wrong (2)              | 37:11,12,13          | 51:23                  |
| 11:5;21:21;31:22;       |                       | 27:21;32:25            |                      | 338.1375 (2)           |
|                         | 10,15,16,21;30:13;    | 27:21;52:25            | 150 (1)              | 5:24;6:13              |
| 40:25;48:3,6;53:23,25;  | 38:22;43:7;44:7;55:7, | <b>X</b> 7             | 17:16                | 338.1381 (1)           |
| 54:1;55:22;57:9;59:20   | 13;59:2,23;62:14,22   | Y                      | <b>1B</b> (1)        | 6:24                   |
| usually (2)             | ways (3)              |                        | 11:18                | 338.141 (2)            |
| 21:7;59:7               | 36:22;53:16;58:1      | year (5)               | <b>1-point</b> (2)   | 51:22;52:5             |
|                         | website (1)           | 4:15;12:23;31:13,24;   | 16:2,4               | 338.150 (1)            |
| $\mathbf{V}$            | 49:10                 | 32:7                   | 1st (1)              | 7:15                   |
|                         | welcome (1)           | years (26)             | 4:7                  |                        |
| V5 (1)                  | 5:17                  | 4:14;9:14;11:22;       | 1.7                  | 338.1693 (1)           |
| 37:2                    | weren't (1)           | 12:2,3,20,21,25;13:6,  | 2                    | 60:23                  |
|                         |                       |                        | 2                    | 338.220 (2)            |
| V-A (1)                 | 33:14                 | 10,13,20;30:25;32:5,9, |                      | 12:10;14:3             |
| 37:8                    | what's (3)            | 9;33:23;36:12;38:2,9,  | 2 (6)                | 338.240 (1)            |
| vacuum (1)              | 25:17;47:2;63:15      | 23;40:18;43:16;47:19;  | 3:25;38:6;44:2,2;    | 8:22                   |
| 27:6                    | whichever (3)         | 48:15;52:8             | 46:11,15             | 338.290 (1)            |
| valuation (1)           | 20:23;21:2;44:17      |                        | 2:00 (2)             | 7:15                   |
| 11:12                   | whole (5)             | Z                      | 3:1,6                | 341 (2)                |
| varies (1)              | 21:19;32:12;46:21;    |                        | 20 (8)               |                        |
| 32:7                    | 55:12;59:6            | zero (2)               | 17:12;23:15;34:12,   | 57:25;58:1             |
| various (1)             | withdraw (1)          | 16:22;43:24            | 19;36:16;39:17,23;   |                        |
|                         | 65:4                  | 10.22,43.24            |                      | 4                      |
| 27:4                    |                       | 0                      | 40:3                 |                        |
| <b>VB</b> (1)           | withdrew (1)          | 0                      | 2001 (1)             | 4 (1)                  |
| 38:5                    | 35:7                  |                        | 47:25                | 5:4                    |
| VC (1)                  | within (17)           | 05 (1)                 | 2002 (1)             | 40 (1)                 |
| 38:22                   | 6:18,19;7:2,3;12:15,  | 34:18                  | 47:25                | 40:7                   |
| Vegas (2)               | 24;13:20;21:17,20;    | 08 (1)                 | 2008 (1)             | 41 (1)                 |
| 10:25;35:2              | 24:11;25:6;30:17;     | 32:17                  | 30:20                | 49:12                  |
| VI (5)                  | 38:15,24;39:10,12;    |                        | 2016 (2)             |                        |
| 40:11,12,24;43:4;       | 43:18                 | 1                      | 4:7,8                | 44 (1)                 |
| 51:14                   | without (1)           | 1                      | 2017 (2)             | 49:17                  |
|                         |                       | 1 (12)                 |                      | 45 (3)                 |
| via (1)                 | 35:6                  | 1 (12)                 | 3:1,6                | 4:15,16;6:18           |
| 57:6                    | wondering (1)         | 15:6;32:22;34:19;      | 20-point (2)         |                        |
| Vice-Chair (4)          | 14:4                  | 39:1;41:3;44:1;46:15;  | 42:19;44:9           | 5                      |
| 3:10;62:1,5,25          | word (1)              | 53:15;54:2,3,9;61:20   | 2-3 (1)              |                        |
| view (1)                | 55:7                  | 10 (22)                | 39:5                 | 5 (21)                 |
| 5:16                    | wording (3)           | 12:3,13;16:2,15;       | 27 (2)               | 4:16;11:22;12:3;       |
| VII (2)                 | 46:12;55:7,19         | 17:11,12;23:14;24:19;  | 3:1;4:11             | 15:12;16:18;17:11;     |
| 43:12;46:10             | words (2)             | 32:20;34:11,13,19,19,  | 27th (1)             |                        |
| VIII (1)                | 37:4;60:4             | 20,21,21;39:1,11,13;   | 3:6                  | 18:6,6;33:23;36:12;    |
|                         |                       |                        |                      | 38:2,9;40:18;43:16;    |
| 45:4                    | work (14)             | 41:4;44:3,9            | 28(2)                | 44:1;48:20;53:15;54:2, |
| violated (1)            | 12:21;19:10;35:4;     | 10,000-foot (1)        | 4:11,11              | 2,8;61:1               |
| 38:1                    | 38:2,17;39:15,15;     | 5:16                   | 2-point (6)          | 50 (2)                 |
| violation (9)           | 41:11,25;47:20;54:9;  | <b>10-point</b> (1)    | 42:20;44:10,10,13,   | 42:16;52:12            |
| 37:5,7,10,22;38:4,6,    | 58:18;59:10,13        | 34:21                  | 15;45:1              | 5C (1)                 |
|                         |                       |                        |                      | - ~ (+)                |

|                                      |   | - |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 39:23                                |   |   |
| 6                                    | _ |   |
| <b>6 (1)</b><br>64:9                 |   |   |
| 624 (2)                              |   |   |
| 41:4,17<br>624.301 (2)               |   |   |
| 40:20;41:20<br><b>624.30175 (2)</b>  |   |   |
| 40:21;41:21<br><b>624.305 (1)</b>    |   |   |
| 40:20<br><b>624.7251 (1)</b>         |   |   |
| 42:6<br><b>625 (1</b> )              |   |   |
| 11:18                                | - |   |
| 7                                    | - |   |
| <b>7 (3)</b><br>12:1;43:23;64:10     |   |   |
| 8                                    |   |   |
| 8 (1)                                |   |   |
| 64:15                                | _ |   |
| 9                                    | _ |   |
| <b>90 (4)</b><br>28:15:20:10 12:40:1 |   |   |
| 38:15;39:10,13;40:1                  |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |
|                                      |   |   |