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CHAIRMAN HAND: Today is Thursday, July 2nd, 2020. It's 9:00 a.m. And this is the time and the place of the State Public Works board meeting. And we've got an agenda with nine items today, I think. Or 11 items. Can we do roll call?

MS. STEWART: Yes. Susan Stewart for the record. Chairperson Adam Hand.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Present.

MS. STEWART: Vice Chairperson Sean Stewart.

Member Clint Bentley.

MEMBER BENTLEY: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member Tito Tiberti.

MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member Kevin Lewis.

MEMBER LEWIS: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member, Director of Department of Administration Laura Freed.

MEMBER FREED: Here.

MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, you have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you.

So Agenda Item 3 is for possible action. Wait a minute. We have public comment. Public comment on page two.

So is there any public comment this morning?

MS. STEWART: Again, Susan Stewart for the record. As you can see on our agenda, we set up a conference call for anyone who wants to listen in to the meeting, they are able to do it telephonically. And then we also allowed -- gave folks the opportunity to call in for a participation code if they wanted to participate and offer public comment. We do have several folks who wanted to listen in to the meeting but no one who asked to offer public comment.

And Ward's assistant, Heather, was the one taking that call. And she just checked her voice mail as of about two minutes until nine and confirmed that there is no one who wants to offer public comment at this time.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Great. Thank you. Then we'll move on to Agenda Item 3 for possible action. This is approval of the Public Works board meeting minutes from October 22nd, 2019.

MR. PATRICK: Chairman, I have additional comment on the discussion.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Okay.

MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. We've got some various items here that the board has had to review that are modifications to the record. This morning we
1 learned that the record reflected on page one, line 11, that
2 Kent Lefevre was a member, which he's not. So we would like
3 to strike on page one, line 11, where it refers to Kent as a
4 member of the board, in addition to the other comments.
5 MEMBER FREED: Mr. Chairman, this is Laura Freed.
6 Before you accept a motion to approve the minutes as amended,
7 since I wasn't on the board at the time this meeting was
8 held, I think I'll abstain from approving the minutes.
9 CHAIRMAN HAND: Great. Thank you. Do we have a
10 motion?
11 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.
12 I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes with the noted
13 changes plus the one that Ward just said.
14 CHAIRMAN HAND: And a second?
15 MEMBER BENTLEY: I'll second.
16 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you, Clint and Tito. All
17 in favor say aye.
18 (The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion)
19 CHAIRMAN HAND: All opposed? Okay. And we have
20 Laura abstain. So the motion is so moved and the minutes are
21 approved.
22 And we will go on to Agenda Item 4.
23 MR. PATRICK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to
24 begin the introduction of our director. Laura Freed comes
25 from the governor's finance office most recently and served
26 at the Legislative Council Bureau. And so very familiar with
27 state government. And, with that, I would turn it over to
28 Laura for any additional introductory comments you would care
29 to make.
30 MEMBER FREED: Oh, gosh. Thank you,
31 Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Administrator Patrick. I don't
32 think I have much to say. I'm privileged to be on the board.
33 This is technically my second meeting because there was a
34 board of appeals meeting on January 28th that I attended.
35 But I, you know, it's going to be fun for me to learn more of
36 the nitty-gritty of the development of the CIP process,
37 because I only ever used to see it when it was already done
38 and recommended by the governor on the LCB side. So this is
39 kind of start to finish, so I'm learning a lot. So thank
40 you, Mr. Chairman.
41 CHAIRMAN HAND: Well, welcome, and thank you for
42 the introduction. And it will be nice to have you on the
43 board with your background. And, certainly with the
44 direction the economy is headed, it will be very helpful.
45 Welcome and thank you.
46 MEMBER FREED: Thank you.
47 CHAIRMAN HAND: So moving on then to Agenda Item
48 5 is the CIP update.
49
1 MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ward
2 Patrick for the record. In your packet, the first blue card
3 stock, we have a brief power point presentation here. This
4 is the first part of the CIP update being a CIP overview.
5 And so on the second page we have an outline
6 of -- a brief outline of what we'll discuss here, kind of a
7 schedule and milestones will be discussed. The number of
8 applications that we've received, we'll be presenting some
9 information on that. And I would point out that you're going
10 to see here that the Public Works Division has been asked by
11 leadership of the state to make applying for projects easier
12 for agencies, so you don't need to be as sophisticated in the
13 world of construction or design or building asset management
14 to request a project.
15 So you're going see kind of a theme throughout
16 these various power point slides that there's a trend that
17 it's so easy, it's making a lot of work for the Public Works
18 Division staff, okay. And so you're going to see that
19 throughout this.
20 And then just presenting some information about
21 the historical funding, which that might provide some insight
22 on maybe things going forward regarding the current downturn
23 of the economy. And then also just letting you know how many
24 applications were coming from each department. So that gives
25 you an indication of the needs of the state.
26 So moving to the next slide on milestones. So
27 here we are today on July 2nd with this current board
28 meeting. And our normal process is on or around April 1st
29 the applications are due from the various departments. And
30 so those applications have been received and there's 914
31 applications. And the first activity that happens is the
32 project managers will start doing their due diligence and
33 figuring out if they are a real CIP and then also doing the
34 estimates and the narratives, which include site visits. And
35 we'll talk later about some of the challenges with site
36 visits.
37 And, after those estimates and narratives are
38 developed and put in to our Excel spreadsheets, we then move
39 those in to a database to allow them to be reported and kind
40 of reviewed more on a data basis instead of a spreadsheet
41 basis.
42 And so with that we've got our share of
43 challenges in that area as well. It's always -- We light up
44 a system every two years. And so, therefore, it's not
45 something that's always lit up and ongoing.
46 Then after the jury process where our other staff
47 members review the work of our various PM's. And Kent leads
48 up that process as the deputy administrator doing all of the
1 peer reviews. Then we get some packets together that are
2 starting to assimilate a CIP book that the board will see at
3 the end of August. So we're starting to see, you know, this
4 whole package instead of bits and pieces. And so that's for
5 the management review hearing staff. So Kent and I will take
6 a look at that more of a package instead of individual
7 projects.
8 And right now we're scheduling meetings with all
9 the various directors of the agencies that have requested
10 projects. So there's 13 agencies that have requested
11 projects. And so we'll be initiating meetings in this time
12 frame here, end of July and first of August.
13 And then finally we get to the item that's most
14 familiar with the board is this exciting two-day meeting of
15 all the maintenance and deferred maintenance needs of the
16 State of Nevada. And so August 26th and 27th. Following
17 that, the administrator's recommendation will come about,
18 which you've seen in our packet here the board's priorities
19 are being considered and the PM's thoughts on the necessity
20 are considered. And the administrator will present the
21 prioritized list of projects after we get the benefit of that
22 two-day meeting.
23 And then often at that April 16th meeting the
24 board makes a decision on their final recommendations to the
25 governor. But over time there's sometimes been a necessity
26 for a second meeting to come to that conclusion. And so
27 we're just, if necessary, we're holding open September 23rd.
28 And so these two meetings, September 16th and the possibility
29 of September 23rd, they would be teleconference, right, so we
30 wouldn't -- You know, that's the way they've historically
31 been done.
32 And so then, finally, the statutory requirement
33 is October 1 for the board's recommendation to be delivered
34 to the governor's office.
35 Any questions on the schedule and milestones?
36 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record. I
37 don't have a question. I just have a comment. The August
38 26th and 27th will be on video conference, so I can't fly up
39 with our vice chairman and pay for his car?
40 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. It's
41 likely that it will be a Teams meeting at this point.
42 MEMBER TIBERTI: I so missed him. Thank you.
43 MR. PATRICK: That will be on the record. So
44 that's a good thing.
45 The next page is the number of applications. And
46 so I discussed this previously that the number of
47 applications continues to increase. And this is a result of
48 making it easier for agencies to request them and which makes
49 it more challenging for our staff. We find we have a bigger
50 effort of figuring out what should not be in there because
51 the due diligence from the agency is less and less. And so
52 we have projects that are requested that may be already
53 funded, may be done. You know, just all sorts of -- may be
54 redundant. And so it's more of a data-processing activity.
55 So clearly it's a challenge and that number keeps going up.
56 And so the good news is the board won't be seeing 914
57 projects or hearing them. And the number will continue to go
58 down as part of our PM review, part of our jury process, and
59 then part of meeting with the various departments that number
60 has gone down.
61 And so, I would point out that the Department of
62 Administration there was 164 projects, which we whittled
63 those down and met with Director Freed to get that down to
64 about 66 or 67 projects is your current list, Laura. And so
65 you can see there's this effort at the early phases to have a
66 meaningful list of projects for the board to hear and
67 ultimately prioritize for the governor.
68 So then on the next page is the historical
69 funding.
70 CHAIRMAN HAND: Ward, Member Hand for the record.
71 You said that it's the application process. Do you think any
72 of that increase has to do with deferred maintenance not
73 getting done?
74 MR. PATRICK: Right. And so deferred maintenance
75 is, you know, it's always been a board, you know, conscious
76 challenge to figure out how to handle that. And later we'll
77 be discussing some of the opportunities, as you've seen in
78 your packet. So it's -- there's so much processing going on,
79 it's hard for us to interpret the data. And so we'll go --
80 when we get to the governor's letter in this packet, we'll
81 talk about how we're interpreting whether or not deferred
82 maintenance is growing or not and how we think, you know --
83 And the time to discuss that would probably be after that
84 August meeting. And so -- But I'll go through that a little
85 bit more once we hit the letter that the board sent to
86 Governor Sandoval.
87 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you.
88 MR. PATRICK: So here we on the historical
89 funding power point slide. So you see in 2007 there was 811
90 million dollars funded in the capital improvement program.
91 And you see in 2011 after the downturn of the economy you see
92 what was referred to by the governor's finance office as the
93 anorexic CIP of 50 million.
94 The fortunate thing for continuity of service
95 here at the Public Works Division is many projects take
96 three, four, five, six years. So even though there's this
1. drastic peaks and valleys that's leveled on a staffing level
2. by some of the durations of the projects. So the staffing
3. levels, they were drastic here where, say, in 2007 we had 83
4. people in our budget account, 1562. And in 2011 there was in
5. the order magnitude of 30 people.
6. So I would point out that on this historical
7. funding this is the overall funding which includes general
8. funds, which as we know now in the downturn of the economy
9. those funds are very coveted, for operations and are likely
10. not to appear too extensively in any capital program.
11. General obligation bonds. Those are the availability and
12. affordability of general obligation bonds are determined
13. basically once a year -- Excuse me. Once a biennium. So if
14. we were to ask, which we have, the treasurer's office what is
15. the status of the bonds going forward, their answer would be,
16. well, we told you that, you know, it's on our website, it's
17. been posted, we do that every October-ish. So that effort
18. doesn't provide a lot of information to our board.
19. And so what might happen is we might provide a
20. list of alternate projects. Something like that might be how
21. that is handled. So, anyway, general obligation bonds. And
22. then, of course, we usually have a federal funding component.
23. You know, we've had the veterans home in the past. We've had
24. readiness centers in the past. And so we don't see any major

1. federal projects coming in to this CIP, but we see possibly
2. the planning for that. So smaller projects that will
3. inevitably be bigger federal capital projects.
4. And then we also have highway funds and then
5. agency funds that come in to the CIP, which historically
6. we've, in 2015, we built the Sahara DMV for about 20, 25
7. million. And we built the Reno DMV, we'll talk about that in
8. the major projects under construction now, and it's
9. approximately a 50 million dollar project. So highway funds
10. could be maintenance or it could be capital. And so going
11. forward we're seeing maintenance.
12. That's some of the variation in there. And then
13. here's just the list by department. And so the Department of
14. Administration is servicing approximately 12 million -- two
15. million -- excuse me -- two million square feet of office
16. space. And so those various buildings have needs and,
17. therefore, we've got kind of a little peek there of number of
18. applications.
19. And then you see conservation and natural
20. resources, which largely they have their parks and the like.
21. And so they have needs but they tend to be smaller in dollar
22. magnitude.
23. And in corrections they have about four million
24. square feet of space and so they have high needs, 24/7

1. facilities, need to be durable, like little cities out there
2. for the state. There's 20-some institutions either minimum
3. security or higher and a lot of needs there.
4. And then, of course, military provides various
5. work for our staff and we provide contracting and asset
6. management services.
7. And so this is, these numbers, I'm relatively
8. certain all total up to 914 applications.
9. MEMBER FREED: They do, yes.
10. MR. PATRICK: So any questions on the power point
11. about that little history of funding and applications?
12. MEMBER FREED: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of
13. clarifying questions, if I may. So going to the historical
14. funding slide, just so I've got it down, is this total
15. ledge-approved CIP all funding sources or is this just
16. general obligation bonds approved in the CIP for that year?
17. MR. PATRICK: All funding sources.
18. MEMBER FREED: Okay. Got it.
19. MR. PATRICK: And if you -- We have on the
20. website -- on the legislator's website they do what they call
21. a general fund appropriations report --
22. MEMBER FREED: That's right.
23. MR. PATRICK: -- annually. And I've summarized
24. that in various, you know -- Susan and I have discussed this.

1. And so I could provide that to the board or to any members
2. that are interested. Because it would break out this graph
3. in to many other levels of details.
4. MEMBER FREED: Yeah. Nobody wants to read the
5. appropriations report. Okay. So it's all funding sources.
6. And of the 914, yikes, that everyone requested,
7. over 13 agencies, obviously the usual suspect, corrections
8. and HHS and administration requested the most. Is that
9. distribution pretty consistent with most biennia about who
10. requests the most?
11. MR. PATRICK: Yeah. So largely the three big
12. ones are, quantity wise, are administration, corrections, and
13. DHHS.
15. MR. PATRICK: Perfect.
16. Ward Patrick for the record. Moving to the next
17. section, which we're entitling SPWD prioritization criteria
18. for CIP, quote, C projects, which C stands for construction.
19. And so these are historic criteria that the board approved as
20. of the last time this was reviewed was over four years ago.
21. And the same with the maintenance projects we're about to
22. look at. And so one historic criteria is for the board --
23. Certainly we've mentioned here, Chairman, taking care of
24. deferred maintenance. And one of the terms that was used
throughout the years is let's take care of what we've got before we build new.

And so this first section is how we would prioritize C projects, construction projects. And just to go over the major considerations would be essential government facilities and then other facilities. And then other items to consider in the lower section. And so this has been discussed many times and it's part of our just normal business. Any questions on this item?

MEMBER FREED: Can I ask what is meant by governance. On number one, institutional I get. That would be your hospitals and your correctional facilities. But what's governance here in building terms?

MR. PATRICK: I appreciate it. So governance would be the capitol building, making sure that the capitol building is running. Likely the emergency operations center and likely Grant Sawyer office building. Those would be primary items under governance here.

MEMBER FREED: Okay.

MR. PATRICK: The next section then is maintenance. And you'll see how this is a sister document that basically it mirrors our capital construction. Legal requirements are of the utmost importance. So, ADA-type items, legal requirements, court requirements. We have projects that are continuation projects. Those get a little bit of a nod. If we go do a planning project which is justified two years before, we want to make sure that we've acknowledged that it's had some investment in it and it was an issue previously and so it needs to be strong consideration to go forward for a continuing maintenance project.

And so read through the rest of this. So some agencies has part of their agency might be more high priority. So looking through this you might see under item 3A6 Department of Agriculture food distribution might be a key item for the State of Nevada to continue the meals programs to the citizens. But so other parts of agriculture might be a lesser priority.

Or, for instance, on here we have that item, 3A5, which is NDF, which is fire and dispatch, would be more critical than the tree nursery listed lower on the list. And so all of these things are considered in -- The PM's and the jury and the management review are considering these things when ultimately the administrator's recommendation comes to the board here, which is scheduled I think for September 16th. These are the items that will be considered in providing that prioritization.

One final comment here is at the bottom. Our PM's use kind of a process of should this -- basically the PM's with the jury and management, should this project be done this session, should it be done next session, or could it be deferred beyond that.

And so what we've been finding is that the -- we can't afford all the projects that the PM's are recommending to be done this session. So the past two sessions we've split that priority one group up in to an A and a B. So we fund the A's and we monitor the B's. And so we're going to talk a little bit more about that when we get to the emergency contracting item herein.

So I believe the management of the Division has reported to the board that, you know, projects not recommended and not funded the greater degree that that occurs more likely there will be a need for emergency contracting and then scrambling to find funding to fix some of these things. And so there are -- there's a couple items in the packet here that have to do with emergency contracting. But there's clearly more scrambling that goes on that doesn't need that level. But still there's problems that are fixed say going to IFC and reallocating funds with their approval.

MEMBER FREED: This is Laura. Out of the 914 requests that the Division received, roughly how many would be M projects and how many would be C projects if they were to make it through the process?

MR. PATRICK: Yeah. In the past -- MEMBER FREED: Knowing full well that you haven't -- you're still doing the due diligence and the peer review and the whole thing. I'm just trying to get a sense of how lopsided the CIP might be.

MR. PATRICK: Right. I appreciate that. I can report more information about last session. And so I think the number might have been, like, 719 applications last session. And we repackaged our information to the governor's office early on. And I believe there was, like, 124 construction projects out of that seven at that time. So 714 keeps shrinking. And so, you know, you could say there's ten to 15 percent of the projects are request for programatic, construction-type projects and then 90 percent or so are deferred maintenance on just a per-request basis.

MEMBER FREED: Okay.

MR. PATRICK: So then now kind of diving a little deeper in to the deferred maintenance areas, all part of the CIP update, I would like to kind of just read through this first one so we can contemplate that as that's been done. Throughout the years the board has had numerous discussions regarding the state's growing backlog of deferred
increase in deferred maintenance spending from historical.
2 So at that time, the prior decade, the state had been
3 requesting, or the board, through the governor's office, had
4 been requesting deferred maintenance in the order of
5 magnitude of 44 million dollars biennium on average for the
6 prior decade.
7 And so this letter says on the 3rd paragraph, the
8 board's deferred maintenance recommendation is 114 million.
9 And so that was basically agreed to by the governor's office.
10 And so governor's recommendation to the legislature was that
11 and was, you know, plus or minus concurred with the
12 legislature. So, you know, that was, like, two and a half
13 times more funding in that area.
14 And so then, also, what this -- to summarize this
15 letter and looking more at the graphic, the intent is to roll
16 in -- roll in a concept of how much money it would be if we
17 removed deferred maintenance, if we got it all handled, what
18 would we need to defund CIP maintenance at. So looking at
19 this graph --
20 MS. STEWART: Excuse me, Ward. Could you just
21 make clear to the members -- Or I'll do it for you. I'm
22 sorry.
23 MR. PATRICK: Thank you.
24 MS. STEWART: Ward is -- Administrator Ward is

referring to the attachment to the November 7, 2016 letter
that was sent to the governor. And that's a nice
illustration of where we were and where we're hoping to go.
Thank you, Ward. Sorry.
MR. PATRICK: Yep. Appreciate it. So this
illustration graph or graphic chart shows at the right-hand
side that at that time we thought maybe 80 million dollars a
year once we worked off the back log would be sufficient.
And you can see toward the left there's 114 million dollar
item. That was the current ask. So that was referred to
early in the letter. And then these cascading bar charts are
showing an attempt to work off the back log, work off
defered maintenance. So this is our -- You know, this was
our first attempt to kind of quantifying that.
And then what we had done -- So this is four
years ago. What we had done two years ago is we looked at
this information similarly to see if -- what the backlog is
doing. Is that growing or shrinking? And in this -- Keep in
mind in the community here in Nevada if we asked -- if we
asked the university system what is their deferred
maintenance backlog, their typical answer has been 1.5
billion. And so our approach is to figure out what, you
know, so is that like a need -- is that a predictive need or
is that really an old need? And so we've been using -- And I

1 maintenance. At an August 16th, 2016, board meeting, staff
2 reported at the board's request on how other states address
3 their deferred maintenance needs. The research revealed that
4 the states with the most success approached deferred
5 maintenance completely separate from capital construction --
6 I'm going to recap on that at the end of this little bit --
7 both in funding and prioritization of projects. Also the
8 successful approach identified a funding source for deferred
9 maintenance in an amount approximately two percent of the
10 total value of the assets. So if you estimate the value of
11 all of your buildings, you might want to consider to be
12 successful managing your deferred maintenance as funding two
13 percent of that valuation for maintenance.
14 In other words here, conclusion was that states
15 that are successful at controlling deferred maintenance
16 funded adequately and did not allow maintenance needs to
17 compete with capital funding needs. So somehow they dedicate
18 an appropriate amount of maintenance and then either the
19 remainder is for capital or it's separate. The key thing
20 being separate is what was concluded back then and been
21 presented to the board throughout the recent couple years.
22 So the Division is recommending -- is not
23 recommending statutory changes this session, so we have no
24 hopeful BDR's and we're not planning on any communication to

the Legislative Council Bureau about CIP bill language. That
would be handled less -- Traditionally it's been handled less
formally than the formal BDR process because it's part of the
CIP bill drafting. We're not anticipating any of that. And
so I would kind of fly over the next section about the 2019
CIP. But, if there were questions, I would give a little
dialogue on why we did what we did back then and what the
result was, which wasn't what was intended to have happen.
Seeing none now, but certainly available for questions on
that.
Moving forward to the next page is the 2021
session. And so largely -- I'm sure everybody had the
opportunity to read this. But our vision going forward is
trying to find a way where deferred maintenance can be better
handled within available resources, and even historic
resources and near historic methods. So even last session we
proposed to do what is presented in these assuming pages is
something called a deferred maintenance statewide project.
And so I would like to go through that in a little bit of
detail.
To keep in order I don't know if -- in order of
your packet I would go through the letter to Governor
Sandoval from the chair. So I would point out that what --
my summary of what this letter did is it asked for large
think this is going to be an effective tool for the state of using this 1-A and 1-B scenario. So if we fund the 1-A's, the current backlog are the 1-B, because the two we think should be done in the future. Even though they're historic needs but they're a little bit predictive.

So here this graph represents -- this cascading of bar charts represent working off the 1-B's. Now, you're asking how are we doing in getting through our backlog. Last session we didn't present this information, but it didn't get better. You know, so it didn't get better. So we think we have a system where we're doing now, we're going to have these 1-B's and we're going to be able to report the status of that. And it's not like all needs forever on a ten-year life cycle or a life cycle of the building basis. It's what was requested and what did we think we should have done if we had the money basically. And so we think that is more of a have your finger on the pulse.

And so that information is not available until after this August board meeting. And so we -- And you'll note that this letter came out in October of 2016. And, so, you know, there's a lot more information available once we go through the various processes and we can kind of boil it down and then we can report what the 1-B's were as a result of the board's recommendation and all of that effort by the board.

So that's a mouthful. But that's one way of looking at deferred maintenance that we think is creating some consistency. And so it's equalized to a baseline.

MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I would also point out that this has been a proactive approach that staff has taken at the direction of the board to address the backlog of deferred maintenance needs. And so it's a quantitative approach so that whether there's funding available or not, this information is being presented to the leadership in a way that conveys the board's ongoing concern with addressing the deferred maintenance needs of the state.

MR. PATRICK: At last session's August board meetings, the governor's chief of staff came up and met just on an informal basis with the chair and myself and we set up a few meetings to discuss how to handle this. And so at some later date we can provide -- I think I've offered the results of that in prior board meetings. And so we'll just kind of stick to the knitting here.

But so point being that this letter had -- was very effective. It was heard, resulted in the maintenance being funded at a higher level than had been in the prior decade. And then it was brainstorming and ideas were tossed around with a larger group of what could be done. And the bill draft request that the board had heard then and is in the packet was furthered. And so I would point out that it was watered down and attacked by others that may have not been in the board's interest and was withdrawn. You'll see that in the written information within your packet.

Seeing no comments or questions on the governor's letter -- And I mentioned earlier that my plan was to breeze through the 2019 bill information.

Moving on to the -- what we're calling the deferred -- the proposed deferred maintenance CIP program. This is not new. We worked to take this through to fruition in the past. And we approached this from two aspects, which was corrections and HHS. And it's my opinion that corrections was a pretty big ask because that estimate was some 50 million dollars. And so we're basically asking for flexibility to, in deferred maintenance, to be more effective getting more done. And the Nevada culture is not geared towards giving flexibility to getting these done. And so I'm using the term baby steps. So we're kind of bringing all of this back to let's focus on one thing that we want to get approved, which would be statewide program for deferred maintenance for one agency, which is HHS. And so this is what we proposed in the past and we're going to kind of somewhat caution you to don't ask for things that people have already denied. But we're planning on being more focused on this and going through some more iterations with state government on if this is something that should be continued.

So this is here for discussion, not like it's a slam dunk right now.

So the first page is a mock-up of what might be there for HHS. And then the second page of this section is entitled project cost estimate approved. And it's for the statewide roofing program. And, to justify what we're doing, we'll go through this in some level of detail. So, as the board is aware, we've got a series of statewide programs of which what we're kind of -- we've honed in on through working with the Legislative Council Bureau and the governor's finance office is listing priority one projects. So on this project cost estimate we see these 11 items. So these are what we're committing to get done with the funding available in the lower right-hand column here, 9.975 million. So we're --

MS. STEWART: Excuse me, Ward. I'm sorry.

You're looking at the -- Just to clarify. You're looking at the approved statewide roofing program, that's what you're referring to?

MEMBER FREED: Yeah, I'm confused. Are we talking about the SO-1 with the priority one of 6.146771?
MR. PATRICK: Yes. So everybody, if you see at the upper right-hand corner, you see the word approved, if you're on that page, we're all on the same page.

MS. STEWART: Thank you, Ward.

MR. PATRICK: Okay. Thank you, everybody. So priority one I would like to focus on the prior paragraph because these are -- all tend to be key items. This is the cost estimated based on 2018 information. So when we estimated those in June of 2018, we said this is what we would think these items would cost on a construction cost basis if we bid them today, that day, June of 2018.

So then the board is going to be seeing, you know, a whole book of these estimates. And to go over this and please ask any questions, any other questions.

So, on the right-hand side, these are our estimates of construction if we bid it today. Then the left -- And in the construction community we call that hard cost. Okay. That's like what the bid would be, what you would write the construction agreement for.

Then on the left-hand side we roll that number over there. And so let me know if I'm going in to too much detail. But Laura pointed out the total was 6.146 million on the right under priority one total. You see that number carry over to the left, the same number. And so that's 20.

considered the hard cost if we did it today. And the rest of those costs on the left are soft costs.

So in every -- When I interview anybody for the Public Works Division, I ask them if they know the different between construction costs and project costs. Because it's all on education. Sometimes people don't come here knowing that, but they always leave knowing that those are important.

And so this particular project shows if we bid all of these today and then they were designed, it would cost six million, in our estimation. But in order to do these in the future, which is going through a one-year approval process through the governor's office and the legislature and the board and then doing the design and bidding, you can see here that we anticipated -- And this is a lot of detail. But there's 24 months of inflation. So if you look up at the right-hand corner where it says approved and you cascade down about two inches, you see a 24 there.

So this is saying that our today's cost is 6.1 million, we're going to add 24 months of inflation to this. At that time, you know, construction was booming. Ten percent was -- We're going to cover inflation briefly here today as well. And so soft cost would take this project up to near ten million from the six million dollars. And so this is what is done in the construction community. This is 20.

how you create a successful project is by having appropriate soft costs and inflation.

But getting back to the topic at hand, which is mitigating deferred maintenance build-up. We also have the priority two list here. And, so this project, SO-1 statewide roofing program, is being administered right now. As we complete priority one projects and we accumulate savings, we're authorized to do priority two projects that are not funded but are authorized out of savings. So the CIP book is allowing that to happen for roofing, for paving, and ADA, okay. So we have priority one projects and priority two projects. And the board saw this last session. And we're just expanding this concept to HHS in order to be more effective and, you know, kind of baby steps, focused baby steps.

MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I would just add that the value of that overall is that when the projects are not lumped together in that fashion, that savings, unless there's a project of the same agency that needs money, that savings sits there for the remainder of the four-year CIP funding authorization. And so the value of doing this on a statewide basis is that the savings -- there's a project, a priority two project, that's been identified, approved by the legislature. And that savings can be utilized within that four-year time frame. So that money is not sitting there unused for that four-year time frame. So we're really maximizing the appropriation on -- to address deferred maintenance. To kind of put a bow on what Ward had said.

MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. We met -- We went -- Kent and I and a couple of others went over to Utah to discuss all things Public Works. We met with their parallel Public Works group. And one of the things they said was within their management group, within their staff, they empower their staff to spend money and do the right thing on maintenance. And so I use the word that they would -- And they have a number of other tools. They use a thing called common contingency and it's in law there. And this kind of gives a common contingency for related projects. But their philosophy is go spend money and do the right thing to decrease deferred maintenance. Because these problems generally grow, right. And so I just thought that would be of interest for the board to hear that.

So then in this area we're talking about the CIP update and we've kind of covered deferred maintenance. And the last item I had here under this was the inflation rate. And there's no additional information here. I would report that during the legislative session, I believe it was on
1. April 13th, 2019, we had a work session with the legislature and they were concerned about inflation and they were also concerned about a projection from a planning project. How come we can't predict pre-design, how much it's going to cost, or how much we're going to estimate it to cost after design. Those were the two primary concerns. And a third concern would have been strategic planning. You know, strategic planning, meaning what is the -- what justifies any project in the capital -- any capital project. They thought there was -- These were some comments that offered commentary from three legislators that had some concerns.

And so, certainly, we've got some ideas regarding how to convey information about how construction costs predicted now that are being used to create AE fees to do two years of a design and then in the future build them, that cost changes.

And so the American Society of Professional Engineers would say you know very little if you do an application over what we've been talking about here today and you sign a PM to four, five, or ten hours of work come up with what it might cost. There's very little accuracy in that is what the American Society of Professional Engineers says. Although we follow the state system is relying on all of our maintenance projects.

1. updates on that quarterly and we still have not heard anything.

MEMBER FREED: I think LCB has just been consumed with other things. I think in a normal interim they might come back with some questions, but this is not that interim.

6. MR. PATRICK: Yeah. It's a different day this last six months.

8. So, anyway, regarding the inflation rate itself, the LCB staff got a hold of some inflation projections from some of the local cost -- some of the Nevada cost estimating firms. And as a result they recommended, and the legislature approved, reducing the inflation rate in northern Nevada and maintaining the inflation rate that the board and the staff recommended in southern Nevada. So the inflation rate was reduced to seven percent all areas outside of Clark County and maintained at ten percent per year within Clark County.

And so we took that as something that would be accepted. And so we've contracted now with that same group. And we'll be able to present information at the August meeting and what we can conclude out of that for whatever -- We were getting a regional, a regional report, and so we'll be able to present that kind of by region.

So that's what I had kind of under the inflation and how we're doing on our projects and being transparent on our processes.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Any questions for Ward?

MEMBER FREED: This is Laura. I have a couple of questions. This is kind of a -- It seems like it was a far-reaching discussion. So you walked us through the SO-1 projects to talk about inflation. On the previous page we've got what I think is a mock-up of a statewide HHS maintenance project with the total construction cost of $11,449,644. Do I have that right?


MEMBER FREED: Okay. So -- In your previous comments to walking us through SO-1, you talked about past boards have since -- the letter of 2016 for the 2017 session, you know, emphasizing, underlying the need for deferred maintenance, which I heartily endorse, and then requesting a dedicated assessment. And you've already said you're not going to try that again.

And now the strategy is to write -- submit back language for the CIP bill that would give flexibility via a statewide project to tackle HHS maintenance projects. So my question, I guess, is -- Two of them, I guess. How is having a statewide project for HHS maintenance materially different than just transferring leftover money...
MEMBER TIBERTI: Well, I'm just getting ready.
MEMBER TIBERTI: At the risk of, you know, being so
transparent at my age. I've been around it seems like
forever, Ward just broke the ice, there's probably nothing
more unsexy than repair of maintenance.
MEMBER TIBERTI: And I've been developing and been around Las
Vegas forever and I've watched us grow. And it seems like
yesterday that we built certain buildings. Or I've been on
this board for a while and I see state buildings that I've
been involved with and observed and have been in and out of
them. And it's just shocking how the time goes by and what
this deferred maintenance is really -- develops in to, like I
say, it's so unsexy that you just don't want to put money in
to something that's already there and it's a little tired.
And especially they're public buildings there. Not your
buildings, they're nobody's building. They're the people's
building.
MEMBER TIBERTI: And at the end of the day it just develops in to,
you know, where Europe is, it's kind of an elegant decay.
MEMBER TIBERTI: And it's very sad and it's a hard thing to fight because
everybody wants to do something big and glamorous. I'm on
the foundation board at the university and they keep wanting
to build a new big building, which they need. They're up to
34,000 students or something like that. We used to be eight
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would call that a two going forward. But small steps there.
So if that answers your question, Laura.
MEMBER FRED: Yeah, it does. Thank you. I
think -- I think being -- Yeah, I guess we'll see if they
could -- if they could see the priority one and priority two
articulated in the same project, they might be more inclined
to give you that flexibility. Although, I think, as you've
noted, the legislature's inclination is not generally to give
agencies flexibility to do stuff with their money. But --

MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
would just add one point that is included in the narrative is
that it's staff's intention to come back to the board and ask
for your approval and permission to send another letter to
the governor that will -- similar to what was directed to
Governor Sandoval that will kind of give a good snapshot of
where we are with deferred maintenance needs, some of the
challenges that we've faced. For example, the emergency
contracts that we'll talk about later. And, again, ask for
the governor's support. The board's proposed efforts will be
reflected in the CIP recommendation that the board sends to
the governor.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Any other questions for Ward?
You're awful quiet, Tito.
1 comment.
2 And Director Freed I know is kind of new to
3 hearing some of this. But it's -- And I don't know where you
4 get the money. But it needs to be taken very seriously.
5 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you, Tito.
6 We'll I guess move on to Agenda Item 6, which is
7 contractor qualification subcommittee update.
8 MS. STEWART: Mr.Chairman, for the record, Susan
9 Stewart. Just a brief update for the board. The
10 subcommittee met in December of last year. We discussed
11 applicable statutes, regs, the current contractor
12 qualification application. We have certain things that, due
13 to recent changes in law and reg, we're required to revise.
14 And then there are other areas that may or may not be a
15 problem and we discussed potential revisions.
16 I'm pleased to report that we over-prepared for
17 the meeting, expecting concern from the contractor community.
18 And there were crickets in response, which may be a sign of
19 the times. But I'm going to take that, as the contractor
20 community knows, we're doing a good job and are balancing the
21 state's needs and the contractors' interest. We made a
22 concerted effort to make sure that they were informed. I
23 sent the packet directly to AGC North as well as
24 representatives in the south. And no one attended.

1 We were in a further agenda item when we talk
2 about upcoming meetings. We will be reaching out to the
3 subcommittee to schedule a meeting, to go over staff's
4 revisions, and follow up with the subcommittee's obligations.
5 Any questions?
6 CHAIRMAN HAND: I think is Laura asking a
7 question and her mic is muted?
8 MS. STEWART: I don't know. Laura, you're muted.
9 Did you have a question?
10 MEMBER FREED: No. I was just talking to myself.
11 Thank you though.
12 MEMBER TIBERTI: Susan, do you think there's just
13 no appetite or it's the COVID or they just don't understand
14 it? Where do you think this is?
15 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I'm
16 going to go with my initial thought that we're -- they're
17 pretty-straight forward changes. The concerns, you know, I
18 think we've looked at the numbers in the past and we've
19 disqualified maybe two contractors in the last ten years.
20 Our appeal hearings we're maybe having a couple a year. So I
21 think maybe they're recognizing the size of the concern.
22 Certainly the board wants to do the best that they can. And
23 so it makes sense for the board to look at it. But I'm
24 hoping that the contractor community is just seeing it as

1 something they trust the board and the Division to handle
2 appropriately.
3 MEMBER TIBERTI: Sound about right.
4 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Tito.
5 CHAIRMAN HAND: Okay. Then we'll move on to
6 Agenda Item 7, which is emergency contracts. And Ward.
7 MR. PATRICK: We can piggy-back on this if you
8 would like to start, Susan.
9 MS. STEWART: Sure. Susan Stewart for the
10 record. NRS 338.011 allows us to award an emergency -- award
11 a contract in an emergency situation. And if an emergency is
12 declared, then the State Public Works Division does not need
13 to comply with NRS 338, bidding requirements, and NRS 341,
14 awarding of consultant agreements.
15 And the process is, is we receive a request from
16 the agency that do in fact have an emergency that meets
17 the requirements of the statute. Staff here performs due
18 diligence on that. And then Ward will send a request to our
19 board chair, which is required in the regs. And then our
20 board chair reviews that back-up information. And then if
21 they find that it does meet the statutory requirements, which
22 frankly we would never send a request if it didn't, then our
23 board chair would approve moving forward on an emergency
24 basis.

1 And since we last met, there have been two
2 determinations and two projects that had to move forward on
3 an emergency basis.
4 And I would defer to Ward now to discuss --
5 You'll be shocked to know that these are deferred maintenance
6 needs of the state that had to be addressed on an emergency
7 basis. Thank you.
8 MR. PATRICK: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman and
9 Susan.
10 And so these two projects are both at the same
11 location, same campus, at Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health
12 Services. And so the first one is building 8-A requiring an
13 air handling unit to be replaced. It turns out that the
14 goals of the governor's office are to take care of family,
15 take care of children. And so there was some high visibility
16 on this problem that the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health
17 Services owns the building, operates the building, and called
18 for support from the Public Works Division.
19 And so, ultimately, the Division came up with
20 money and we -- and a request that this be considered as an
21 emergency contract. And we concurred and got Chair Hand's
22 approval on that. And so this was a high profile project.
23 And we were reporting weekly to the GFO, which was being
24 passed on to the governor's office directly, as we understand
1. We announced that this was going to be a ten-week project even with emergency contracting procedures. It would have been much longer without that. It wasn't warmly received that it would take ten weeks. We gave detailed reports weekly on the project and we gave an original schedule, followed the schedule, completed on time, and the agency complimented that the, you know, all the contract reports were, you know, better than they've seen anywhere, because, of course, we're submitting reports to the governor himself was the intent of all of these to make everything clear. But very detailed. And so it was a successful project. Anticipated to take ten weeks, anticipated to cost a quarter million dollars, and was completed on time, on budget.

And so on that I would -- And so, you know, it was completed less than -- less than the anticipated quarter million dollars. This was a 1-B project, as we pointed out. You saw that on the mock-up list.

There's a second project for building one, which was a boiler project. So the boiler failed. And boilers fail in the winter and chillers fail in the summer. It's crazy that way. So, you know, if you see in your packet, the agency provided a lot of detail of the necessity, and it was since approved.

---

1. And this particular case the GFO offered us flexibility to use existing money in an existing CIP to complete this effort. So it was emergency project that didn't go to IFC. But, again it received similar exposure. And so we had similar reporting and completed it on time and on budget.

And so the goal is to get, you know, the children that need treatment in to the facility. So some of those children receive treatment, say, in an alternate location on the campus, but others were sent home due to other capacity issues. So the emergency contracting certainly was necessary and was completed as quick as possible.

That one building one project was also a 1-B item. So these are the items that we already asked for over a hundred million dollars in deferred maintenance. And, you know, how far reaching do we want to go. It's hard to predict when something is going to fail, right. But we do our best at that. And so some of those are 1-A's. Some of them are 1-B.

I would also point out that periodically people ask why does Public Works take so long to deliver a project. And when some of these bidding rules are suspended we can get work done in a short amount of time, right. So you might say the team was having fun getting, you know, showing how they could perform in a short amount of time.

That's the end of my report on that item and if there's any questions.

CHAIRMAN HAND: Anybody have any questions for Ward? I'll just say that from my perspective the process was very simple. You made it very easy for me to provide the support that was needed and I'm glad that they got done. And it also probably creates some -- I better not use the word ammunition in here. But for our arguments moving forward about deferred maintenance, it's a couple of great examples that we can use. So thank you.

With that then we'll move on to Agenda Item 8, which is the administrator's report on agency activities. So it's a big meeting for Ward today.

MR. PATRICK: Yeah, thank you. Let me take a drink of water here. And there's water here for anybody else who needs it.

So, traditionally, we provided staffing and major projects reports. And, certainly, the Public Works Division is an enterprise fund, meaning that when there's economic downturn, budgets woes create staffing issues. And so I would like to give you a brief -- just some bullet points on some of the challenges that came about as a result of COVID-19 downturn of the economy. And so certainly travel was restricted. Certainly our staff, many of our project management staff, are working from home. There were questions about is construction essential, right. So are we really -- You know, so we come to work. Are we really going to be -- are we going to be shutting construction down or not. As I understand it, in some states, it wasn't considered essential. So in Nevada it was. But it was -- construction was considered essential in the light of we'll revisit that in six weeks or the end of next month. So we're always kind of preparing for keeping our -- watching the ball and preparing for something that might happen.

And so certainly when we asked -- approached our staff we were sensitive if they had -- if they were in the vulnerable population or if they are interacting daily with family members or other people close to them that are in vulnerable situations. And, you know, this COVID issue also created a hiring freeze for the state. And so we've been working through that. And we've -- years ago the board mentioned that continuity is important. I think Tito emphasized that a couple of years ago.

And so we've -- the administrative assistant position is filled by Heather Watkins. And she was AA-1 and now an AA-4, is a great worker, has been working in the...
building official area in Fernley. So she fits right in with
our community here at Public Works building people.
We've also promoted to the chief of design
position Brian Walker, who is a civil engineer with a
Master's degree and has been here over four years, pushing
five or six years. And so we really appreciate his effort.
He is a strong player for us that has strong organization
skills. And he's been leading our charge doing some of our
sweep process, some of our making general funds available out
of the CIP to do other things for state government.
So I would report that the staff, you know, we've
identified 156 million dollars of general funds that are in
our active projects. We spent -- At that time in February,
we spent all but a hundred million. And we're finding a way
to give back pretty much all of that plus some that were
previously spent. So we're going to replace some of those
with bond money.
And so the goal was -- And so this affects staff.
And staff is knowing that, hey, general fund money is leaving
and is my role here leaving. To relieve the board of those
concerns like we relieved our staff, we are at 25 percent
vacancies in the project management area. And our project
management area is largely -- is basically directly related
to the dollars we have to do projects for project management,
the allocation on those soft costs. It's directly related.
Like, every dollar is allocated to a position. And so, you
know, the team -- the team is concerned. Put we believe that
they were doing more with less, right. The Division was
doing more with less. And we now should be able to do a
better job at the work we do have instead of jumping from job
to job and less of a scramble because we're maybe more sized
right for the work we have.
We haven't completed that entire review. But
what we have done we believe is -- We're not having to
either -- We're not having to just do a quick reduction of
force or anything. We believe we're kind of coasting with
the idea that when the special session and future IFC
meetings happen we would realign our funding resources in our
budgets with our staffing resources and do an evaluation.
But our preliminary indications are that we're good but we
can't do a detailed review until other decisions have been
made.
So in regarding to staffing, that's pretty much
the report, other than during this process we were holding
contracts, because the concern is we might issue a contract
and then have to buy it out from underneath the contractor in
order to create general funds. So the staff -- I think the
morale I believe is -- I'm certain the morale is high. But
there was all of this uncertainty. And so given that we had
so many vacancies and were thoughtfully making these sweeps
of general fund out of it, you know, that seems like there's
enough work to go around and the morale is very good.
And so that's kind of my report on staffing and
the COVID inferences of how that affects staffing.
MS. STEWART: Yeah. Kind of on every one's mind.
MR. PATRICK: So then to move on to major
projects. So we've got five major projects that are under
construction right now, three of which are planned to be
completed in the short term. So the DMV in south Reno is
designed to open on November 2nd. This is approximately a 40
million dollar project. And things are going as good as can
be expected. I've been warned not to say that they're ahead
of schedule or on -- just going as well as can be expected,
but going well. And the same -- And so that project is
completing in November.
Then we've got the Speedway Readiness Center,
which is in north Las Vegas. That's approximately a 50
million dollar project. And that is at the real final
throws. The guard is planning on using it October 1. And
we're looking at -- We've issued a temporary certificate of
occupancy, the building official has. So we're just right
there at the end of making sure that all the key things that
the guard needs in that building are there by the time they
got ready to go do it in October. But certainly we're at the
deadline of contract time. And we might have a few change orders
to enhance the project for some of their security needs that
have been expressed to us.
Then we have the -- another project that is
rolling through the final stages is the UNR engineering
building. So that's in Reno on the main UNR campus. And so
this project is almost a 90 million dollar project. Its
current contract time is Monday when it's all said to be
done. We have some requests for a time extensions of, say,
30 days, just kind of -- Because of COVID-related items this
building has a clean room in it and the people in
Massachusetts weren't able to perform to meet the current
schedule. The university is planning on doing some move-in
activities starting August -- And you might know from a
different perspective, Adam. But we believe that the move-in
is August 17th is when we're told we need to kind of make
sure that it's ready for move in. And so all of this seems
to be coming in to alignment to make a successful handoff.
CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record here.
Your date and what we're hearing are in the same ballpark.
MR. PATRICK: Well, good, good.
MS. STEWART: That's always good.
MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick for the record. So those are the ones that are closing out in the next three or four months. And then we have two projects that were initiated in southern Nevada, actually both in Henderson, in the last fall, October and November, we started both the health science building for CSN, College of Southern Nevada. And we initiated the education building at Nevada State College. And so these projects are moving along well. They're all -- They're planned to be completed not this spring -- Well, in spring of '21. So in spring of '21. So April, May, June of '21. So they're early on in the project. But 30 or 40 percent complete of an 18-month basically construction schedule.

So I would point out to the board that there was a safety near miss event Friday where structural steel was not completely installed and certified but did -- had a small collapse in a limited area of the southeast section of the building. And apparently there was a welder on a lift actively welding when this came down. And there were no injuries, okay.

So we've been -- So we've been investigating and planning and reacting and working to mitigate the impacts to all parties concerned, yet looking out for the state's best interest.

And so we've had meetings with, you know -- So all sorts of people have been going to the site and we're involving third party -- Because it's structural steel, we've involved a third party structural engineer to kind of provide oversight to some of the planning. But right now this is seen as a means of methods type of an item, not a design item. And so that's still under review. But we've got a meeting after this to kind of clarify that with this Burke Construction is the contractor. Carpenter Sellers Delgado is the design engineer, of which Lock Saw Engineering, LLC, HSA, is the structural engineer of record.

And, you know, as I stated, it's a near miss and we're moving forward, you know, as we check some boxes and make sure that's the proper thing to do here in the next few 15 days, weeks, and hours.

MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.

Everyone is very solution-focused and we don't anticipate there's going to be any serious challenges in just getting the project right back on track.

MR. LEFEVRE: And Kent Lefevre for the record.

The damaged steel was removed from the site, so we don't have that risk anymore. It was neutralized.

MR. PATRICK: That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.
1 find out. I'll report back to staff.
2 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Tiberti. I
3 appreciate that. You saved me a phone call.
4 CHAIRMAN HAND: Any other -- Any other input on
5 the upcoming meetings or action items for the -- that we may
6 request of the department? You just took one off the list,
7 Tito. Do you want to add one?
8 MEMBER TIBERTI: I'm just trying to help, just
9 trying to help.
10 CHAIRMAN HAND: Well, if not, then we'll move on
11 to Agenda Item 10, which is public comment.
12 MS. STEWART: Again, Susan Stewart for the
13 record. I have not been notified that anyone has made a
14 request to access the participant -- participant sign-in code
15 for the phone line. So there is no public comment.
16 CHAIRMAN HAND: Then we'll -- It's 10:35 and
17 we'll adjourn the meeting.
18 MS. STEWART: All right.
19 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you all.
20 (Hearing concluded at 10:35 a.m.)
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