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CHAIRMAN METCALF: This is the time and place for the State Public Works Board Meeting, Thursday, December 18th at 9:00 a.m. The first item on the agenda is roll call. Michelle?

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Michelle Schierholt, for the record. State Public Works Boards Meeting roll call for December 18th, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Tom Metcalf?

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Yes.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Vice-Chairman Sean Stewart?

VICE-CHAIRMAN STEWART: Here.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Member Bryce Clutts?

MEMBER CLUTTS: Here.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Member Steven Kwon?

MEMBER KWON: Here.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Member Tito Tiberti?

MEMBER TIBERTI: Here.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Member Roy Walker?

MEMBER WALKER: Here.

MS. SCHIERHOLT: Member Julia Teska?

Mr. Chairman, we have quorum.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Thank you very much. Item Number 2 on the agenda is public comment. Is there any public comment at this time? Anybody down south? Okay.

Seeing none, next item agenda, Agenda Item, I'm sorry, Number Three for Possible Action: Acceptance and Approval of the Public Works Board Meeting Minutes for October 29th, 2014. I'm looking for a motion and a second unless there's any comments.

Member Walker?

MEMBER WALKER: I have no comment. I'd like to motion that these be approved.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: We have a motion. Looking for a second.

MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti. I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Moved and seconded. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD: Aye


Next item: Agenda Item Number 4 for Possible Action: Discussion and Possible Action on the Staff Report as Requested by the Board During Agenda Item #5 at the October 29th, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Gus Nunez?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. For the record, Gus Nunez, Administrator, Public Works Division. At the last meeting, the Board had various comments, but in addition to that, on the matters that we have here today, we’ve been looking at for the deferred maintenance needs of the State to keep our buildings functioning, our facilities functioning.

But you also asked for a number of information, and one of them you needed some information on the buildings and how old they were, so if you go to the first attachment here, you’ll see where we gave you the number of buildings by agency, and which it includes the square footage of the buildings, and I thought it would be interesting, of some interest to you as to who is responsible for the maintenance of these facilities, so we included the maintenance responsibility as one of the line items here.

So as you can see, we’ve got 2,847 buildings, 23,616,824 square feet in total. Of that, Nevada System of Higher Education is 12,314,189. And then State, which includes all of the agencies including NDOT, Legislature, and it comes out to be about 11,302,635 square feet. I hope that this is how you want it. I considered giving you the information on a building by building, but as you can see, 2,800 buildings, it would have been a lot of paper, and I thought a summary might be best for you and to take a look in general at what we, what the State currently has.

And you also asked, you were interested in not only the building inventory, but you wanted to see the year built, when these buildings were built. So that is in the next attachment or exhibit that we gave you, and it’s titled, "Building Inventory by Year Built." And as you can see up at the very top where it says 2020, actually, those are totals to date, which is through the end right now of 2014. And so currently, total square footage again is 23,616,000 plus change. NSHE is about 12 million of that, 12.3 million of that. The rest of it is either DOT, Legislature or State.

As you can see, if you go back a hundred years, so that would be if you look at what we had in 1910 and average that with 1920, it’s probably a little over 900,000 square foot that we had a hundred years ago, not quite a million, and 50 years later, we have approximately 5, 6 million square feet. And then today, you know, up through 50 years, we’ve gone from about a little over five million all the way up to 23 million square feet in facilities.

And if you look all the way over to the right-hand side, you can see it’s broken out. The State facilities, not including the Nevada System of Higher Education, NDOT, or the Legislature on the far right, which are the buildings we typically address in our CIP for deferred maintenance, state funding for deferred maintenance, you can see how the growth has occurred. So if you compare that to the total square footage that’s been built every ten years, you can see where half of the -- over half of that has been Nevada System of Higher Education and less than -- much less than half would be for State government-type facilities.

I wanted to stop here just one second to make sure that, you know, there’s quite a bit of information all the way across the way we -- actually, Ward Patrick broke this thing down for us in this spreadsheet here in case you had a question about, you know, what all of these figures mean. There was quite a breakout all the way across, so I don’t know if everyone picked up on looking at the headings and those numbers and how it’s been broken out, if it makes sense to you, or if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: If it’s okay -- this is Chairman Metcalf -- that maybe we let Gus go through this presentation and then maybe everyone write notes and then come back and ask questions at the end.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That would be great.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: If anybody has another idea, that’s fine, but just continue.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the next tab here, there’s Leasing Services Information. You asked for a breakdown of what we’re currently leasing, and I reported the last time around that we are -- we currently lease about, in general terms throughout the state, about 1.8 million square feet of office space. That includes close to 300 individual leases for that amount.

I think the last time I checked, we were around 289. I think, leases total throughout the State. That’s Southern Nevada and Northern Nevada, which is Reno and Carson City, and then rural would be the rest. And we spend about $34 million dollars a year for these leases. I’ve broken down into northern and southern, and then we took the northern and southern leases. We did not include here any detail, by the way, on the rural, but we included quite a bit of information here on the northern/southern. Southern, again, is pretty much all of Clark County and mainly the Las Vegas Valley area as to what we lease there, and then up north is mainly Reno and Carson City.

And then we broke it farther into what we called Administrative Support and customer, and what we label, define as customer-based services. The reason for...
that generally is that generally -- not the rule, but
2 generally, administrative support services, generally
3 that square footage, it's very adaptable and belongs in
4 a lot of cases for efficiency of operations, they're
5 better located in a government center in government-type
6 buildings altogether, where the others, the ones that are
7 classified as customer based, those are facilities where
8 the program operations there is to provide services
9 directly to the citizens of the State, and they need to
10 be located strategically in areas where their customer
11 base are at, so they don't typically belong in a
12 government center.
13 So basically, what -- You can look at this
14 thing as administrative support is kind of like the hub
15 of a wheel, and then the customer service are the spokes
16 out there that are providing the services directly to the
17 citizens of the State, and the hub is administrative
18 support to support those services that are being rendered
19 in the community. So a lot of them and most of them are
20 SIMCO sensitive. They need to be in certain specific
21 areas to meet all of the requirements of, in a lot of
22 cases, federal requirements. And those typically, like I
23 said, they don't belong in a -- don't lend themselves to
24 being built or located, co-located in a government
25 center.

So quickly going through those, the first one
2 we have, the Northern Nevada Administrative Support
3 Services, and you can see there right now, we're leasing
4 that amounts to 441,000 square feet of office space and
5 2,500 square feet of storage warehouse space. In
6 Southern Nevada, you're looking at those administrative
7 services are approximately 110,660 square feet of office
8 space, and 1,925 square feet of storage warehouse space.
9 Going onto the customer base services in the
10 totals there in Northern Nevada is 489,999 square feet of
11 office space and 8,420 square feet of storage warehouse
12 space. And in Southern Nevada, the total for that is
13 569,773 square feet, or 4,800 square feet of office
14 space. And I just want to reiterate, you know, what I
15 stated about what belongs in the government center and
16 what belongs out there. And I said generally in here,
17 that's the case.
18 In some cases, for instance, there are some
19 what I call customer listed on -- agencies that are
20 listed under customer-based services that actually lend
21 themselves very well to being located in a government
22 center. For instance, many of the agencies under the
23 Department of Business and Industry have very -- even
24 though they provide services to the -- direct services to
25 the State, to the citizens of the State, it's very

affect the life safety of the building, so such as like
2 meaning painting, carpet, re-carpeting, etcetera.
3 Meaning that if it's over a hundred thousand or affects
4 the -- or it's a structural alteration of the building,
5 or if it affects the life safety of the building, then
6 basically, they are directed to request those under the
7 CIP, including those under a hundred thousand, which are
8 under the statewide programs and the CIP, which is the
9 ADA statewide program, roofing, life safety, advanced
10 planning, mold abatement, indoor quality projects that we
11 have. You see in that: in the Capital Improvement Program
12 that we go through every time.
13 There's also what they call a Decision Unit
14 M-425, which was created in 2005 to address air quality
15 issues that at that time were what we call rampant, going
16 through quite a few of our facilities, and most of them
17 dealt with mold issues. And it was basically a result of
18 the lack of maintenance of the building envelope. So
19 basically, those M-425 units were to address the building
20 envelope, including deep cleaning of interiors.
21 And also at that time, Public Works had been
22 noticing for the last several years a lack of maintenance
23 on water treatment on the wet side of the HVAC system, so
24 that was also addressed in the M-425. The nice thing
25 about M-425 is that anything budgeted under that decision
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1 unit, you can transfer to cover other things in other
2 areas of your budget once it was directed there. The
3 other thing I thought it was important was that in those
4 budget instructions, it defines deferred maintenance as
5 maintenance that for whatever reasons was not funded when
6 it was requested, and therefore, it was being requested
7 again as something that can be addressed in M-425.
8 Normally in the industry, we don't define
9 deferred maintenance that way, as you all know, but in
10 the budget instructions, deferred maintenance is defined
11 just if it wasn't -- if you requested one biennium and it
12 wasn't funded, then all of a sudden, that became deferred
13 maintenance.
14 Scheduled maintenance, which is discussed in
15 the budget instructions, like I said, is not defined.
16 And by that, I mean it's a criteria as to how that
17 routine maintenance, our scheduled maintenance, what we
18 call in some cases we call preventive maintenance of all
19 your equipment in the building, equipment systems in the
20 basically, how they're supposed to be maintained and the
21 criteria for maintaining those buildings. That is not
22 defined.
23 So it's basically, at this point, it's left
24 to each individual agency that is responsible for the
25 maintenance of facilities to define that criteria and

1 define what the scheduled maintenance or preventive
2 maintenance program and how that's going to be performed,
3 and to what level it's going to be performed is up to
4 each individual agency that's responsible for the
5 facility to develop that and then implement that, so
6 there's not a statewide standard.
7 I've had recent discussions with the budget
8 office because we are, B&G, Building and Grounds,
9 currently, we've just initiated what we call our
10 preventative maintenance program is now computerized, so
11 we have a computerized maintenance management system
12 which actually schedules -- part of that system will
13 provide, will kick out work orders every day to do the
14 preventative maintenance of the State.
15 To do that, obviously, you've got to define
16 actually what I call locate, tag each piece of equipment
17 on each system in each building and then the criteria
18 as to how that and how often that piece of
19 equipment is going to be maintained, and we just went
20 live with that. It still needs to mature a little bit
21 more, but it's also one of the things that this system
22 has required us to do in order for it to be working, not
23 only to identify every system and piece of equipment in a
24 building, but it requires you to define how you're going
25 to maintain that or what is the criteria for the

1 maintenance of that particular equipment or system, and
2 how often you're going to do that maintenance. It all
3 has to be defined. So for the system, for this
4 computerized maintenance system to work, it forces you to
5 do all of that which needs to be done straight across the
6 board and should be done throughout the state.
7 In discussions with the director, we've been
8 talking about how do we roll that out to the rest of the
9 state so that we can be consistent throughout the state,
10 and that will be coming up hopefully in the future once
11 we get our system completely running, which I'm hoping
12 within the next six months, it will be fully running, we
13 can roll that out to other state agencies.
14 The last part that we wanted to cover the
15 last time around we talked a little bit about public
16 private partnerships, and Susan and I were -- we just
17 happened that at the beginning of this month, there was a
18 seminar in Southern Nevada that part of it addressed what
19 we call these P3s or public private partnerships, and we
20 got a chance to attend. There were other courses there
21 that I attended regarding CPM scheduling, claims, how to
22 settle claims and other things, quite an extensive
23 two-day seminar, but Susan put a small, I guess, a few
24 pages of an update as to what's going on in this country
25 with respect to P3's, and she's just going to present

1 that portion to you.
2 So I would like to, at this point, turn this
3 thing over to Susan Stewart, Counsel, and have her go
4 through this part.
5 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. Mr. Chairman?
6 CHAIRMAN METCALF: You bet.
7 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. For the record,
8 Susan Stewart, Construction Law Counsel. Good morning,
9 everyone. This is intended to be primarily a 10,000-foot
10 level view of what other states are doing with respect to
11 P3.
12 And before I go into a little bit more
13 detail, in your Board packet, Exhibit A, is a Vertical P3
14 Project. There's a map of the United States, and I
15 apologize. When we made the colored copy of this, the
16 green turned out blue, and the tan turned out white, but
17 if you look at the map, it's intended to represent those
18 states that have legislation in place that allow vertical
19 P3 projects. And if you look, Nevada is identified as
20 not definitive.
21 And I suspect the reason for that is that the
22 NDOT does have authority to do P3s, and within their
23 statute, it talks about airports and mass transit
24 facilities, which are and could be vertical, so I think
25 that's why Nevada is listed there as not definitive.
1 I did want to mention that UNR currently has
2 a P3 with Bellflower, I think is the name of the
3 organization, for graduate housing. The Elko Convention
4 Center is currently pursuing a P3, so there are P3s going
5 on in Nevada, but they do not involve the State, per se,
6 so they would operate under different legislation than we
7 would or NDOT would.
8 What I included here for you is just a
9 general overview of what some other states are doing, and
10 it's kind of a little bit of intended to give you a
11 spectrum of what's going on out there. Interesting,
12 California allows local governments to do P3s, but not
13 the State. And my limited understanding of the reasoning
14 for that is there's California Engineers, California
15 State Engineers do a lot of the engineering for all of
16 their projects, and under a P3 scenario, they would lose
17 that role, and so they lobbied effectively to limit P3 to
18 just local governments. That's the skinny I heard on
19 that.
20 Now, P3 was authorized under separate
21 legislation, and I included in Exhibit B just a brief
22 summary sheet of the Governor George Deukmejian
23 Courthouse in Long Beach, and that was separate
24 legislative authority given to the administrative office
25 of the courts. And the reason that I included this in

here is I just thought that this was a very interesting
concept. It is the Long Beach Courthouse, but for the
State of California. But they lease a huge portion of
the building to the county, and then there's also retail
space in the building.

Also, my understanding is it is a
performance-based arrangement, so if the building doesn't
perform to certain standards, the amount that the -- I
think it's the Judicial Council of California is required
to pay can be adjusted if the building doesn't perform as
required. So I just thought that was a very innovative
way to partner with county, state, and local retail
businesses, and included that as an example.

Arizona is an example that is, I think,
similar to what Nevada has. It allows P3s, but it's
related to transportation facilities. And then finally,
I included just a little bit of information about
Florida. Florida is essentially wide open and encourages
P3s on all different levels for counties, municipalities,
school boards, and all other political subdivisions for
both vertical and horizontal projects. This was
intentionally just kind of a broad presentation.

If there's, you know, if you have any
questions you want me to drill down, there's certainly
templates here for moving forward if it's something the

1 Board wants us to pursue, and that's the conclusion of my
2 presentation. Gus has one more thing.
3 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. Just to conclude
4 on this thing, you know, basically, the bottom line is
5 for vertical, for let's say a general office building in
6 the State of Nevada, to do a P3, it would require
7 legislative action. So right now as it stands, or
8 enabling the Legislature as it stands, we couldn't do a
9 P3.
10 However, I want to make sure that you
11 understand that we can do lease purchase, which is how
12 the Bryan Building was done, and that's under the
13 treasurer's NRS. Also, a scenario of a lease, leaseback,
14 where the State would own the facility at the end of the
15 term, I think, I believe that we've looked into that, and
16 I think that would also fall under the definition under
17 the treasurer's NRS that could be that type of
18 arrangement would also work in the same way that I
19 would classify as a lease purchase.
20 We, Public Works right now currently has, is
21 in the final throws of contracting. We went through the
22 RFP process, through purchasing, and to select a firm
23 team out there to look at these scenarios. As you know,
24 we always, every biennium, we look at owned versus leased
25 for State facilities, and that's what happened with the

1 Bryan Building. We found out that it made sense at that
time to own versus continue to lease for DCNR at that
time here in the Carson City area, and we moved ahead.
2 What happened after that, after the project
3 was built, is that we had -- we went through quite a bit
4 of an inflation, and lease rates actually went through
5 deflation then after that because of the economic issues
6 that we went through. So lease purchases was no longer
7 -- no longer made sense at that point. But we've been
8 looking at it every biennium, but we've been doing that
9 work in-house.
10 So this time around, we wanted to look at
11 just instead of strictly lease purchase like we did the
12 Bryan Building, we wanted to look at other ways that
13 maybe the State may be feasible to do under current
14 statutes to determine, to answer that question is it
15 better to continue to lease the facilities that we have,
16 or would it be better to own. Again, lease versus own,
17 and we wanted to look at all of the options that are
18 available currently in the marketplace that are currently
19 legally authorized under the Nevada Revised Statutes.
20 And we are just -- we finished, we just at
21 this point, we just finished negotiating the contract,
22 and the contract is being prepared to be signed, and we
23 expect to see the results of that in the next 60 days,
MEMBER TIBERTI: Well, I've gone through this carefully trying to find Sean Stewart's hidden ownership in these things. He must have a sophisticated dealing here because I didn't see Stewart on anything.

I think this is great, kidding aside, I think this information, Gus, is really going to be needed because I'm really concerned about the deferred maintenance of this whole state for all of the stuff. I think you getting your group to have all of this data of what we're getting up to because we always love to go build new buildings, but we've got to take care of what we've got, and it looks like to me, I'm waking up to the fact that the whole state and the county and the city, we all have lots of buildings that we built.

If you look at the schedule of decades you have, you know the 2000's and 1990's, you know, we built a huge number of buildings, and that's starting to be 15, 18, 20 years old. And another three, four, five six seven, eight years, it's going to be a huge amount of maintenance. And I'd like to be the responsible agency that telegraphs this to everybody because nobody likes taking money from a glamorous sexy project, putting it into a boiler or a roof or, you know, something like that.

So I think this is going to be something that's going to sober up a lot of people on what we've got a responsibility for what we've already got. So nothing can wake us up better than you having good data, so I'm really supportive of this whole computerized breaking it down and projections so we can talk to the Legislature in a way that makes some sense.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Member Clutts?

MEMBER CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts, for the record.

Gus, just a couple of clarifying. So the agency building area summary, that is what we own; correct?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Let me go there right quick.

MEMBER CLUTTS: The 23 million square feet?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes. On that, the 23 million, that includes the Nevada System of Higher Education and the Legislature and DOT.

MEMBER CLUTTS: But that's not leased.

That's all owned?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Exactly. That is all owned.

MEMBER CLUTTS: And I was trying to hear. I was having a hard time. It's more on me. With respect to the feasibility study, Gus, that you mentioned, is that feasibility study to assess the cost difference between what it's costing the State to own versus lease...
1 with respect to maintenance? Did I understand that
2 correctly?
3 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. What that will
4 evaluate is we'll look at what is the capital cost of
5 leasing -- well, the capital cost of owning, and what the
6 debt service requirements would be for that and then
7 compare that to what we're paying on leases.
8 So again, we're paying $34 million dollars a
9 year on leases, granted a lot of those don't belong in a
10 government building in a government complex, but
11 certainly some of them definitely do. So based on how
12 much we're currently paying for leases, it is more
13 economical to build and own, or is it more economical for
14 the State to continue to lease? That is the question
15 that we ask ourselves every biennium. Like I said, we
16 look at that. We've been looking at that every biennium
17 and doing that work in-house.
18 What we've done this time around is that
19 we're outsourcing for the first time that analysis, and
20 to be done by a private firm right now, and that's where
21 hopefully we'll see some results back here in the next 60
22 days. But obviously, if we end up in a lease, leaseback
23 scenario rather than lease, straight lease purchase, we
24 could certainly be looking at something that would
25 include the deferred maintenance needs because I imagine

1 investors are going to want to make sure that -- at least
2 through the terms of the lease, that things are taken
3 care of.
4 MEMBER CLUTTS: Yeah, that was going to be my
5 next comment is in that assessment. Are we looking at
6 what the cost of the maintenance is when we own buildings
7 versus what the cost is of the maintenance by the
8 landlord's to some degree built into the lease in
9 assessing both the capital cost of the purchase plus the
10 cost of the maintenance versus the lease. Is that
11 maintenance component being considered so we can really
12 get an apples-to-apples idea?
13 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. What we
14 typically do, we go okay. It's going to cost ex amount
15 of money to build. Let's say we recently did an analysis
16 in-house on a 135,000 square-foot building in Vegas and
17 figure out what the -- contacted the treasurer's office
18 with respect to what sort of interest should we assume
19 for this, you know, analysis that we're doing just for
20 the debt service. They said, "Use five percent." We
21 used five percent and we said, okay. If we are paying
22 monthly on that, what is the monthly payment, and what
23 does that look like per square foot.
24 In addition to that, what we do is we say,
25 okay. Then we apply what we're currently paying for

1 average, what we pay on all of our buildings here in the
2 State, B&G buildings, the ones that B&G maintains, we
3 have data on that. We usually pay anywhere from 7 cents
4 to 11 cents for janitorial, we pay around 22 cents a
5 square foot for utilities, we -- and I shouldn't say pay.
6 That's what it's costing us. And it's costing us around
7 30, 35 cents for maintenance. And we also have to put in
8 for Capitol Police. I think Capitol Police is around 14
9 cents a square foot.
10 So anyhow, we actually take what the debt
11 service is, we add to that, you know, janitorial,
12 utilities and maintenance, and if it's going to be a B&G
13 building, we have to add Capitol Police because we fund
14 Capitol Police to that, and then we compare that rate
15 that we come up with to the rate that we're paying for
16 leased space for a full-service lease. So typically, all
17 of our leases are full-service, basically, so it includes
18 all of those items. It includes janitorial, maintenance,
19 and utilities. That's what we typically negotiate on all
20 of our leases. So we make a comparison at that point.
21 The other thing that we know is that
22 traditionally, except for we had a downward spike there
23 here awhile back, leases have generally been going up
24 about one and a half percent per year, so that's what
25 we've been experiencing if you look back over time. So

1 in the analysis, you need to take that into
2 consideration, where if you own that payment is set now
3 for the next -- let's say that you look at a 25-year term
4 to pay off that facility. You know that for 25 years,
5 that's set, where you're leasing, that rate is going
6 to continue to escalate over time. That's what we
7 typically experience with the State.
8 And obviously, after 25 years, you own it
9 free and clear, and that needs to be taken into
10 consideration. But at the end of the day, you do need to
11 consider under the current economic conditions of the
12 state, you really have to pay attention as to what is --
13 what are you going to be paying in on day one versus what
14 you're currently paying because, you know, we just don't
15 have any money to do any different at this point. So you
16 really are somewhat, because of the economic conditions,
17 again things are looking, in our opinion from what we see
18 and hear, is that things are improving. The economy is
19 improving, but we just saw that we here recently at an
20 IFC meeting that we had an issue with some shortfalls on
21 our revenue projections that we all saw here recently
22 that was presented at the Interim Finance Committee to
23 the Legislature.
24 So generally, I think we're looking at
25 improvements, but today right now, I think you got to
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| 1 | issue of what my thinking, again, I'm just kind of |
| 2 | thinking out loud. The maintenance issue is absolutely |
| 3 | huge. |
| 4 | Now to go to things that I know sitting as a |
| 5 | Board member. We are governed by NRS 341. Within 341, |
| 6 | we are given in title planning, maintenance, and |
| 7 | construction. But then as you go farther into this into |
| 8 | weasel words, I'll say, it takes away maintenance from |
| 9 | this Board because it doesn't allow us to do that. But |
| 10 | yet in our budget projections, we have our maintenance |
| 11 | items, which are the M items, which amounted to $64 |
| 12 | million dollars out of a $68 million-dollar budget. So |
| 13 | I'm kind of confused. |
| 14 | How do we address the maintenance issue when |
| 15 | legislatively, I believe they've taken -- maintenance is |
| 16 | not under our real thing we're supposed to be doing, but |
| 17 | there is nobody else doing maintenance within the state, |
| 18 | so I think we have to take control of the maintenance |
| 19 | because it's the biggest part of our budget. So I do |
| 20 | know that. |
| 21 | When I look at what is presented to us, it's |
| 22 | not called maintenance. It's called repairs and remove |
| 23 | and replace. So in repairs and move and replace, is that |
| 24 | how, I guess, this would be to Susan, we get through that |
| 25 | issue? |

| 1 | the road of least resistance. |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN METCALF: Member Clutts, this is |
| 3 | Chairman Metcalf. I've been writing notes while |
| 4 | everybody has been talking. Maybe if we could let |
| 5 | everybody finish, and then I'll try to read through my |
| 6 | notes and see if everyone can poke holes at it. How is |
| 7 | that? |
| 8 | MEMBER CLUTTS: Yeah, I'm done. That was my |
| 9 | last comment. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN METCALF: Member Walker? |
| 11 | MEMBER TIBERTI: Chairman? |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN METCALF: Oh, I'm sorry. Member |
| 13 | Tiberti? |
| 14 | MEMBER TIBERTI: We have Steve Kwon here. |
| 15 | Sorry. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN METCALF: Oh, I thought I started |
| 17 | with him, sir. |
| 18 | MEMBER TIBERTI: Okay. I'm sorry. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN METCALF: Member Walker? |
| 20 | MEMBER WALKER: Member Walker. I believe |
| 21 | there's about three issues that we have before us today. |
| 22 | One is maintenance, one is getting the biggest bang for |
| 23 | our buck, and the other one is selling what will |
| 24 | eventually come out of this. |
| 25 | I'd like to address first the maintenance |

| 1 | Then from the maintenance part of this, from |
| 2 | the facility maintenance that each agency gets, I should |
| 3 | probably frame the issue. I could go buy a new car |
| 4 | today, not put oil in it, not change the oil in it, and |
| 5 | maybe get 20,000 miles out of it, or I could buy a new |
| 6 | car today, change the oil per the factory warranty, drive |
| 7 | it, and get 300,000 miles out of it. |
| 8 | And I'm relatively appalled when the State |
| 9 | doesn't have a maintenance issue that can determine are |
| 10 | we going to get 300,000 miles out of our car or 30,000 |
| 11 | miles out of our car. There is a need for, I think as a |
| 12 | board, we've got to scoop this in. There's a huge issue |
| 13 | of are we going to have a 30,000-mile car or a |
| 14 | 300,000-mile car. So when there isn't a policy within |
| 15 | the State to do this, huge gaping hole. |
| 16 | I know that from my business, I have a lot of |
| 17 | equipment. My maintenance budget for my equipment, rough |
| 18 | numbers, I spend 65 percent of my maintenance budget on |
| 19 | preventive maintenance; 35 percent on maintenance, on |
| 20 | fixing things in a routine, scheduled manner. I do my |
| 21 | preventative maintenance, and I get, from my 30,000-mile |
| 22 | car, I get 300,000 miles. That's how I have to run |
| 23 | economically. And we don't do that. |
| 24 | Agencies are given an instruction: All |
| 25 | routine and scheduled maintenance. I really don't know
1 what that means, and I'm probably more closer than the
director at the agency to that. Premature failure of
3 HVAC. We've witnessed so much premature failure here
4 within the State. The inventory that Gus mentioned. We
5 need that. Deep cleaning of interior. Okay. Deferred
6 maintenance issues, and the definition. You'll love this
7 one. How many millions of dollars have you submitted to
8 us to do things we can't approve because we don't have
9 money and that gets added onto the end? Tito's first
10 part of this is absolutely huge with using the State's
11 own definition of things. This is just being swept under
12 the rug, in my simple terms. And I think I've made
13 enough talk there.
14 The second issue, how do we get the biggest
15 bang for our buck? Absolutely have to go down this road.
16 There's no doubt. Our preventative maintenance is taking
17 up all of the money. There won't be any new. Then the
18 third is how do we sell it. Director Bryce had the right
19 answer. We've got to sell this stuff.
20 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Yeah.
21 MEMBER WALKER: And that's the issue. So
22 that's enough for me right now.
23 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Thank you, Member Walker.
24 I'd like to -- there's no public, I guess, that's walked
25 in in the south since I've asked?

1 MEMBER CLUTTS: No, sir.
2 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Or no state agency
3 representatives?
4 MEMBER CLUTTS: No.
5 CHAIRMAN METCALF: We have several members up
6 here. I'd like to throw it out to anybody here in the
7 audience that would like to say anything at this point
8 before I try to put a bow around something.
9 Mr. Davis from NDEP?
10 MR. DAVIS: Or State Parks.
11 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Or State Parks.
12 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. I think that Mr. Walker
13 stated it succinctly. I mean, you know, we do submit, in
14 our operations budget, in our maintenance budgets on an
15 annual basis and get a small percentage. We submit in
16 M-425, the massive list, which is then culled down to a
17 small percentage, which then brings us to having to bring
18 it to development through the CIP because things are
19 falling apart by that point. And if you want to sum it
20 up in a nutshell, that's it.
21 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Deferred maintenance. Is
22 there any other comment?
23 Mr. Chimits, do you have anything to say?
24 I'm just offering before I kind of --
25 DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CHIMITS: No.
1 the facilities maintenance description, it says here:
2 Deferred maintenance basically needs to be handled by the
3 agency. All routine and scheduled maintenance, building
4 improvements and repairs under a hundred thousand
5 dollars.
6 Well, that's not going to come to us, but who
7 says that these agencies -- and I cannot blame anybody
8 period, and I'm not pointing fingers, doesn't bundle
9 these under a hundred thousand-dollar deferred
10 maintenance issues until they become a hundred thousand
11 because they have to because of other pressures. How do
12 we quantify that. Yesterday, Gus shared a projection of
13 inflation report to me that is it Cummings?
14 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Uh-huh.
15 CHAIRMAN METCALF: I'd like every member of
16 the Board to get a copy of that because we're all in the
17 industry, but Gus, when you get a chance, you might want
18 to -- I'm not going to say anything about it. I'll let
19 you do it after. I'm almost done. Maybe -- because
20 that's scary, that report.
21 And the last item is what everybody's been
22 talking about. We could talk about this all day long and
23 have meetings, get some interesting information. We need
24 to sell this. Well, who do we sell this to? We have to
25 sell it to the Legislature, and that's kind of the end.

1 And again, it's offering solutions. We can identify the
2 problem, we can help, but we have to offer solutions.
3 And to me, that needs to go to the Legislature.
4 Gus, if want to make a real quick comment on
5 that Cummings report, it was real interesting.
6 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We just received a
7 report from this company. They do keep track of the bids
8 and inflation in this area, and they're -- I think
9 they're a little bit on the high side myself, but they're
10 project -- they did part of the report and their
11 analysis, they did a pre-Tesla report, and this is for
12 Northern Nevada, by the way. A pre-Tesla report, and
13 one, a post-Tesla report on projections.
14 And for '15 and '16 -- I can go get the
15 report. For '15, I think they were projecting eight
16 percent inflation, and for '16, they're projecting 10
17 percent. And I think it comes back down a bit for '17
18 and '18. Yeah, it's quite concerning to us because we
19 obviously prepared our CIP and inflation that's in the
20 CIP is pre-Tesla. And so we're right now looking at the
21 CIP very, very closely.
22 And I think post-Tesla, we have, after the
23 analysis was done, I think we were looking more around
24 perhaps inflation could go up as much as, you know, up to
25 four and a half percent, maybe five, but this report was

1 -- I need to look at it myself, actually. I just
2 received it a couple of days ago, and yesterday I didn't
3 get much of a chance to look at it in any detail, but I
4 know that it's got us -- it's got Chris and I over here
5 squirming in our seat a little bit with respect to the
6 budget that we prepare for the CIP, and we're giving a
7 heads-up to the budget office. We're giving a look at
8 actually doing a little more detailed analysis to
9 determine which projects, for instance, are going to go, 10
and how quickly they will go as soon as the CIP is
11 approved in July of next year once the CIP is approved.
12 What's going to go out to bid right off the shoot, and
13 how much do we have in there for inflation and
14 contingencies.
15 So we're sort of extremely concerned about
16 inflation at this point. And if that's correct, boy, we
17 haven't seen that since 2004-2005, in there, 2006 where
18 we were experiencing like one to one and a half percent
19 per month at that time. So I hope we don't see that
20 again. I think that they're a bit on the high side, but
21 we're consulting with others, seeing where they're at and
22 now with their post-Tesla projections for this area up
23 here.
24 I know a lot of the primes here are concerned
25 with respect to finding sufficient amount of subs because
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<td>1 a future meeting in addition to maybe we have, like you 2 indicated, having the firm that's doing our feasibility 3 study right now actually instead of waiting for a report 4 to come in, we'll see if they can come in and actually do 5 an actual presentation on their findings at that point to 6 the Board. 7 But we certainly -- but I think that we have 8 a lot of -- we've presented a lot of data and 9 information, and I think we're probably in a position, 10 and I think some of these categories that you've been 11 looking at with respect to starting to quantify, trying 12 to quantify as best as we can and project what our needs 13 are or should be, you know, to the level of funding that 14 we should have in order to keep up. It's an issue. 15 One of the things that I learned, I've been 16 thinking about since the meeting that we had yesterday 17 with Mark and the director from DCNR is that just like I 18 pointed out to the director, when we looked at when the 19 PM's basically looked in detail at all of our projects 20 this time around, they came back and said we need to do 21 about projects that they felt in their opinion needed to 22 be done here in the next CIP. I think that they 23 identified about 200 million of those projects that 24 needed to be done. 25 Then we understand that all we have is like 26 amount of maintenance that we do. And the only way to 27 increase that is additional funding. I just, for 28 maintenance purposes, I just don't see a really another 29 way around. 30 Obviously, as you saw this time around, we're 31 trying to do as much as we can with other funding, so 32 we're identifying projects that have a payback of, you 33 know, of 15 years or less so that we can get together 34 with the agency and say would you be willing to pay for 35 this particular upgrade, replacement, whatever it may be, 36 from the utilities savings that you're going to have in 37 your budget over the next 15, 20 years. Would you be 38 willing to do that? 39 If they're willing to do that, then we're 40 putting it into that statewide energy efficiency 41 statewide that we've created, and therefore, we can go 42 after some type of a revenue bond to do those projects so 43 that we have more money to do other projects that don't 44 have a payback, that is not a -- it's not something 45 that's going to have savings from your utility bills, or 46 even if it does, the savings are such that you can't pay 47 them back in a reasonable amount of time. So those are 48 the things that we're trying to do. And obviously, we 49 need to do more. 50 But like I said, I think it's time to start</td>
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| 1 $65 million dollars, so now you've got to prioritize. 2 You can't just say we have 200 million. We don't have to 3 prioritize. We just say we're going to do all of those 4 projects. But because there's not sufficient money, we 5 need to prioritize. Okay. So when we prioritize, how do 6 we do that? Well, we've got to look at essential 7 facilities like prisons. You can't shut down Ely State 8 Prison or Lovelock or Southern Desert. Those things have 9 to function. Hospitals, for your psychiatric hospitals, 10 your forensic hospitals, HHS manages. You can't let 11 those things shut down. You've got to keep up with them. 12 So what happens is, for instance, with State 13 Parks, with Museums, by the time you get to them, the 14 money is already pretty much all gone. And it's not the 15 fact that it's all gone and they can look forward to next 16 biennium, but it's gone, and the next biennium, the same 17 thing is going to happen at this level of funding. And 18 pretty soon, somewhere along the line, they're going to 19 be faced with potentially partial shutdowns of facilities 20 or maybe -- 21 MR. DAVIS: Or complete. 22 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- or complete shutdown 23 of some of their facilities. So that's an issue that 24 needs to be, you know, needs to be addressed. And the 25 only way to address it is to basically increase the 26 sort of like taking all of this information, start making 27 some sense out of it, putting it together and bringing 28 some recommendation, start bringing some proposed 29 recommendations for you to consider and deliberate or any 30 others that you may want us to look at in detail. 31 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Thank you, Gus. I'm going 32 to go back to Member Walker and then throw it back to the 33 South, and then I've got a couple of things. Maybe we 34 can wrap this up, a couple notes. Member Walker? 35 MEMBER WALKER: I'll be real short. The 36 State being without a real maintenance policy, I see that 37 as something that we inherited from Buildings and 38 Grounds, and it came from Buildings and Grounds to Public 39 Works, so I don't see any issue with remaining business 40 as usual. But I do believe we can get some, at a 41 minimum, some policies of how this would be dealt with. 42 But with a policy, I chime right back with Gus, comes 43 funding of a policy. No matter how we turn this cubit, 44 it is going to come back to that dollar. And with that, 45 it's in search of money to do this because it is -- there 46 are two times two four, and as we look at each CIP 47 budget, it's almost a squared issue that comes back 48 before us every year. 49 And without solving the dollars, it was a 50 coin coincidence that the AFCE report on the State of Nevada
yesterday that our infrastructure is down $1.5 billion dollars, it came out. And we're discussing this, and it's how do you begin to eat away at this apple that's not -- we can supply some solution to the legislative body, but this is political about dollars. As Tito said, are you going to buy a vote with a new building or buy a vote with a mechanical system inside a building? They're not cute. I would like to move forward with maintenance, which will continue, I guess, to you. Do we have the authority to, or are we just going to take it and move forward?

COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan Stewart, Construction Law Counsel. We do have authority under 341 to perform maintenance. And generally, the breaking point, my understanding is, the hundred thousand dollar is it belongs with and it would be termed major maintenance.

I think that there -- If you look at what we put together for you, there are some gaps there in what is deferred maintenance, what is major maintenance, what is repair, remodel. A lot of those terms have not been defined, and I think what's missing is also what is the agency's responsibility, going to your point of are we going to have a, you know, a vehicle that dies at, you know, 30,000 miles or 300,000 miles, and how do we account for that.

And there may be some direction to develop some policies and perhaps proposal of some statutes that address that, and of course it all comes back down to how it is going to be funded, but at least perhaps that's a way to approach a solution that okay, we've got to at least identify what the issues are, and then hopefully come to a solution of how we, you know, ultimately address it.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Are there -- I've got, I think, maybe I can wrap this up, but I would like to throw it back down to the south if there's any Board comments. Anybody down there? Member Stewart?

VICE-CHAIRMAN STEWART: Yes. Sean Stewart, for the record. I'm not sure if this is more appropriate in the Board comment on the next item, but I'll just bring it up.

The agency and the NCA are running a bill this legislative cycle, infrastructure bill designed -- the general concept is to try to get a one-shot funding for infrastructure that would be administered by the State Public Works Committee or the State Public Works Office. We've had preliminary talks. It's going to be held -- it's going to be run by the Senate. So I don't know where it's going to go.

There's obviously a huge shortfall in the budget, but it's going to give us a platform, I think, to bring these issues to light with the Legislature. So I'm in full support of getting what detail we can get together because there's obviously going to be hearings through this bill where we can educate the Legislature, if nothing else, on the shortage we have in this funding. So just bringing that to light to the Board.

COUNSEL STEWART: I would just like to chime in real quick. For the record, Susan Stewart. One of the things I included in your packet of information is the Florida statutes. And one of the things included in their legislation is the Legislature's findings and intent. And if you read that -- and this is in connection with the P3 legislation that Florida recently put into place, it says, "The Legislature finds that there is a public need for construction or upgrade of facilities that are used predominately for public purposes."

And then, you know, they go on to say, "There's a public need for timely and cost-effective acquisition, design, construction," etcetera, etcetera, and then it says, "There are inadequate resources to develop new educational facilities, transportation," etcetera, etcetera, "and a public private partnership has demonstrated that it can meet the needs by improving the schedule for delivery, knowing costs and providing other benefits for the public."

So it seems to me that other states have faced the exact issue that we're facing. So, you know, maybe we don't need to completely reinvent the wheel, but can look and see what other states are doing, you know, by further drilling down as far as, you know, exactly what they've done. Because it seems to me that they've, you know, that this is an indication they're finding that they face the exact same, you know, issues that we are.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: And, Ms. Stewart, there's how do I say this. We've got the beginning part, not beginning part, but where we kind of decided to start this process. NSHE said we have a billion and a half deferred maintenance. And you have this statement here on this page that Florida, actually the Legislature put this in their record; correct?

COUNSEL STEWART: Yes, this is part of their statute.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: So to get from where we were from August when the guy from NSHE said we're a billion and a half behind in deferred maintenance to get to something like this, we have to have concrete evidence and concrete findings to give to the Legislature.
And again, before I finish this up, is there any more comments down south?
MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti, for the record. I have a -- and I mentioned this before, so I'm being redundant, but in my experience in our own private developments, there's two things that strike me, is one we were developing a hotel-casino, and it was a six million dollar sign. I think I mentioned this before, and I was telling my partner, you know, "The sign is going to be six million dollars." He said, "Yeah, but we're leasing that." I said, "Well, okay. However, we're paying rent to the leasing guy, or we're increasing our loan amount, and we're paying a little more principal and interest on the loan." So to me, I was trying to put down all these things that were going to cost us money. And he kept arguing with me, "Well, we're leasing." And I said, "Well, we can lease it, or we can just increase our loan by six million dollars."

And I was working on a project down here that was a combination of city and county, and Guy Hoff, he's an analyst, as you know, and he said, "I don't know how you can make this work because government interest rates trump any gains you could bring to the party." Our rates are going to trump your gains because we can borrow the money at three percent, and you're going to pay seven percent or something. And he did a big study for me. It is hard, in my opinion, to trump government borrowing rates by all of this other stuff. So I just wanted to introduce it that it's kind of like I'm not seeing a free lunch out here by trying to do public private partnership or whatever all that means. I just wanted to sober up a little bit of this. To me, it's more difficult than it might seem, really. We're out of money. I guess that's what I'm saying, and there's no panacea that I can see that's going to be easy. I don't want to throw a wet blanket on everything. I'm just trying to be realistic. So that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: And, Member Tiberti, I hear you. But, I mean, just recently, I met a gentleman that is in the P3 arena, and he uses tax-free bonds. And this gentleman said, "Oh, yeah. We helped fund a P3 partnership that owns the airport in the country of Sweden," you know, and it was tax-free bonds out of London. So, you know, there are some different ways than just conventional financing out of the bank. But still, you're right. There's, you know, somebody is going to make a profit somewhere. Is there any other comments down south before we try to wrap this up? What I'd like to see if everyone agrees with is we have -- We've been told that there's a lot of deferred maintenance out there, and we don't know what the number is. Is it a billion and a half? Is it three billion? Whatever it is. We've got some nice reports here of how many buildings, how many square feet. Gus has offered that maybe we can start quantifying this. And I'm not going to put a timeline on anything, but maybe we come up with a matrix on these 2,800 buildings that we go back to the agencies.

And I just wrote some quick notes, and this can be anything, but hey, give us your deferred maintenance on your site, your structure, your envelope, your finishes and equipment, meaning like kitchen equipment or things like that, and your systems, which would be MEP, things like that, and just kind of give a matrix and because then you can kind of quantify it too, again, by these items. And again, what is deferred, quantify it, and then slip it into a timeline into our biennium, our CIP biennium. Show that we've got 8 and a half percent increase in pricing in the next year and ten percent in 2016, and that really hurts us even more. But if we can start coming back to something like that, then maybe we can get down to what Florida did someday.
talking, you know, kind of whispering during one of the last meetings, and she said she wants to hear it.

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CHIMITS: Right. We need to define the terms first because I heard that I think it was Ron Zurich that said they had a $1.5 billion worth in deferred maintenance. I don't know what that means. I really don't know what he meant by that.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Well, can we find out?

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CHIMITS: We can find out. And also, we have our own staff here who can help us to define what level, like priority one, priority two, and priority three levels of maintenance that we have in our statewide owned buildings and quantify that for you fairly quickly, I think.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Including NSHE?

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CHIMITS: No, No, NSHE has their own facilities maintenance program that we could probably get from them.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: I mean, if Ron said $1.5 billion, where did he get it from?

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CHIMITS: He probably got it from their facilities maintenance program.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Which is over ten years, typically over ten years. The problem with those reports over ten years is that those projects that they're 7, 8, ten years, things get a little fuzzy way out there. But it sort of gives you a sort of like level of magnitude idea as to what's going to be, you know, more or less.

MEMBER WALKER: Next layer of building.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Well, it just makes sense with our last economic downturn that deferred maintenance is going to pile on top of each other. Now, as we try to claw out of the bad economy and hopefully get into a better economy, we've got all of this quote, "Piled up deferred maintenance." Let's quantify it because we can't have a Legislature out there thinking we're going to get some sexy new buildings for the constituents or for the State or whatever, and we're sitting here with a pile of deferred maintenance that nobody knows about. So do we need any kind of an action on this agenda item or --

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Can I give a shot at --

CHAIRMAN METCALF: -- something?

COUNSEL STEWART: No, we don't need it. No, we don't need a vote or anything.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Just from what I hear and --

COUNSEL STEWART: You want to summarize, Gus?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. I heard from the Board that there are issues with what I would call scheduled maintenance or preventative maintenance. I wanted to delve into that a little bit and perhaps bring some recommendations over to you in that area to try to, as Roy mentioned, some type of a policy, I think that which goes along with funding.

That may be probably more along the ways of a process to get there because it's going to be very difficult to quantify here in the next couple of months, but at least we can make a recommendation as to what should be done with respect to your scheduled routine preventative maintenance program throughout the state. That's one thing. We can feed off of what we're doing with B&G. If that sounds reasonable to you all, perhaps we can make some recommendations along what B&G is doing currently in that process.

We're looking at also about getting a handle on deferred maintenance and for all of the facilities in the state, and to perhaps try to define what exact -- a better definition of what deferred maintenance is that belongs in the CIP that the Board wants to look at and what that level of funding should be.

In addition to that, you know, I've heard about like P3 and like, you know, P3 is just going to be hopefully, or which we can't do right now. That's something that we can look at for something that we could recommend to the Governor and the Legislature to maybe look at in the future as another tool in our tool belt to fund facilities when we're looking at owned versus leased.

Certainly, in looking at this map that was provided as to certainly the trend in the country seems to be going to having P3 as a tool belt, as one of the tools in the State's tool belt to get projects done in a cost-effective manner. That's not to say that there are not other methods out there depending on what the project is that is more cost effective than a P3, but obviously, having more tools in your tool belt that you can use and utilize, the better decisions, the better analysis you can do, and the better decisions you can make to what is the best course depending as to what you're trying to achieve for a particular project or do a particular project.

So we can -- and we'll tie that into the feasibility and analysis report that this consultant firm is going to be doing for us, but only in the areas we've narrowed that down to only in areas where we currently have authority to do within the current laws, not -- P3 is not something that we currently have in our tool belt, you know. It's not a tool for us that we can
1 use.
2 So I see those three areas that we can kind
3 of start by using the information that we brought forth
4 to you that we currently have, start bringing and what
5 we're doing with respect to B&G and where we're at with
6 respect to facilities, the information from facilities
7 group here at Public Works, and the recent request versus
8 level of funding that we've had, and start putting this
9 together and try to start making some sense so that we
10 can -- actually the Board can look at making some
11 recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature to
12 move forward with respect to the future for you all to
13 consider.
14 But I think perhaps at the next meeting, we
15 can start bringing some information and suggestions to
16 you in those three areas, and you all can debate and
17 decide what you want to move forward with respect to
18 making any reports or recommendations to the Governor
19 and/or the Legislature.
20 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Are there -- I think that
21 might have just been number five.
22 COUNSEL STEWART: I just have a quick
23 question. Gus, did you, in your summary, did you mean to
24 include trying to identify deferred maintenance, the
25 existing obligation as we know it based upon what was

1 submitted for the CIP and what we had to prioritize?
2 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Exactly. And we've
3 brought a lot of that information forward that we've
4 discussed in prior meetings. It's just a matter of now
5 putting it all together, analyzing it, and doing some
6 projections and saying okay, and bringing some suggested
7 recommendations back to you that you can massage and do
8 whatever you want with it.
9 CHAIRMAN METCALF: And, Gus, what I'd like to
10 see is almost like a PowerPoint or a bullet point
11 presentation that we can carry with us. And if we have
12 to go to somebody, the Legislature, the Governor,
13 whoever, that we can say here it is in a PowerPoint kind
14 of view, and yes, by the way, we have the backup. This
15 isn't something we just threw out there. Because again,
16 if we don't get to something like the Florida
17 Legislature, what Ms. Stewart just gave us, then we're
18 just sitting here looking pretty.
19 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We certainly will start
20 moving forward in that direction.
21 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Are there any -- I think
22 that covered number five since we don't need any action
23 items. And before I go to public comment, I would like
24 the Board to have one more chance to say anything, and
25 I'd like to shoot it down to the south, and you guys pick

1 understanding of the final analysis of what that really
2 means. All we would need to know is what format you'd
3 like it in.
4 CHAIRMAN METCALF: Mark, I think that's a
5 great comment. I think what we need to do is just say,
6 hey. Here's what you we're doing, guys. If you've got
7 something in the weeds, bring it out. This is the time
8 to bring it to the light of day.
9 Member Walker?
10 MEMBER WALKER: I thought Gus addressed that
11 comment with the agent -- I had four or five things I
12 wanted to put in agenda five, and I think that was
13 exactly one of them, from the agency's perspective of
14 where are the divisions of this deferred maintenance that
15 the Chairman discovered or broke that, the divisions out
16 and sent them to each agency to have them from agency
17 level bring to us, so that would be Ward recapping all of
18 that. That's absolutely mandatory.
19 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And, Mark, we will look
20 at not only what's in the FCA report, but what was
21 requested out of the CIP that was not funded or not
22 proposed to be funded.
23 MR. DAVIS: So there was an awful lot that
24 was not requested in the CIP.
25 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And we understand that.
MR. DAVIS: So that's my point is that I
think that we could, you know, at least bring more to
light what wasn't even requested and knowing that there
was obviously a limitation.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: And, Mark, what that I
think is the Board -- When Ron said $1.5 billion, that's
kind of when the lights all started sparking and we all
started talking, you know, because we've all been kind of
playing defense the last six years. So now it's time to
play offense again, and we've just got to learn to play
it better this time.

Okay. Is there any further? I'd like to get
a Motion for Adjournment. Member Walker moves. I'm
looking for a second.


CHAIRMAN METCALF: Member Clutts seconds.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN METCALF: Motion carries. We're
adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 10:40 a.m.)
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through 61, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct
transcription of my stenotype notes of said public
meeting.

Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 22nd day of
December, 2014.

NICOLE ALEXANDER, NV CCR #446
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<tr>
<td>2020 (1)</td>
<td>6:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5;9;4:5;5:2;12:21;19:20;44:14;46:22,22;57:59:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worth (1)</td>
<td>53:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrap (3)</td>
<td>44:9;46:11;50:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write (1)</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing (1)</td>
<td>30:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written (1)</td>
<td>35:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrote (3)</td>
<td>35:14;36:23;51:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year (9)</td>
<td>6:5;7:8;14:25:9;27:24;36:10;39:11;44:23;51:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years (18)</td>
<td>6:15,17,18,20,7:6;12:22,23:18,19;28:4,8;40:7;43:8,15;23:24;24,25;54:1;61:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday (5)</td>
<td>35:5;37:12;39:2;41:16;45:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields (1)</td>
<td>21:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich (1)</td>
<td>53:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-'05 (1)</td>
<td>40:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 (1)</td>
<td>40:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing - 900,000 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>