

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

STATE OF NEVADA

PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION REGULATION WORKSHOP

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2024

CARSON CITY, NEVADA

ORIGINAL

The Board:

- ADAM HAND - Chairman
- CLINT BENTLEY - Vice Chairman
- JACK ROBB - Director, Member
- TITO TIBERTI - Member
- PHILLIP MANNELLY - Member
- LAURA FREED - Member
- KEVIN LEWIS - Member

For the Board:

SUSAN STEWART
Construction Law Counsel

Reported by:

CAPITOL REPORTERS
Certified Shorthand Reporters
BY: KATHY JACKSON
Nevada CCR #402
628 East John Street #3
Carson City, Nevada 89706
(775) 882-5322

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

INDEX

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
1. Roll Call	3
2. Solicitation of Comments on Proposed Amendments To Chapter 341 of the Nevada Administrative Code	7
3. Adjournment	24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2024, CARSON CITY, NEVADA

-oOo-

CHAIRMAN HAND: This is the time for the State Public Works Board Regulation Workshop. It is March 27th at 10:23 a.m., and we have three items on our agenda today. The first item is roll call.

THE REPORTER: Yeah, I'm having a hard time hearing that.

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

CHAIRMAN HAND: Present.

MS. STEWART: Vice Chair Clint Bentley?

VICE CHAIR BENTLEY: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member Tito Tiberti?

MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member Kevin Lewis? Present. The record indicate Member Lewis has raised his hand on camera.

Member Phillip Mannelly?

MEMBER MANNELLY: Here.

MS. STEWART: Member Roy Walker?

MEMBER WALKER: Present.

MS. STEWART: Member, Director of Department of Administration Jack Robb?

DIRECTOR ROBB: Present.

1 MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

2 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you. And we would like
3 to --

4 THE REPORTER: Can I talk? Can they hear me?
5 Wait. Excuse me. This is the court reporter.
6 I'm having a hard time hearing. I think that's the Chairman?

7 CHAIRMAN HAND: I'll speak up.

8 MS. STEWART: We'll speak up.

9 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

10 MS. STEWART: We're doing introductions now.

11 MS. ASKEW: I'm Tera Askew. I'm a commerce
12 consultant.

13 MR. PANG: Justus Pang. I'm a project manager
14 with the State Public Works Division.

15 MR. GENTILLE: Michael Gentille, PCNA Group,
16 Consulting Engineers.

17 MR. FINISTER: Demetrius Finister, a member of
18 Local 525. I'm also with --

19 THE REPORTER: I didn't hear any of that. Can
20 you repeat that?

21 MS. STEWART: Could you speak up, please.

22 MR. FINISTER: Yes. Demetrius Finister, current
23 member of Local 525, business representative slash organizer.
24 I'm also a member of IAPMO as well.

1 THE REPORTER: And what was your name?

2 MR. FINISTER: Demetrius Finister.

3 THE REPORTER: Can you spell that, please.

4 MR. FINISTER: I can spell you my name.

5 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

6 MR. FINISTER: D-e-m-e-t-r-i-u-s F, as in Frank,
7 i-n-i-s-t-e-r, Finister.

8 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. FINISTER: You're very welcome.

10 MS. STEWART: Sir.

11 MR. SIEDLECKI: My name is Mike Siedlecki. I
12 currently sit on the Board of Directors of IAPMO, and I'm
13 also a long-time member of Local 525, and my position there
14 is a business representative.

15 MS. STEWART: This is Susan Stewart for the
16 record. For the court reporter's reference, I have
17 everyone's name and spelling that I can provide to you at the
18 conclusion of the meeting.

19 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

20 MS. WILKINS: Mandi Wilkins, and I represent the
21 Mechanical Contractors Association and the Sheet Metal and
22 Air-Conditioning Contractors of Southern Nevada. So MCA of
23 Las Vegas, SMACNA Southern Nevada.

24 MR. KRAHENBUHL: Jordan Krahenbuhl, executive

1 director of the Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors of
2 Nevada.

3 MS. STEWART: And we have some folks from Public
4 Works that will be participating via Teams. T.J., can you
5 introduce yourself, please.

6 MR. DOBSON: Public Works Division.

7 MS. STEWART: Thank you. Susan Stewart, general
8 counsel and deputy attorney general and construction law
9 counsel for the State Public Works Division.

10 Wil Lewis, administrator, State Public Works
11 Board.

12 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti, Board member.

13 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker, Board member.

14 CHAIRMAN HAND: Adam Hand, Board member.

15 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phillip Mannelly, Board member.

16 MR. WALKER: Brian Walker, deputy administrator
17 with State Public Works Division.

18 MEMBER BENTLEY: Clint Bentley, Board member.

19 DIRECTOR ROBB: Jack Robb, director, department
20 of administration.

21 MS. STEWART: And we also have in the north, Bob
22 Ragar, and he is our new chief of planning, and you'll hear
23 more from him perhaps.

24 MR. RAGAR: Bob Ragar, chief of planning, State

1 Public Works Division. You got a corner of me.

2 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you, all.

3 The second item on our agenda this morning is for
4 discussion only. And it's solicitation of comments on
5 proposed amendments to Chapter 341 of the Nevada
6 Administrative Code and for public comment. We can begin
7 with public comment on this item.

8 MS. STEWART: Yes. If it's okay with you, I can
9 take this item, Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN HAND: That would be great.

11 MS. STEWART: Sure. Susan Stewart for the
12 record. The purpose of the meeting today is to have a
13 workshop on proposed changes to the State Public Works
14 Division's regulations.

15 If it is acceptable to the Chair, what I would
16 propose to do is there are three, in general, sections of the
17 regs that we're proposing to amend. So I could present the
18 first section that we're proposing to amend, take discussion
19 and then do that for each of the successive sections, if
20 that's acceptable.

21 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record. That
22 would be fantastic.

23 MS. STEWART: Okay. So the first section starts
24 on page one and goes over until page four, and this is the

1 State Public Works Board is responsible for adopting
2 regulations, and one of the purposes of our regulations is to
3 adopt building codes. We're on a six-year cycle. And so
4 that means it's time for the State Public Works Board to
5 adopt the 2024 code, and that is what this section of the
6 regulations does, and you can see the proposed changes there.

7 And with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would
8 just open it up for comment. We do have T.J. Dobson and
9 Justus Pang from the State Public Works Division, as well as
10 the administrator here and Brian, I'm sorry, that can answer
11 questions as far as staff's motivation as far as updating the
12 building code. Is there any comment or questions? And I
13 just ask that you speak up and identify yourself before you
14 start.

15 MR. KRAHENBUHL: My name is Jordan Krahenbuhl.
16 I'm the executive director of the Plumbing Heating Cooling
17 Contractors of Nevada. Formerly, I, for 30 years was the
18 plumbing and HVAC code official for Clark County. I'm
19 retired luckily and former board member of IAPMO as well.

20 I'll just take the liberty, and we all can say
21 whatever we want, but we're all on the same page. We are in
22 favor of the update to the 2024 uniform plumbing code and the
23 uniform mechanical code. I believe it's sections E and F is
24 what that is.

1 We've been involved in both the south and the
2 north, with the local jurisdictions, updating their codes as
3 well, to the 2024 codes. This is -- we're all -- we all
4 train on the 2024 codes. We all train on the uniform codes,
5 and so I'll just keep it and speak to myself, and that way I
6 don't get myself in trouble. But we are -- we are very much
7 in favor of updating to the 2024 uniform plumbing code and
8 uniform mechanical code. Thank you.

9 MS. WILKINS: Mandi Wilkins, executive vice
10 president of the MCA of Las Vegas, SMACNA of Nevada, and I
11 would echo those fabulous comments made by my colleague here,
12 Mr. Krahenbuhl.

13 MR. SIEDLECKI: Mike Siedlecki, Board of
14 Directors of IAPMO, and I would I would definitely stand in
15 agreeance with both of them, as well, that we do train on the
16 UPC code, IAPMO, and we would like to keep doing that. You
17 know, we would like to keep doing that. It's a much more
18 comprehensive code than IPC. And I've done -- I've had
19 experience doing plumbing, using IPC and I've done here, and
20 it's much more comprehensive. We cover so many more things
21 that the IPC does not cover, you know, and I could list those
22 and if you want to hear them. I don't know.

23 MS. STEWART: Thank you.

24 MR. FINISTER: Demetrius Finister. And I also

1 agree with what Jordan's portion. We are all in agreeance
2 with that. And I'll keep it short with with the technical
3 difficulties that we are experiencing here today. So we all
4 are in agreeance with it and let's push this meeting forward.

5 MS. STEWART: Thank you.

6 MR. GENTILLE: Mike Gentille, same group. I
7 should have mentioned this earlier. I'm here representing my
8 company, but I'm also here representing IAPMO of Southern
9 Nevada. And being in review of the proposed changes here,
10 we're in support of all of the changes.

11 We do have questions with regards to the energy
12 conservation code. That code has not been published yet, so
13 no one has seen it under appeal, at the national level. We
14 understand that five of the appeal items were upheld. So,
15 you know, decision of those Boards, many of these were
16 overturned, the five. We don't know the four items that were
17 denied.

18 But the questions were with respect to the
19 elimination of test fire appliances, so water heaters, gas
20 heat and gas stoves, and so we have some serious concerns not
21 having access to that code yet as, again, it's not been
22 published. This body, going forward with an adoption of
23 that, without knowing what the implications are going to be
24 for industry and so forth.

1 With respect to the other codes in the '24 cycle,
2 we're in full support of those, and we're in full support of
3 the modification that's listed to rollback the A17.1 standard
4 for accessibility, 17 back to the outline. We have worked --
5 we work nationally, and we would have a lot of other states
6 that we work with and they have done the same thing, at
7 California, just adopted the latest code version at the
8 beginning of '23, and they chose not to adopt this 2017
9 standard either. They kept it back, which is what you all
10 asked to do here. So we're in full support of that as well.

11 MS. STEWART: Thank you.

12 Mr. Chairman, if I can. Susan Stewart for the
13 record, a couple of things. With the 2024 energy code, this
14 is a first pass at our reg adoption. And Justus and others
15 have been tracking the release of the energy code, and so we
16 are mindful of that. And if there are changes or concerns,
17 they would be circulated to all of the contracting community,
18 just like this was circulated before the Board ever voted to
19 approve it.

20 And, Justus, are you comfortable talking about
21 the distinction between the 2017 and then the 29 or the 2009
22 differences regarding ADA accessibility?

23 MR. PANG: Yes. Justus Pang for the State Public
24 Works Division. The concern that we had with the 2017 NC

1 accessibility code was that it significantly increased
2 turning radiuses also increased third floor areas beyond what
3 is required in the 2010 ADA, the federal ADA guidelines. And
4 the result of that would be that it increases the efficiency
5 of our buildings which ends up, we have to do bigger
6 buildings to support the same form.

7 Certainly on specialized facilities, for example,
8 we just had a presentation last week on the Veterans Home, so
9 a specialized need, larger areas due to the type of building,
10 it should be industry standard for that sort of use. We're
11 happy to do it, but we did not -- our concern was to do just
12 a blanket increase was beyond what was federal -- federally
13 required. That was our concern that we discussed and
14 determined.

15 MS. STEWART: Thanks, Justus.

16 So to be clear, what we have included in the
17 proposed amendment is consistent with federal ADA
18 requirements. So we're in compliance with that. Did you
19 have any comment?

20 If there isn't anything else on the first
21 section. Yes, Roy? I'm sorry, did we have -- questions from
22 the Board. I apologize.

23 MR. WALKER: Roy Walker for the record. On the
24 page four, the change from the 2024 EC, 35, 2009, accessible

1 standards. Does that have the industry's -- the majority of
2 the industry's support and will that happen in upgrades
3 support of the time improvement?

4 MS. STEWART: To my knowledge, yes, and this
5 gentleman may be able to speak to that.

6 MR. GENTILE: Chairman, for the record, Michael
7 Gentile, PCNA Group. In response to your question, industry
8 is in full support of this rollback because as Justus said,
9 the newer standard could go well beyond what the federal
10 regulations are for any of the federal agencies. And all of
11 the adjacent states around us continue to be on full
12 standard, and it would maintain consistency for us from a
13 development and competitive perspective. We're attracting
14 businesses to the State of Nevada.

15 MS. STEWART: Any other questions or comments
16 from the Board?

17 Okay. Hearing none, the next section is the
18 change to NAC 341.136 and that starts on the bottom of page
19 four. And this is a State Public Works Division uses a
20 committee in certain instances to select consultants,
21 architects, engineers and that is a formal selection process.

22 Currently, in most instances, that committee
23 selection process has to take place on any estimated cost of
24 services for \$250,000. It's a lot -- it's a heavy lift for

1 consultants to do the formal selection process. They put
2 together a proposal. We have to send out a request for
3 proposal, and the value added on a project that size just
4 doesn't make sense anymore, and so we're raising -- proposing
5 to raise that to estimated cost of services of over
6 \$1,000,000.

7 The other change on the following, page five, is
8 just a typo. When it talks about the imposition of fees for
9 the building officials, inspection and permitting, there was
10 just a typo as far as the dollar amount in the categories of
11 that. So that's the next group of changes, if anybody has
12 any comments on that. Okay. I'm seeing all kinds people
13 shake their head no.

14 Any comments from the Board?

15 MR. MANNELLY: Just one. Bill Mannelly. Can you
16 maybe explain what the process is for currently under 250 and
17 what it would be.

18 MS. STEWART: The process -- Susan Stewart for
19 the record. The process would be the same.

20 Brian, do you want to speak to how we do a formal
21 selection process for our consultants and architects?

22 MR. WALKER: Yeah, I can. So Brian Walker for
23 the record. The -- for the formal selection process, we send
24 out an RFQ, request for qualifications, that says a publicly

1 advertised notice. Usually we group our projects into a
2 single RFQ, and we ask the, you know, architect or
3 subcommittee to respond with an SOQ, statement of
4 qualifications, and so we get their packets back.

5 The first step in the process is to go through a
6 short listing exercise with a committee. The -- that
7 committee recommends three of five firms to be interviewed,
8 and so the interview then will happen. And based on that,
9 the interview committee provides recommendations to our
10 administrator, and our administrator makes the final
11 selection. With that, you know, we have our selected
12 architect, engineer, our consultant for that project to move
13 forward with the contracting due to design.

14 So making this change here, the process is, it
15 will be the same process. It just affects the size of the
16 project that we do the formal solicitation with. I know with
17 that 250,000 dollar limit, I remember this last CIP, I mean,
18 it would have -- you know, starting to take months to get
19 through the interview process and interviews. It's a big
20 commitment from our -- from our consulting community that
21 comes to the interviews over and over to -- its a lot of
22 effort. So this is a way to be mindful what they need to put
23 in the process for their purpose.

24 MS. STEWART: Yeah. And Susan Stewart for the

1 record. And then the second piece though is those
2 consultants under a million, there is typically, and, Brian,
3 correct me if I'm wrong, there's a list comprised of those
4 folks that didn't get selected. They are all qualified. And
5 so the administrator, when he -- we award those other
6 consultant contracts, makes sure that they are awarded
7 appropriately so that every -- you know, we don't just pick
8 one and everything goes fair. So we have a group of
9 consultants that we rely on that deliver good services, and
10 so then the administrator directs those other consultants.

11 MR. MANNELLY: Thank you, Susan. Under a
12 million, so thank you.

13 MS. STEWART: No other comments?

14 The next section is, and I -- this is our Public
15 Works, incorporation of green building design measures, and
16 the suggestion actually came from our professional services
17 group to change the verbiage to high performance building
18 design measures as a more meaningful term. And so throughout
19 this section, we have clarified that language. We have taken
20 out the simple payback period, which is defined in statute.
21 And the last piece of this is we have deleted the recycling
22 requirement as obsolete.

23 And part of what is suggested here is, as many of
24 you may be aware, that the Governor asked us to do a

1 regulation review and looking for redundancies and things
2 that weren't perhaps beneficial to the community that we
3 serve, and so some of these, for example, the deletion of the
4 simple payback period is a -- is redundant as it's in
5 statute, and the change of the verbiage high performance
6 building design is more precise language and omits perhaps
7 the lightning rod, green building, and I don't want to put
8 words in anybody's mouth but from professional staff, I've
9 often heard the phrase nobody -- green building doesn't mean
10 anything. And so this is more of a precise way to implement
11 this process in our larger state buildings, and I'll open it
12 up for questions, comments.

13 And, T.J., I leave it to you to correct me if I
14 missed anything or said anything wrong.

15 MR. DOBSON: No, Susan. T.J. Dobson for the
16 record. What you explained is exactly right. The -- we're
17 trying to align ourselves with other even states. Utah, for
18 example, uses very similar language in their facility and
19 they use high performance building standard. So we're just
20 trying to align with what codes. Codes are starting to
21 develop. We have, you know, there is IECC and ASHRAE 90.1,
22 which is all based around energy code. Those -- those
23 requirements are adopted. They're standard in our practice
24 on the engineering side, and we're just trying to have a more

1 appropriate term.

2 The "Green Building" term probably, I would say,
3 generated with things like Green Building Council, LEED,
4 everybody has heard of LEED before. That's when green became
5 the catch phrase and over time, even that type of verbiage is
6 starting to be watered down and the focus has been more high
7 performance, energy efficiency. So we're just trying to
8 align with our industry and how we're using those terms.

9 And for an engineer like myself, mechanical
10 engineer background, that's a better way to explain the
11 performance that we're trying to do which is, you know, an
12 efficient system versus a green system.

13 MS. STEWART: Thank you, T.J.

14 Any other comments? Questions?

15 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record. I
16 have a question on page seven. The second sentence, the term
17 includes consideration of renewable energy source where cost
18 effective over the life of the project. It seems redundant
19 based on the sentence before that. I think it was added at
20 some point for clarification, but it seems redundant.
21 They're trying to eliminate the code rather than add.

22 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
23 will review that, and see if I can't clean that up.

24 CHAIRMAN HAND: I have a second question. With

1 the payback period, is 25 years used for every item or is it
2 the life of the estimated life of that in terms of payback,
3 in the economic, whatever the item is.

4 MR. WALKER: I can answer that. Brian Walker for
5 the record. So it depends on the life of the item and what
6 equipment we're talking about. If you look at page eight on
7 341.356, the change in the simple payback period, you know,
8 to say simple payback period must not be longer than 25 years
9 where it used to say ten years, unless approved by the
10 administrator. So changing that to 25 years gives our
11 project managers flexibility to entertain a longer payback
12 period where appropriate on this type of equipment. So it
13 will be shorter for some and longer for others, it just
14 depends, and it reduces the reliance and having to talk with
15 our administrators say, can we do this, you know, every
16 single time, so it reduces the burden a little bit.

17 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you.

18 DIRECTOR ROBB: Jack Robb for the record. I
19 think the main point is we're trying to make something that's
20 obtainable and cost effective at the same time and that's the
21 whole point because before it wasn't -- ten years, it was
22 obtainable but maybe not cost effective to do that.

23 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phillip Mannelly for the
24 record. Somewhat related to Chair Hand's Comments. If you

1 look up above at 341.351, subsection C, it seems to state, at
2 least as I read it, that the life cycle cost analysis must
3 include a least a calculation of 25 years. Life cycle cost
4 analysis must be performed in a manner prescribed by the
5 administrator and include without limitation the calculation
6 of the simple payback over a 25-year service life period.
7 That seems to, at least as I read it, say it must be 25, not
8 up to 25.

9 MS. STEWART: Yes, Susan Stewart for the record.
10 We can clarify that.

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: And then related to that too, I
12 see that the definition of simple payback period is stricken
13 but that phrase is used in other areas. So I see that these
14 changes are limiting it to or expanding it up to 25 years.
15 But without the definition of simple payback period, what
16 does that mean?

17 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.
18 Simple payback period is defined in statute.

19 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay.

20 MS. STEWART: And so we're just eliminating the
21 redundancy.

22 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay.

23 MS. STEWART: And Susan Stewart for the record.
24 LCB would look at that and say no. But it's our intent to

1 try and streamline these and reduce those redundancies. And
2 so the next time we get together to talk about these regs,
3 we'll have a version that I've worked with LCB to put
4 together, and we'll be -- I'll be working with them. They
5 have software and they plug things in and they have a set of
6 standards for the development of these regs. And so my goal
7 will be to make sure that your intent is what results in the
8 end.

9 Any other comments? Yes.

10 MEMBER WALKER: Board Member Roy Walker for the
11 record. Page eight, the top of the page, C, a life cycle
12 cost analysis. That includes the cost of money, inflation
13 factors?

14 MR. DOBSON: Susan, do you want me to take that
15 one?

16 MS. STEWART: Yes, I do, please.

17 MR. DOBSON: T.J. Dobson for the record. When
18 we're performing life cycle cost analysis on our projects,
19 when it comes to, you know, I'll speak to the mechanical
20 systems. Specifically, the system approach, there's several
21 systems that are analyzed. Those are analyzed for a first
22 cost perspective, a maintenance perspective, residual value
23 of those life expectancy and the residual value of those
24 pieces of equipment and those materials.

1 So, for example, if we're talking about a piping
2 system, as an example in the life cycle cost analysis, you
3 know, a common piping system is going to have a 50-year life
4 expectancy versus a boiler is going to have 20 to 22 years.
5 And those -- those thresholds for life expectancy are kind of
6 dictated by industry, and life expectancy usually is
7 something like an organization like ASHRAE would explain what
8 they see as a common life expectancy.

9 And so when you're comparing all those cost
10 factors, the life, the residual values, all of those elements
11 go into that 25-year analysis to determine, you know,
12 replacement cost at say a system A is 20 years, it's gotta be
13 replaced versus system B is 23 years. Each one of those
14 factors are analyzed and then compared over that same period
15 of 25 years. And the idea is that the lowest life cycle cost
16 system is -- is something that we look at and go, yeah,
17 that's -- that's the system we want because it has -- you
18 know, it has the best life expectancy for the intended use of
19 the building.

20 So there's a lot of factors that go into these
21 reports, not just -- it's just not a money thing. It's
22 maintenance, residuals, everything I was trying to explain.
23 Does that help understand that item?

24 MEMBER WALKER: The cost of money, does it

1 include the cost of --

2 MR. DOBSON: Yeah, it does and it will carry --
3 it will take the cost of money. It will be -- they will take
4 a present value essentially and compare it. All of them
5 would be compared the same, so you're getting apple to apple
6 comparison so, yeah. That's a factor in the inputs to that
7 analysis.

8 MS. STEWART: Thank you.

9 And other questions?

10 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record.
11 There's a couple of other green buildings that, here on the
12 top of page eight for sentence, green building that's in
13 there, and then the section, the last sentence.

14 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
15 will go through and make sure I am consistent in my edits and
16 the changes that we're making. Thank you.

17 Chairman Hand, I don't have anything else for the
18 presentation of agenda item number two.

19 CHAIRMAN HAND: Thank you. The third agenda item
20 is to adjourn. And what time -- are we going to make it?

21 MS. STEWART: Five to 11:00.

22 CHAIRMAN HAND: So the third item is to adjourn.
23 Do we have a motion to adjourn?

24 MEMBER TIBERTI: So moved.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CHAIRMAN HAND: Do I have a second?

MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. Second.

CHAIRMAN HAND: All in favor.

(The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.)

CHAIRMAN HAND: Opposed? Hearing no opposed, the meeting is adjourned.

MS. STEWART: All right. Thank you, everybody. Thank you very much.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

STATE OF NEVADA,)
) ss.
CARSON CITY.)

I, KATHY JACKSON, Official Court Reporter for the State of Nevada Public Works Board, do hereby certify:

That on Wednesday, the 27th day of March, 2024, I was present in Carson City, Nevada, for the purpose of reporting in verbatim stenotype notes the within-entitled public workshop to the best of my ability;

That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1 through 25, is a full, true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said public workshop.

Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 4th day of April, 2024.

Kathy Jackson

KATHY JACKSON, CCR
Nevada CCR #40

Joe Lombardo
Governor



Joy Grimmer
Director

Bob Ragar
Deputy Director

Wilfred J. Lewis, Jr.
Administrator

Carson City Office:
680 W. Nye Ln, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Phone: (775) 684-4141

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

Las Vegas Office:
7115 Amigo Street, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Phone: (702) 486-5115

STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD
Meeting of August 28 and 29, 2024

Agenda Item # 3

SUBJECT TITLE:

FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes for:
March 27, 2024, Public Works Division Regulation Workshop (attached)
March 27, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting (attached)

DISCUSSION:

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the March 27, 2024, Public Works Division Regulation Workshop meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 1:11 change "PHILLIP" to "PHILIP" (throughout)
2. Page 7:24 change "MEMBER" to "ADMINISTRATOR"
3. Page 11:21 change "29" to "24" and "2009" to "2024"
4. Page 11:24 change "NC" to "ANSI"
5. Page 12:4 change "increases" to "decreases"
6. Page 12: change "the change from the 2024 EC, 35, 2009, accessible" to "the change from 2024, ECC, chapter 35 to 2009 A117.1 accessibility"
7. Page 14:15 change "Bill" to "Phil"
8. Page 14:20 change "formal" to "informal"
9. Page 16:10 change "directs" to "selects"
10. Page 17:9 delete "nobody"
11. Page 17:17 change "even" to "western"
12. Page 20:24 change "would" to "could"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the March 27, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 1:11 change "PHILLIP" to "PHILIP" (throughout)
2. Page 6:3 change "MEMBER" to "ADMINISTRATOR"
3. Page 7:24 change "where" to "for"
4. Page 10:21 change "date" to "update"
5. Page 10:24 change "building" to "building official"
6. Page 11:19 change "of or projects outside of the" to "our projects and assign them to"
7. Page 12:13 change "689" to "680 Nye"
8. Page 12:15 change "689" to "680 Nye"

9. Page 12:16 change "BAG" to "B&G"
10. Page 12:24 change "have" to "Nevada"
11. Page 14:8 change "bowling" to "imploding"
12. Page 14:10 change "bowling" to "imploding"
13. Page 17:2 change "if" to "of"
14. Page 18:18 change "to actually" to "requests to actually"
15. Page 20:1 change "her got" to "her car got"
16. Page 22: 20 change "may" to "any"
17. Page 25:23 change "deemed" to "reviewed"

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve or deny the March 27, Public Works Division Regulation Workshop meeting minutes as amended.

Approve or deny the March 27, Public Works Board meeting minutes as amended.

ACTION ITEM:

Motion to approve or deny the March 27, 2024, Public Works Division Regulation Workshop meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.

Motion to approve or deny the March 27, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.

PREPARED BY: Susan K. Stewart, Construction Law Counsel