

ID	Entity or Organization Represented:	Which NAC section needs the most improvement?	Which of the following statements apply to the current regulation?	Please describe your recommended changes:	Please provide a clear and concise explanation of why such changes should occur:	Is there anticipated cost savings to the state or agency as a result of these changes?	What type of economic impact would be the likely result of these changes?	Describe both adverse and beneficial effects resulting from the proposed changes in the regulation:	Is there another NAC section that needs improvemen t?	Which NAC section is the second most in need of improvement?	Which of the following statements apply to the current regulation?2	Please describe your recommended changes:2	Please provide a clear and concise explanation of why such changes should occur:2	Is there anticipated cost savings to the state or agency as a result of these changes?2	What type of economic impact would be the likely result of these changes?2	Describe both adverse and beneficial effects resulting from the proposed changes in the regulation:2	Is there another NAC section that needs improvement? 2
1	Burke Construction Group	338.64	Unnecessarily onerous;	None the System Works - I had to Vote on Item #7 this is not Fair as they did not give any Positive Items on the Questions - This will make the result INCORRECT	Nothing - The CMAR process works	No	Negative	Project would cost more - Timelines would be extended - The State would not get real time feedback from all parties	No								
2	Monument	338	Unfocused and inefficient;Unnecessarily onerous;Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Definitely NV needs to lower the PW rates it is using. The high wage is 50% than what most worker's would be glad to receive. It does allow more opportunity for organizations with pricing focused on the gaming corridor, but the tax payer should not have to pay so much. There is no reason NV should be paying more for public buildings than nearly every state in the nation. Also the AUA, Apprentice Utilization Act is silly and arbitrary. It requires to state to pay money to labor organizations for something they have always done for free. Additionally something that they later charge their members for. Why is the state doubling that fee? They could put more bodies to work by distributing those funds over more jobs. AUA has led to a landslide of labor compliance complaints by third party groups. Ask each public entity how many of these complaints and how much paper they have worked through. They will all say they had to double their staff and develop a stronger review process which leads to mostly clerical failures. The stringent LCP system does the same work.	Wasted money for first paragraph. The Governor and School Districts could have more suitable assets if the rates just lowered. The Schools operated at 75% PW on term ago and they still had plenty of good contactors apply. AUA speaks for itself as a failed program which decreased contractor participation in Public Projects because it was so biased. Again ask the offices. I can get you their names. They hate this program and all of the frivolous claims it generates.	Yes	Positive	Some workers would have to work more hours to make their previous highs. More projects though would lead to more bodies exceeding their previous compensation than this constricted group that are currently succeeding.	No								
3	Summit Engineering Corp	0	All of the above;	None	None	No	Positive		No								
4	Western Door and Gate, LLC	338.46	Unfocused and inefficient;	Section should be opned up to all certified disabilities. This can be accomplished through https://disabilityin.org	There are quite a few contractors that have a disability and are doing their best to compete in a market that sees "token" copanies choosen because they have a straw person to check a box. By opening it up to ALL certified disability owned business you create a competitive arknet taht will save the State a ton of money.	Yes	Positive	This slight change will open up the competitiveness of bids, which it was intended for.	Yes	610.02	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Remove this section so that it can allow more competitive bids.	No all trades have an apprenticeship and those that do ar almost 100% Union. This section eliminates almost all contractors who are not affiliated with a Union yet have the workforce and skillset to accomplish what's needed to hold a NV Contractors License.	Yes	Positive	This elimnates the conflict that the NV Contractos Board issues licenses based on competency only to have that thrown out the window when it comes to certain bids. Just because a Contractor doesn't have an apprenticeship program shouldn't eliminate from the opportunity to bid and be awarded work.	No
5	J&J Enterprises Services inc	338.06	All of the above;	state law basically gives unions all the power to determine PW Vez PW is much higher than other states and costs the state much Money	Non union wages could save a lot of money for the state	Yes	Positive	I dont see a downside	No								
6	Boyd Martin Construction LLC	338	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Public entities should be required to hard-bid all projects. There also needs to be some kind of consequence for public entities that do not state;Unnecessarily onerous; follow payment terms (or other terms) of 338.	Allowing CMAR gives the public entity the right to choose whoever they want for a project with no real justification. When that happens, several smaller qualified companies lose out on the ability to do this work because they cannot compete with the marketing arm of the larger firms. In the next five years, the majority of schools will be built by the same five companies. There do not appear to be real consequences for public entities that do not follow the law short of going to the media. The entities know that the only way they will be held accountable is by a long and expensive trial - a trial most people are not willing to put themselves through. CCSD is illegally holding funds on us as I type this and we know it will cost us more to fight them so we just have to sit here and not so patiently wait.	Yes	Positive	Self-explanatory.	No								
7	IT PAINTING	338132	All of the above;	LOWER PREVEILING WAGES RATE TO \$100,000	MORE OPURTUNITY FOR ALL	Yes	Positive	STATE GETS MORE WORK DONE WITH LESS BUDGET	No								
8	BRAMCO CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION	338.62	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Keep in person paper proposals to be allowed.	Submittal of the current electronic submission of the proposals has its problems if the NDOT web site is down.	Yes	Negative	Perhaps an electronic submission of the proposal isn't able to be submitted due to a web site problem or the contractor's computer is experiencing problems.	No								
9	Etchemendy Engineering Inc	625.61	Obsolete;	Eliminate the need for encrypting signatures. With todays computer technology it doesn't protect anything and just causes undue complication for the designers, jurisdictions and contractors.	With todays computer technology it doesn't protect anything and just causes undue complication for the designers, jurisdictions and contractors.	No	Positive	I don't see any adverse effects, the current requirements are outdated, unnecessary and can be circumvented simply. The benefits would be eliminating undue complication for the designers, jurisdictions and contractors.	No								
10	PERFORMANCE ELECTRIC	341.1	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Electronic submission	Using a billing platform such as WAWF or IPP	Yes	Positive	Could be cost efficient by saving potential interest or penalty	No								
11	AAA Air Filter Co	171104	All of the above;	No issues	N/A	No	Positive	None	No								
12	FEA Consulting Engineers	338.13	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	n/a	n/a	Yes	Positive	n/a	No								
13	Optiv Security Inc.	336.4	Unnecessarily onerous;	Change the 10 day period to 10 business days.	n/a	No	Positive	Benefits - Allowing appropriate time to provide an appeal of disqualification will lea	No								
14	Shaheen Beauchamp Builders	338.64	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Open up the CMAR process and allow more projects to more GCs.	Because of the format and point system, it has become limited to a select group of large GCs who are awarded all the projects. Excluding a larger number of qualified GCs who can not compete. The State loses out because competition is removed from the process.	Yes	Positive	More competition in the process will save the State big dollars and allow smaller Ne	Yes	338.46	Unnecessarily onerous;	Streamline and speed up	Streamline and speed up would same all parties time and money	Yes	Positive	Streamline and speed up would same all parties time and money	No
15	George M. Rogers, Architect	0	All of the above;	the regulations are okay	changes do not need to occur	No	Positive	none	No								

