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CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: This is the time and the place for the State Public Works Board meeting for December 18th, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. Agenda Item Number 1, roll call.

MS. PASCIAK: Chairman Bryce Clutts.

CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Here.

MS. PASCIAK: Vice Chair Sean Stewart.

Member Clint Bentley.

MEMBER BENTLEY: Present.

MS. PASCIAK: Member Adam Hand.

MEMBER HAND: Present.

MS. PASCIAK: Member Tito Tiberti. Member Kevin Lewis. Member Patrick Cates.

MS. STEWART: Four?

CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Three.

MS. STEWART: There's so many people in the room.

How can we not have a quorum? Okay. Well, we're going to have to wait a minute.

(Pause in the proceedings)

MS. PASCIAK: We'll go back to Member Patrick Cates.

MEMBER CATES: Present, now.

MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
Kathy Pasciak does the initial review and
scoring, which is then finalized and approved by a
qualification committee. That includes two project managers
and then also the deputy administrator. All of them sign off
on that.

If it appears from the initial scoring that a
contractor may not pass, Kathy brings that to myself and
Administrator Patrick and we review it just to make sure that
the scoring is being done accurately. And then the scoring
is finalized. The administrator signs all the qualification
letters and/or the denial of qualification letters. And, as
you know, staff has no discretion in how they score those
applications.

Now, if the contractor wants to appeal, they
simply -- they have ten days and they send a letter to the
administrator. It's just that simple. And then I coordinate
with them. We schedule a meeting with the board. As you
know, from prior appeal hearings, the board in our reg's is
specifically given discretion. They're not bound by the
technical scoring that staff implements.

And I will say that there are occasions that
because of the nature of the scoring and otherwise what we
would consider a presumable qualified contractor may be
disqualified. And we've see[n] that with examples where

Lewis is now present.

I wanted -- Before I gave you the most updated
information, I wanted to just go back and just do a little
bit of background on the prior reports. There's a board
report. This should be January 27th, 2017. And that is
Exhibit A in your board packet. And when we presented it on
January 27, we did an overview of the statutes and
regulations. We went over the qualification application and
also the scoring.

We did a follow-up report at a board meeting July
25, 2017. Those -- That packet information is included as
Exhibit B. And during that report, we provided a copy of the
January 29, 2002, board meeting minutes that showed the
board's approval at that time of the scoring process.

We also included a contractor qualification
report that showed the number of applications that we
received, the number of appeals, and then the result of those
appeals. And that is at the end of Exhibit B. And that's
the contractor qualification report, 2006 to 2017.

So Public Works Division we follow NRS 338 and
the NAC 338 in implementing the contractor qualification
process. We only consider the criteria that's allowed by
statute and then we assign a score that's been previously
approved by the board.
1. That. Thank you.
2. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.
3. Is there any questions or comments from the board?
4. MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record. I would like to ask Sean Stewart, our evil vice chairman and head of the contract association, is there any heart pain or anything about the contract in the industry with what Susan presented in your opinion being representing all of these different contractors?
5. MEMBER STEWART: Tito is doing this because I lost my voice and so he wants to hear me talk, I guess. No, I don't think so. I think it's a stringent standard, but I also think that as I go around in the industry, the State Contractors Board requirements are -- or the State Public Works Board requirements are what everybody tries to get to. So I think we've struck a balance. I think it's what she said is exactly right. When they come and present to the board, if it's a reasonable cause, we've always reversed those.
7. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Member Hand.
8. MEMBER HAND: Member Hand for the record.

1. I think at the last meeting when Granite -- we had the hearing with Granite, the question I posed a question that Granite would be back in two years. And if nothing has changed then it's likely they'll be back in two years. Is that correct, Susan?
2. MS. STEWART: That's my understanding. Although some of them it's five years. So some of the OSHA violations may fall off. And if that's the case, they may score differently so that they wouldn't have to come back.
3. MEMBER HAND: I think that's why I asked the question about -- at the last meeting about reviewing is, you know, if we had -- if we had heard from a company and, you know, was clearly qualified, we're going to have to keep hearing from them every few years. And I guess if that's a one off that that happens then we probably don't need to make a change. That was really why I asked the question before, to bring everybody's memories back up to speed.
4. MS. STEWART: Well, it never hurts to go over it.
5. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. Are there any other questions or any action that we're requiring of staff? Hearing none, we'll move on to the next agenda item.
6. Agenda Item Number 6, legislative update.
7. Ms. Stewart.
8. MR. PATRICK: Number 5.
Like I say, I know they're very interested. I would be surprised if there wasn't something in there for that. I just don't know what it's going to look like. And if I did know, I couldn't tell you in a public meeting anyway. But I'm hopeful we'll see something come out the other end in January.

Chairman Clutts: Thank you, Director Cates.

Any further comments or questions regarding deferred maintenance?

Member Tiberti: Tito Tiberti for the record. My instructor, he's a little bit bigger than me, so he tries to cower me in the parking lot. Vice Chairman, he said we really have to -- And I happen to agree with him on this. We really have to push this thing forward because I think at that August meeting, and we've heard these numbers before, when you start hearing a billion, a billion-two, a billion-five, all of these nice new buildings we built over the last 15, 20 years, I think for our watch we really have to step up. And I know it's going to be a contentious legislature and there's never any money.

On the other hand, to see these -- even in Las Vegas, these roads are just going to pot holes. We haven't paved anything in the last ten, 12, 15 years. And it's starting to get serious. We've gained a bigger population.
building rent, say. And so other items that were discussed, and this one was brought to the attention by the governor's office, was use of the rainy day fund. So if that fund accumulates to a certain threshold level or trigger level, that's a possibility.

Another item that was mentioned was, as we know, the veterans home had the ribbon cutting last night. And so that project was funded solely with state funding. But there's a grant for reimbursement of 33 and a half million dollars. So I believe the governor's office is in consideration of using that for deferred maintenance as well as part of the discussion back in -- back in September.

And then -- So there's some other ideas about being able to fund these things, you know, not just general fund or the general obligation bonds. You've got the surcharge, the rainy day fund, as well as the reimbursement from this big capital project.

And other ideas about decreasing the demand would be strategic building replacement. So you could see where this would in the effort to separate deferred maintenance from capital construction. Dueling capital construction will help decrease deferred maintenance. So buildings such as, say, the Belrose building that's under the careful watch of the Public Works Division is a building that needs a high

level of care and maybe should be demolished. And so within your 2019 board recommendation there's a building that could work to help improve the inventory and maybe be able to lose some of the older buildings that are a little more decrepit.

So strategic building replacement would be one. Possibly increasing the funding for maintenance in the operating budgets. So we call this M425 or deferred maintenance. And so basically what M425 is, is an area where the agencies get funding to, say, improve the facility such that it will be able to keep running in the, you know, the five-year time frame. So it's not a major maintenance project to replace a system, but it extends the life of the building systems.

And so we went through and discussed these in various levels of detail at that meeting. But as Director Cates pointed out, the meeting -- we haven't heard a lot since then. So these are still on the table is what I understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.

Any other comments or questions? Thank you.

Moving on to Agenda Item Number 6, legislative update. Ms. Stewart.

MS. STEWART: Thank you. Susan Stewart, deputy attorney general, construction law counsel, for the record.

Just briefly I wanted to update the board on the upcoming 2019 legislative session. This is a pretty skinny update. But this is what's going on so far. You'll see the next page, Assembly Bill 56. This is the State Public Works Division bill. Administrator Patrick gave a summary of this bill at the last meeting. This clarifies the administrator's delegation of authority and puts actual requirements in the legislation. And you'll see -- You've got a copy of the bill attached in your packet.

If an agency is not given delegation, they have a right to appeal before the board. It expands some of the exemptions in place. And what the governor's office did when -- Because our bills go through the governor's office -- they combine our bill where we're adding a requirement for a recommendation of deferred maintenance project. So, as another tool for addressing deferred maintenance, what we're proposing is when the board puts together their capital improvement program, there's a separate carve-out specifically for deferred maintenance projects. So that's going to be -- Hopefully that will move forward and get passed in this upcoming legislative session.

Our regulations that the board adopted, NAC 338 and 341, the legislative commission is having its meeting tomorrow. And those regulations are on the agenda for adoption by the legislature. Ward and I will be attending that meeting.

As far as prior legislation, Assembly Bill 100 from last session, this was AGC's bill regarding public works no damage for delay clause, AGC has reached out to both Ward and I regarding their intention to resurrect this bill. Ward and I are both -- Administrator Patrick and I have both been working with AGC. I should say AGC north. I haven't talked to anyone in the south.

But we've sent some draft language and we're hoping that we can come to some agreement where we can address AGC's concerns with the current legislation but that the Public Works Division is still able to effectively manage the risk of delay.

We are also very preliminarily tracking legislation, which I've listed here. And then we're also tracking several bills that are related to B and G's operations.

And that's the conclusion of my update, if anybody has any questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.

Any questions or comments?

Okay. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7, for possible action, discussion on cost containment measures,
1. staff report and update.
2. Mr. Patrick.
3. MR. PATRICK: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I would like
4. to formally introduce Kent LeFevre, our deputy of
5. professional services. And if you would allow, Kent has a
6. brief summary of our past activities and bring everybody up
7. to date on this.
8. MR. LEF EVRE: Thank you. Kent LeFevre for the
9. record. In your packet is a spreadsheet that summarizes
10. eight projects that we were asked to look at, as well as just
11. to remind everyone the criteria for this exercise was to look
12. at our projects specifically over the last sessions and
13. evaluate the initial cost that's against the final project
14. cost.
15. So, with that, there are eight projects we
16. identified that fall into this criteria. And if it please
17. the board, I'll just summarize each project.
18. Item number one was the Sahara DMV which had the
19. initial cost estimate at 22.9 million and the final cost at
20. 20 million -- 20.4 million. So we saw an actual savings
21. there of roughly 2.5 million.
22. The UNLV Hotel College, item number two, the
23. initial cost estimate was 48.7 million. And the final
24. project cost was 47.7 million, roughly saving approximately
25. one million dollars.
26. Item number three is the veterans services
27. building. Currently estimated -- the estimate was 50.1
28. million dollars. That project is not completed yet, but
29. we're tracking some savings on that project as well.
30. Item number four is the Northern Nevada
31. Correctional Center ADA retrofit. The initial estimate was
32. 11.2 million. And the final project cost is projected at
33. 10.4 million.
34. Item number five is the UNR engineering building
35. estimated originally at 84.7 million. The final project cost
36. is estimated at 88.9 million. That project is just coming
37. out of the ground at this point. And the reason that there
38. is an increase is because the UNR folks decreased the project
39. for their purposes and that was handled at the IFC, I
40. believe, in August.
41. Item number six is the Speedway Readiness Center.
42. That project is estimated at 37.1 million. We had a very
43. successful bid on that in October and early November. I
44. believe the November GMP. And that project is moving forward
45. to approval in January.
46. Item number seven, the DMV South Reno originally
47. estimated at 42 -- 42 million dollars. The final estimate
48. is 50.6 million dollars. And this project has seen quite a
49. bit of inflationary impact. There is a CIP prepared to
50. address the shortfall of 8.6 million.
51. And item number eight is the medical education
52. building originally estimated at 60 million dollars. That
53. project, due to UNLV's funding, continues to remain on hold.
54. MR. PATRICK: Thanks, Kent.
55. MR. LEF EVRE: Thank you.
56. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you very much. So the
57. question -- Chairman Clutts. The question that I have is in
58. the initial project cost estimate, is that the initial cost
59. estimate that this board saw in the CIP presentation or is
60. that the initial project cost estimate of the CMAR7
61. MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. Yeah,
62. these are the approved project costs here in the initial
63. project cost estimate. So those are board recommendations to
64. the governor numbers and went through the legislative
65. process.
66. And I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that these
67. are all CMAR projects. And so we do have other projects that
68. met the criteria. But they are still in design. So these
69. are all construction projects. We have the fleet services
70. building is planning to be designed big build project, which
71. is approximately a ten million dollar project, and also we
72. have a design bid build project in the 19 CIP, which the
73. board is aware of. But for a reminder, two housing unit
74. expansion at the Southern Desert Correctional Center,
75. approximately a hundred million dollar project.
76. And the reason for those being designed big build
77. selection for the delivery method is that there's a large
78. percentage of the projects that are prototypical. So we've
79. built parts of these projects before.
80. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Chairman Clutts again for the
81. record. So with items one and two, maybe you can just
82. explain. Those seem like awfully round numbers in terms of
83. savings. Are they rounded or are those the actual numbers?
84. MR. PATRICK: Yeah. Ward Patrick for the record.
85. Those are rounded numbers. But, as it turns out, the two and
86. a half million dollars for the Sahara DMV, that's the actual
87. number in legislation that is authorized to move ahead to
88. help fund the next DMV process. And regarding the Hotel
89. College, it's above one million but it was rounded down.
90. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Are there any other questions
91. or comments?
92. MEMBER CATES: I have some questions. Can you
93. clarify your comment, Ward, on what you just said? The 2.5
94. million dollars was to do what?
95. MR. PATRICK: In the legislation for the South.
96. Reno DMV, there's authority to use the bond availability.
MEMBER CATES: Okay.

MR. PATRICK: Okay. From the southern Nevada DMV.

MEMBER CATES: Okay. And I just want to understand this column, final project cost. It seems you've got a mixture here of what is a true final cost and what is an update to a cost estimate, because the South Reno DMV obviously hasn't been built, whereas the north or the Sahara DMV has been built, the South Reno DMV has not been built. So we don't have final cost on that.

MR. PATRICK: Right. Ward Patrick for the record. Projects that were labeled as completed are the final cost. So I apologize. We can update the record to reflect that the final completed costs are only for those projects that are completed. So if you see the right-hand column, there's a comment that says these two projects are completed. So the balance of the projects were not completed. So they are indeed the current project budget.

MEMBER CATES: So I guess I'm not sure if this really gets at the original question that you asked, which is what activities were done to detain cost on projects. And I don't know, you've got some estimates that are updated. I don't know. I'm just not sure that really gets what your original question was. Not to speak for you, but --

Chairman Clutts: Thank you, Director Cates. It doesn't. And I think what I was going to reiterate here at the end is I guess what I'm looking for is when a CIP presentation is brought to this board and there are estimated construction costs, what I want to know is when the GMP is established or when the lump sum bid comes in or when the design bill bid comes in, what I would like to see, obviously, is that the numbers are less than the CIP estimate that was created by the State Public Works Division. I'm sensing, and I could be wrong, that the budgets -- that the GMP's that are coming in are either close to or identical to the CIP estimates that are prepared, which would be concerning to me. And maybe I'm wrong in that assumption. But the numbers just too often appear too close.

And so I'm just not -- I'd like to know historically in maybe a year or two years when we -- when we review and approve a CIP based on the estimates provided by staff, how are we doing in terms of the actual bids and the final project costs that are coming in? That's really what I'm looking for. And, beyond that, if our CIP estimates are low and the costs are coming in higher or if we're seeing that these projects are becoming expensive -- And when I look at these numbers, I would argue that they are -- what are we doing to mitigate the costs, contain them and to some degree lower them? Or is this just -- And with all due respect to the architectural and engineering community, are we keeping them in check with respect to the designs? Because we have a budget problem. I mean, we keep talking about it. We've talked about it for years and years and years. Deferred maintenance is just one issue. The cost and expense of these buildings that we're building is a whole 'nother issue. That's really what I'm trying to get to.

MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. Thank you. We're working hard to satisfy the needs of the departments. And so you'll note that many of these projects are university projects that have university funding. And some of these are, for instance, the Hotel CoLege is an entertainment-type facility. And so, you know, you can see where the driver on the quality of the building and the architecture would be higher and therefore the cost per square foot would be higher.

Last night at the ribbon cutting for the veterans home, the governor took great pride in the fact that he thought the building was the highest caliber veterans home in the country. And so apparently that was part of the standard. And so those costs are included in here. I would point out that in the area of the military type projects, there seems to be very just -- these features are -- these are just very usable and durable as opposed to architectural masterpieces.

And so, as it turns out, these projects, you'll find, are more in line with conserving the state's funding. But, again, the two projects previously mentioned, over 50 percent other funding and there's other projects like that that the programs are somewhat driven by donor expectations.

Chairman Clutts: Thank you, Mr. Patrick. And I understand that, especially given the projects on this list.

However, there is, I don't know, a hundred million dollars worth of other projects that are smaller in scale obviously but nonetheless make up a large portion of the budget. So I think just in totality I just want to be ensured that we're doing everything that we can to contain the cost and to ensure that the budgets that were presenting, especially when it comes to CMAR, that the GMP's that are being established are really being closely monitored so that they are not so ironically close to the budget that y'all prepared. That's ultimately what I'm asking. And I'm not necessarily looking for any kind of response to that. Just a statement more than anything.

MR. PATRICK: One more comment. Ward Patrick for the record. So a part of our process, we have a statute that strongly advises that we go through a planning process prior.
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1. to the construction process. So our projects -- There's a
2. project that's over ten million, which is to always meet that
3. criteria, it's normal that the project would have a design
4. done and usually through whole design in a separate project.
5. And so when we're establishing fees for these planning
6. projects, those estimates that are developed for those are
7. for the basis of developing the CMAR's pre-construction
8. funding and the architect's and engineer's funding. So these
9. follow-on projects are the result of that design process and
10. the estimating process that largely includes the CMAR's work
11. and guidance and coordination with the architects and
12. engineers.
13. So, just as a little preview cf maybe two years
14. down the road, the estimates that the public works staff is
15. generating and preparing for the board are largely estimates
16. that are prepared by the CMAR, the architects and engineers,
17. as well as professional construction cost estimators.
18. So part of the reason for using this procurement
19. method is to give some assurance that they're closer. So
20. there's a little informational background about how these
21. projects might end up having estimates similar to the result
22. because they're based on the CMAR's input.
23. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you.
24. Any other questions or comments?

1. MEMBER LEWIS: Yeah, actually I had -- Kevin
2. Lewis, board member. Just to add to Chairman Clutts'
3. comments, I was just asking Patrick if there's any processes
4. that during the construction process, is there any other
5. metrics that can help us monitor or processes to stay on top
6. of that estimated cost?
7. MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. Any
8. other method that we can use to stay on top of that estimated
9. cost? So we're consulting with the owner community here in
10. State of Nevada. So we consult with Washoe County School
11. District. They're a major builder in the north. We're
12. consulting with Clark County School District as well and
13. working to keep apprised of this. And, you know, so even in
14. recent years we've had, you know, inflationary impact to the
15. projects. And so, you know, if we had a group, our owners,
16. and we are subject to, you know, the tariffs in the metal
17. industry and lack of subcontractor labor due to, you know,
18. the ups and downs in the economy, those types of labors.
19. Leaving and returning causes issues in pricing on the
20. projects.
21. So we are working to coordinate with other
22. owners. But the variability and pricing is leaving most
23. owners in a reactionary -- a reactionary stance and we're
24. finding that it's great advice in the statute where it says

1. do planning as a separate project to establish solid
2. construction estimates. And so we just really only reference
3. what would be working with other owners in our community.
4. MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you.
5. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Any other questions or
6. comments?
7. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 8, 
8. administrator's report, administrator report on division
9. activities. Mr. Patrick.
10. MR. PATRICK: We've got three items underneath
11. this agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ward Patrick for the
12. record. Major projects, CIP update, and staffing updates.
13. Major projects. At the August board meeting I
14. handed out a little status report. And there's not many
15. differences from there. We're basically at the -- We're
16. basically at the end of our contracting process for the 17
17. CIP. So we had a series of projects that were significant
18. construction projects, five or six significant construction
19. projects for which the last one that was bid was bid in the
20. fall here, the Speedway Readiness Center. And so that was a
21. project that you saw in the 19 CIP, there was a recuse to
22. defer some of the scope and move that in -- move that funding
23. beyond the 17 CIP.
24. And, as it turns out, we had a very favorable bid

1. on the Speedway Readiness Center. It's for the Department of
2. Military and the Army National Guard. And so that project
3. has multiple funding sources within it that only can be used
4. for certain things. And so during the design process there
5. is an extensive accountability for what can be a small
6. portion of the project would be used for off-site type
7. work and what the federal component can be used, which this
8. project was considered a hundred percent federally-funded
9. project but yet the states are required to provide project
10. management as well as off-site construction and improvements.
11. And so that project is successfully contracted
12. and will be -- successfully bid and will be at the next board
13. of examiners meeting for the new governor in January as a
14. contract. And we anticipate the notice to proceed the week
15. after that, January 25th.
16. The other big one that is still outstanding is
17. the DMV project and so that project is still basically in the
18. same condition it was before where you saw on the cost
19. containment project we still have request for funding of
20. highway funding in the 19 CIP. And so that's -- Any comments
21. or questions about the major projects?
22. Hearing none, Mr. Chairman, CIP update. We have
23. very little to report on that. We are informed that, as you
24. know, the governor's office received the CIP board
1. recommendation on October 1st, per statute, and we're
2. anticipating meetings to help them with any final changes
3. that they might be interested in making to the capital
4. improvement program.
5. The capital improvement program went over to the
6. governor's office at approximately 350 million dollars of
7. state funding and 150 million dollars of other funding. And
8. so we look forward to meeting with the governor's office and
9. the new transition team to work through any modifications
10. that they may have. That's the CIP update.
11. And then, finally, staffing updates. You know,
12. we've tried to keep you apprised of leadership of the Public
13. Works Division. And so we had quite some turnover in the
14. past year or so. Myself, Kent, Ron Cochran, and even Jeff
15. Graham from the building official, it turns out Jeff Graham
16. turned in his resignation to go be with his family and help
17. his father run their ranch in the Ely area. And so we're
18. pursuing on various building official websites applicants for
19. that. That's been, I believe, on the street for about three
20. weeks or so.
21. And so with that I would also -- Oh, one last
22. thing I would comment on is we were in the airport the other
23. day with Army National Guard and one of their leaders there
24. is Brian Hunsager. And he was commenting that the newer

1. that wants to work.
2. MR. PATRICK: Mr. Tiberti, we find that some of
3. them 60 and 70-somethings have been retiring here and we've
4. got to go out and find replacements. We've got a whole bunch
5. of boxes that we're actively managing. But we appreciate
6. those 60 and 70-somethings as well here.
7. MEMBER TIBERTI: Thank you.
8. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Any other comments on the
9. administrator's report?
10. Hearing none, moving on to Agenda Item 9, for
11. possible action, board comment and discussion, board comments
12. on any agenda items, items to be included in future agendas,
13. review of action items for state Public Works Division
14. management, and setting of a future meeting date, if needed.
15. Are there any board comments on any agenda items?
16. Hearing none, items to be included in future agendas?
17. MS. STEWART: You can do it.
18. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: One item that came up is I
19. received a letter in the mail from Mr. Paul Corrado,
20. C-o-r-r-a-d-o, regarding lead and sights V2 rating systems.
21. So I would like to give this letter to staff. If you could
22. review and then appropriately respond, I would appreciate it.
23. MS. STEWART: And for the record, Susan Stewart.
24. We'll just make sure it's included in a future agenda and so

1. architects and engineers that we have on staff have been
2. performing, you know, in an astounding manner and comparable
3. or better than prior individuals.
4. And so I would point out that the average time at
5. the Public Works Division for our architects and engineers is
6. approximately only four years on average for the architects
7. and engineers that are on staff. It turns out we have
8. construction project coordinators and other PM's that aren't
9. licensed and there's quite a senior group in that area.
10. But we have been very fortunate to replace what I
11. would call our 60-somethings with some 40-somethings and
12. we're attracting individuals that understand our work because
13. they're coming from consultants that have been supporting the
14. division. So that concludes the administrator's report.
15. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.
16. Any questions?
17. MEMBER CATES: If I can just make a comment. I
18. just want to make sure that everybody knows that the State of
19. Nevada welcomes 60-somethings to the state and in no way
20. discriminates based on age. I just want to state that for
21. the record.
22. MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.
23. Thank you, Mr. Cates. What about the 70-somethings?
24. MEMBER CATES: 70-somethings are great. Anybody

1. it's just a matter of public record.
2. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Perfect. Any other items to be
3. included in future agendas? Any review of action items for
4. the State Public Works Division management? Setting future
5. meeting date? TBD?
6. MS. STEWART: TBD.
7. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: All right. Moving on to Agenda
8. Item Number 10, public comment. Is there any public comment
9. in the south?
10. MEMBER BENTLEY: No,
11. CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Any public comment in the
13. (Hearing was concluded at 9:56 a.m.)
14. 15.
16. 17.
18. 19.
20. 21.
22. 23.
24.
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