

STATE OF NEVADA  
PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION



STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD  
MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

DATE & TIME OF MEETING:

Wednesday, April 12, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

**NOTICE:** *Unless set for a specific time, items on the agenda may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chair. The public body may combine two or more items for consideration; and the public body may remove an item or defer discussion of an item on the agenda at any time.*

*Prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or a quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment. See NRS 233B.126. Public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.*

PLACES OF VIDEO CONFERENCE MEETING:

**NORTHERN NEVADA**

State Public Works Division  
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 102  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Carson City, NV 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

**SOUTHERN NEVADA**

State Public Works Division  
2300 McLeod Street  
Conference Room  
Las Vegas, NV 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

**REVISED  
AGENDA**

1. Roll Call
2. Public Comment

Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. Public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

3. **For Possible Action:** Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes: December 9, 2022, and January 4, 2023.
4. **For Discussion Only:** Introduction: New Board Member Philip Mannelly, Esq. and Jack Robb, Director of Department of Administration
5. **For Discussion Only:** 2023 Legislative Session Update
  - I. CIP
  - II. SPWD Bills
  - III. Other relevant Bills
6. **For Discussion Only:** Public Workshop, Executive Order 2023-003 Regulation Review
  - I. Survey Results
  - II. Staff Recommendations
  - III. Public/stakeholder Input
    - i. Written submissions
    - ii. Other stakeholder input
7. **For Discussion Only:** Board comment and discussion
  - I. Board comments on any agenda item
  - II. Items to be included in future agendas
  - III. Review of action items for SPWD management
  - IV. Set future meeting dates
8. Public Comment

Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. Public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

9. Adjournment

**NOTES:**

- (1) The appearance of the phrase “For Possible Action” at the beginning of an agenda item denotes items or sub-items on which the Board may take action.
- (2) Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:
  - State Public Works Division, Las Vegas Office, 2300 McLeod Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104;
  - State Public Works Division, Carson City Office, 515 E. Musser St., Suite 102, Carson City, Nevada 89701; and
  - The following web locations:
    - <http://publicworks.nv.gov>
    - <http://notice.nv.gov>
- (3) We are pleased to provide reasonable accommodations for members of the public with disabilities. If special arrangements are necessary, please notify Kent LeFevre, Administrator for the Public Works Division, 515 E. Musser St., Suite 102, Carson City, Nevada 89701, telephone (775) 684-4141, or via email, to [j.wiest@admin.nv.gov](mailto:j.wiest@admin.nv.gov) as soon as possible and no later than 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.
- (4) Abbreviations: SPWB is the State Public Works Board, SPWD is the State Public Works Division, CIP is the Capital Improvement Program, A/E is Architect/Engineer, IFC is Interim Finance Committee, BOE is Board of Examiners, RFP is Request for Proposal, CMAR is Construction Manager at Risk, and RFQ is Request for Qualifications.
- (5) For further information, or supporting materials contact Kent LeFevre, Administrator the State Public Works Division, 515 E. Musser St., Suite 102, Carson City, Nevada 89701. Phone (775) 684-4141, Fax (775) 684-4142.

State Public Works  
Board Meeting  
Roll Call  
April 12, 2023, 9:00 am

Name	Attended	
	Yes	No
Chairperson Adam Hand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chairperson Clint Bentley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member Tito Tiberti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member Kevin Lewis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member Philip Mannelly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member / Director of the Dept. of Administration, Jack Robb	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 2

SUBJECT TITLE:

Public Comment

DISCUSSION:

Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which actions may be taken. At the Chair's discretion, public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

PRIOR ACTIONS:

Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS/ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Not required.

PREPARED BY:

The Assistant to the Administrator





**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD ACTION ITEM REQUEST**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 3

**SUBJECT TITLE:**

**FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes for:

December 9, 2022 (attached)  
January 4, 2023 (attached)

**DISCUSSION:**

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the December 9, 2022, meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 8:22 change "Where this is?" to "Where is this?"
2. Page 8:23 change "It's the Augustine Building" to "It's located at the corner of Mojave and Stewart"
3. Page 14:23 change "PPI" to "DEI"
4. Page 15:5 change "Mr. LeFevre" to "Chairman Hand"
5. Page 16:10 change "spoke" to "speak"
6. Page 40:17 change "long" to "bond"
7. Page 40:22 change "were the telling of" to "we're implementing in"
8. Page 41:4 change "CEMAR" to "CMAR"
9. Page 41:6 change "NIT" to "KNIT"
10. Page 46:14 change "2011" to "2021"
11. Page 48:5 change "Governor" to "Governor's budget"
12. Page 48:14 change "may in stack log" to "maintenance backlog"
13. Page 48:15 change "fund" to "bond"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the January 4, 2023, meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

No recommended revisions

**PRIOR ACTIONS:**

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve or deny December 9, 2022, meeting minutes as amended.

Approve or deny January 4, 2023, meeting minutes as presented.

ACTION ITEM:

Motion to approve or deny approval of December 9, 2022, meeting minutes as amended.

Motion to approve or deny approval of January 4, 2023, meeting minutes as presented.

PREPARED BY:

Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General and Construction Law Counsel



*Do Not Copy*

**In The Matter Of:**

*PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING  
TELECONFERENCED/LIVE STREAMED OPEN MEETING*

---

*December 9, 2022*

---

*Capitol Reporters  
628 E. John St # 3  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
775 882-5322*

STATE OF NEVADA  
PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING  
TELECONFERENCED/LIVE STREAMED OPEN MEETING  
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2022  
CARSON CITY, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

The Board: Adam Hand, Chairperson  
Clint Bentley, Vice Chairperson  
Kent LeFevre, Administrator  
Kevin Lewis, Member  
Laura Freed, Member

For the Board: Susan Stewart,  
Construction Law Counsel  
Homa Sayyar Woodrum,  
Sr. Deputy Attorney General  
Carson city, NV

Reported by: Shellie Loomis, RPR  
Nevada CCR #228  
CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2022, A.M. SESSION  
2 -000-  
3  
4 CHAIRPERSON HAND: This is the time and the place  
5 of the State Public Works board meeting. It's February -- I'm  
6 sorry, February -- it's Friday, December 9th at 10:02. And  
7 this is Chairperson Hand for the record. I apologize for not  
8 starting that way. And roll -- roll call.  
9 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay. Roll call.  
10 Chairman Hand.  
11 (Short off the record discussion.)  
12 MS. WOODRUM: So for roll call, if people  
13 could -- this Homa Woodrum. If you could make sure you start  
14 with your name before indicating that you are present.  
15 MS. STEWART: Yep.  
16 MS. WOODRUM: Thank you.  
17 MS. STEWART: How is the volume?  
18 MR. WACKER: Yeah, that's as loud as we can get  
19 it.  
20 MR. LEFEVRE: All right. Let's begin roll call  
21 again.  
22 Kent Lefevre for the record.  
23 Chairman Adam Hand.  
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Adam Hand present.

AGENDA/INDEX	
AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
1. Roll call	3
2. Public Comment	4
3. For Possible Action: Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes:	5-6
4. Announcement of SPWD Administrator selection	6-7
5. Notice of Chairperson designation of emergency project	7-9
6. Staff presentation: Discussion on CIP criteria revisions I. Diversity, equity, and inclusion II. Sustainability	9-39
7. Administrator's Report to the Board	39-43
8. For Possible Action: Board comment and discussion	43
9. Public Comment	50
10. Adjournment	51

1 MR. LEFEVRE: Vice Chairperson Clint Bentley.  
2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Clint Bentley present.  
3 MR. LEFEVRE: Member Tito Tiberti. Absent.  
4 Member Kevin Lewis.  
5 MEMBER LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis present.  
6 MR. LEFEVRE: And member and Director of the  
7 Department of Administration Laura Freed.  
8 MEMBER FREED: Laura Freed, present.  
9 MR. LEFEVRE: Let the record reflect we have a  
10 quorum.  
11 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
12 record. Thank you. And do we have any public comment this  
13 morning?  
14 Anybody in Carson?  
15 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. No  
16 public comment here in Las Vegas.  
17 MS. WOODRUM: Homa Woodrum for the record. No  
18 public comment present in Carson City.  
19 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand or Chairperson  
20 Hand for the record. The next agenda item for possible action  
21 is the acceptance and approval of the Public Works Board  
22 Meeting minutes from August 24th and 25th as well as  
23 September 14th.  
24 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record, if I

Page 5

1 may. Presented for the Board with this action item, I read  
2 the minutes August 24, 25, and 14th of September. The changes  
3 are reflected in your action item request and the  
4 recommendation is to approve or deny the August 24th, 25th and  
5 September 14, 2022 meeting minutes as amended.  
6 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Clint  
7 Bentley. I move to approve the minutes August 24th, 25th and  
8 September 14th as amended.  
9 MEMBER FREED: Laura Freed. I'll second.  
10 CHAIRPERSON HAND: We can do this. All in favor.  
11 I guess we need to raise our hands. However we need to do  
12 this, let's do it right.  
13 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.  
14 Homa, how would you like us to acknowledge our ayes and nays  
15 for matters for action?  
16 MS. WOODRUM: Homa Woodrum for the record. You  
17 could do yeas, nays, abstentions and that way people could --  
18 you could do by voice vote if that's easier, and then people  
19 can speak up if they, you know, object and we'll count them in  
20 the yeas. If they don't show up in the nays or the  
21 abstentions that might be the easiest.  
22 MS. STEWART: Thank you.  
23 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
24 record. All in favor.

Page 6

1 Nays?  
2 Hearing none, the motion will pass.  
3 (Motion carries.)  
4 CHAIRPERSON HAND: And we will proceed to agenda  
5 Item Number 4 which is now State Public Works Administrator  
6 selection.  
7 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. And  
8 Member Freed, I was hoping you would handle this.  
9 MEMBER FREED: Laura Freed for the record. I am  
10 delighted to do that.  
11 I am delighted to officially let the Board know,  
12 although I have no doubt you've all seen our emails and the  
13 emails to the staff, that we did -- we completed a selection  
14 process and Kent Lefevre was appointed and accepted -- too bad  
15 for you, sir -- the public works administrator position on a  
16 permanent basis after serving as the interim.  
17 We are delighted to have him, and he has made --  
18 his work already in terms of being asked to scramble to adjust  
19 some things that may or may not be in the Governor's  
20 recommended CIP.  
21 So I -- I know I speak for the deputy director  
22 and the staff when I say I am -- I'm relieved and happy that  
23 we have a permanent administrator and I'm very happy that it  
24 is Kent. So please join me in congratulating or consoling

Page 7

1 Kent on his job.  
2 (Applause.)  
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
4 record. The next agenda item is notice of the chairperson  
5 designation of emergency project.  
6 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay. Kent Lefevre for the record.  
7 I'll take that item. On November 2nd, 2022, Lisa Sherych, the  
8 administrator for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health  
9 for the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services  
10 requested that the State Public Works Board division manage  
11 forensic renovations as the emergency project.  
12 Based upon that request, the State Public Works  
13 determined that the request met the statutory requirements of  
14 NRS 338.011 and therefore, State Public Works division pursued  
15 an emergency determination from the Board Chair as required by  
16 NAC 341.145.  
17 Chair Hand approved the award of contracts for  
18 this contract as an emergency, and under NAC 341.151 it  
19 requires the notice of the emergency filing of the next  
20 meeting of the public body, which is now.  
21 So what this is, in layman's terms, the HHS is  
22 acquiring some forensic space from the City of Las Vegas and  
23 the City of Las Vegas jail, but that requires some  
24 modifications to the building in order for them to use their

Page 8

1 program.  
2 So there was ARPA money that was funded in the  
3 October IFC for this -- for this project, so we're currently  
4 working with consultants right now to get those contracts on  
5 the -- hopefully the January agenda as soon as possible.  
6 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
7 record. Thank you, thank you, Kent.  
8 MR. LEFEVRE: You're welcome.  
9 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chair Bentley. I  
10 have one quick question. Kent, you said you were hoping for  
11 to address it at the first of the year. Is that for the  
12 contracts for to be able to go out for bid and what's the  
13 status there?  
14 MR. LEFEVRE: Good question. Kent Lefevre for  
15 the record. That is for our contracts to begin the design or  
16 begin the remodel.  
17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: What kind of a time  
18 frame do we have here?  
19 MR. LEFEVRE: We're looking at drawings third  
20 quarter of this year ready to go to bid, so it's going to be a  
21 quick one. And it's attendant on improvement.  
22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Where this is?  
23 MR. LEFEVRE: It's the Augustine building. So  
24 we're scrambling to get that up and running as fast as we can

Page 9

1 for the agency.  
2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you.  
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
4 record. The next agenda item is staff presentation on CIP  
5 criteria revisions which includes diversity, equity and  
6 inclusion as well. Sustainability.  
7 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I'll  
8 be speaking on this subject. We have some handouts, some  
9 materials in our packet that I will go over in depth.  
10 Susan is going to talk about diversity, equity,  
11 and inclusions, and then Brian Wacker, who is here as our  
12 chief of planning, will talk about sustainability.  
13 MS. STEWART: Thank you. For the record, Susan  
14 Stewart. I think what might be helpful is if I take a minute  
15 to orient the Board as far as the information you have in your  
16 packet.  
17 You'll see in discussion there is an Item  
18 Number 1, diversity, equity, and inclusion. There is an  
19 overview. A single memo been provided.  
20 Then Item Number 2, State Public Works Division  
21 current practices. And if you look at that Attachment 2,  
22 there's a memo there where we'll talk about current practices,  
23 which is our green building standards, net zero preliminary  
24 design analysis, and then there's a bill draft request. And

Page 10

1 for each of those topics you'll see an associated attachment  
2 included with some further backup on each one of those  
3 packets. Or each one of those subjects, excuse me.  
4 And then the last Item Number 3 is we're going to  
5 be talking about AB160 which is legislation regarding window  
6 replacements and there are two attachments to that. One is a  
7 copy of the bill and then another is a copy of window  
8 replacement projects. And we'll dive into each one of those,  
9 but I thought an overview of what you have in front of you  
10 might be helpful.  
11 So the first -- what I'm going to talk about  
12 first is we had a request from the Board to take a look at our  
13 CIP criteria and how we assess projects coming from -- I'm  
14 sorry, I was hearing some very weird background noise. I'm  
15 glad it wasn't just me.  
16 So okay. So we had a request from the Board to  
17 take a look at our criteria and one of the requests included  
18 some way to incorporate an analysis or consideration of  
19 diversity, equity, and inclusion.  
20 And so you'll see the memo that we put together,  
21 and it begins with the definition of diversity, equity, and  
22 inclusion, because I -- for me I thought it was helpful to  
23 really, you know, let's be clear about what we're talking  
24 about.

Page 11

1 And so you'll see the definition there. And I  
2 did some research on other states, is there anyone that is  
3 implementing this type of program in connection with  
4 implementation of their capital improvement programs.  
5 And what I came across was DEI is typically  
6 associated with hiring practices where you're attempting to  
7 address historically underrepresented folks so that you have a  
8 more diverse team. It's also the way I -- my research showed  
9 it came up was in an organization these are -- they are kind  
10 of a foundation, other ethical considerations and how they  
11 treat members of their team.  
12 So having done that preliminary review, we kind  
13 of -- you know, Brian Wacker and Kent and I had several  
14 discussions on this and looked at how does that framework fit  
15 into the work that the State Public Works division project  
16 managers do, and what we came up with was it seemed a little  
17 bit outside of their lane, that they wouldn't necessarily have  
18 the expertise on a formal basis to review what is the program  
19 that the agency is supporting and asking for construction  
20 associated with that program.  
21 So we thought that went a little bit beyond what  
22 the engineers and architects are looking at when they're  
23 thinking about a building and structure and mechanical  
24 systems.

Page 12

1 So now, we do have a couple programs that we  
2 implement that are related to veterans. We also have a small  
3 business -- disadvantaged small business program that we  
4 implement. Those are the current programs that we implement,  
5 but they're unrelated to the CIP.  
6 So now, sticking with the formal consideration,  
7 we looked at what Utah does. And Utah, they make sure that  
8 each state agency gets 1.1 percent of their buildings' value  
9 in the Utah CIP.  
10 And Brian Wacker can speak to this a little bit  
11 more if he would like to, but he understands that in Utah they  
12 manage all of the university projects within their CIP so  
13 there's a lot of angst, if you will, to make sure everybody's  
14 getting their fair share.  
15 So when we think about doing 1.1 percent of the  
16 total value of the buildings, what we see is our heavy  
17 hitters, Corrections, DHSS, they've got the most square  
18 footage so they're still going to get the most of the project.  
19 So we felt like that really wasn't -- you know, museums are  
20 still going to be at the bottom of the list using that  
21 criteria.  
22 So which moves into our informal implementation  
23 of DEI as criteria. And there is nothing formal, but I think  
24 in the Board's experience they've seen Kent and other

Page 13

1 administrators look at the CIP through an equitable lens,  
2 making sure that each agency's needs are considered in a  
3 consistent way.  
4 And sometimes that goes beyond what the agency,  
5 what the Department is actually asking and one of those  
6 examples is the Stewart gymnasium remodel.  
7 DCNR had it number 51 on their priority list so  
8 they weren't even prioritizing the project, but it was  
9 recommended by Kent in the interest of Stewart needs to be  
10 supported, it's -- it's a project that's very important to  
11 them and Kent can speak to that more.  
12 So that's kind of our informal way that we look  
13 at things through that equitable lens. So what we came up  
14 with is we're not sure that we have the skills to formally  
15 consider DEI when we're looking at planning, maintenance and  
16 construction; however, informally we certainly -- speaking for  
17 Kent, we certainly do that.  
18 So at this point, staff does not have any  
19 recommendations for the formal incorporation of DEI as a CIP  
20 criteria, however always we welcome input and additional  
21 direction from the Board. And before I ask for questions I  
22 would make -- give Kent and Brian an opportunity to jump in in  
23 case I missed anything.  
24 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. And

Page 14

1 just -- just one comment at the end of this and that is that  
2 the DEI really isn't embedded in our law right now as far as  
3 how we -- how we manage projects and assign projects, award  
4 projects; it's more of a frankly a low bid environment  
5 regardless of DEI.  
6 So that's -- that's where we are right now with  
7 the law. So if there needs to be a change there then we may  
8 need to have conversations about that.  
9 And, Brian, do you have anything on that?  
10 MR. WACKER: Yeah, sure. Brian Wacker for the  
11 record. The one thought I had listening to this is a lot of  
12 the projects that we would recommend in this CIP are really  
13 just a reflection of, you know, what the different state  
14 agencies are trying to accomplish, and what they're  
15 accomplishing is, you know, not something that comes from us,  
16 it comes from just the Governor and just the direction of the  
17 state overall.  
18 So if HHS needs a building to complete their  
19 program then that's something that's important to us, but we  
20 don't drive that train necessarily.  
21 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.  
22 I would just like to comment that I feel that if we really  
23 went into a full implementation on this PPI that it would  
24 really impact our deferred maintenance projects in an unfair

Page 15

1 manner.  
2 I'm just hoping it fits our criteria to maximize  
3 all of the items that we need to get addressed within the  
4 state.  
5 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I  
6 brought this topic up and created some work to get the  
7 feedback. Some work --  
8 MS. STEWART: I'm sorry. Susan Stewart for the  
9 record. Kevin, can you hear us?  
10 MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, I can. I will let Adam  
11 finish. Go right ahead, Adam.  
12 MS. STEWART: All right. Thank you.  
13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I guess I wanted to thank you  
14 for the work that you did, and the reason I brought it up is  
15 things like museums are always at the bottom of the list and  
16 so, you know, how -- what -- the thought process that I was  
17 going through was would there be a way to get some small  
18 portion of this, where she got the 1 percent which I was  
19 unaware of.  
20 For those -- again those folks that come back  
21 eight, nine, ten years in a row with the same project and show  
22 us potentially the delapidated buildings and, you know, the  
23 type that never work their way up the list. So that's why I  
24 brought that up, so I'd like to thank you all for the work

Page 16

1 that you did.  
2 And I apologize, Kevin, I looked to Clint for  
3 comment and I didn't look to the screen for comment so I  
4 apologize.  
5 MEMBER LEWIS: Kevin Lewis for the record. I'm  
6 curious to see how come we didn't look at California or, you  
7 know, that's more representative of minorities or  
8 disadvantaged folks.  
9 I'm wondering why we didn't look at Arizona. I'm  
10 wondering if Kent could possibly spoke to other state agency  
11 and look how they perform with the same challenges. I know  
12 that they've put together coalition that may have included  
13 urban chamber, the Latin chamber. Have you reached out to any  
14 of these agencies at all? It's out there. So I'm just  
15 curious.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Do you want to answer that?  
17 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.  
18 Thank you, Kevin, for the question. That's a great question.  
19 And I did a global search of DEI in general for -- it's a --  
20 it's a unique, specific ask. We're developing a capital  
21 improvement program. Are there other state agencies that are  
22 including some type of DEI analysis. We did see small  
23 minority businesses, but that's contracting.  
24 We did see DEI throughout universities, but that



Page 17

1 was hiring and admissions. And so I didn't see anything on --  
2 on a state level where a -- including California -- where the  
3 selection of projects for recommendation in the capital  
4 improvement program included a DEI analysis.  
5 That said, you just listed some entities and if  
6 you feel that I missed something, please send me the  
7 information and I will report back to the Board on additional  
8 information that you have. Hundred percent.  
9 MEMBER LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis for the record.  
10 I'll definitely give you some recommendations. I know that  
11 Georgia's probably doing quite well in leading that force.  
12 I've looked at the -- from airport, different things that  
13 they're doing in the state, and that might be one place where  
14 we can start, as well as Florida. So I'll send that list to  
15 you.  
16 MS. STEWART: Thank you. Susan Stewart for the  
17 record. Thank you very much. And then just one more thing.  
18 Piggybacking on what Chairman Hand said, there -- perhaps  
19 there is a way to incorporate something into the CIP criteria  
20 for museums when they've asked for the same project five times  
21 in a row. Maybe the third time is the charm.  
22 MEMBER FREED: You get a couple extra.  
23 MS. STEWART: That's right. So maybe there's  
24 room for more investigation. And certainly I'm outside of my

Page 18

1 lane suggesting this, but when you mention what you're trying  
2 to address, there may be another way to get there. So thank  
3 you.  
4 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I  
5 just have another comment on this too. One of the sister  
6 states that we look to a lot right now is Utah because their  
7 CIP is about the same size as ours.  
8 Their facilities maintenance group is about the  
9 same size as ours. They're very much like a sister as far as  
10 scale, and they face all of the same problems with the same,  
11 you know, kind of demographic that we've got. So it's a good  
12 place to, you know, bounce things off.  
13 We've had conversations with the Utah department  
14 of facilities management several times in the past and they're  
15 turning out to be pretty good partners for just processes that  
16 we both face, and they do it a different way and we learn from  
17 that so...  
18 MEMBER LEWIS: Kent, I look forward to hopefully  
19 expanding upon that. I'm not sure that Utah is more  
20 representative as far as diversity inclusion, but I can look  
21 at our own home court. Keep in mind that it was not until the  
22 year 2017 that our board became more diverse. And our  
23 history.  
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the

Page 19

1 record.  
2 Again I want to thank you for what you all did,  
3 and I'm glad we're having a conversation that there will be  
4 some follow up.  
5 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
6 will -- we can certainly talk about this later in the agenda,  
7 but I will make sure that I make a note that we will circle  
8 back and have further discussion on this on our next meeting.  
9 Okay. So the next memo in Attachment 2, and this  
10 is the -- this memo addresses sustainability, our current  
11 practices, net zero preliminary design analysis on a couple  
12 projects in the bill draft request. And we're going to do a  
13 little tag teaming on this, but I think Brian was going to  
14 start on this one.  
15 MR. WACKER: Thank you. Okay. Brian Wacker for  
16 the record. Thank you, Susan. Yeah, I'll go ahead and get  
17 started on this. Just to kind of start, I'll be going over  
18 the memo in Attachment 2.  
19 And just a reminder on what's in the packet in  
20 front of you, Attachment to Exhibit A is the green building  
21 standard NAC that we follow.  
22 Attachment to Exhibit B is an example of our  
23 green building design template checklist, and Attachment to  
24 Exhibit C is a net zero bill draft request we submitted. So

Page 20

1 just going back to the memo in Attachment 2.  
2 So what we started with is how sustainability is  
3 a part of our current process. State Public Works currently  
4 implements green building standards as set forth in  
5 NAC 341.301 through 341.376.  
6 The green building standard focuses on site  
7 selection, material selection, water efficiency, energy  
8 efficiency, and indoor quality. We currently follow ASHRAE,  
9 which is the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and  
10 Air-Conditioning Engineers -- I had to look that up -- 90.1.  
11 So ASHRAE 90.1, ASHRAE 62.1 and EPA standards as a part of the  
12 green building standard.  
13 We at public works take a holistic approach to  
14 sustainability with the green building standard. The way we  
15 approach it is we look at all the building systems and their  
16 interactions with the intent to develop a unique solution for  
17 each project, and that process and what we typically look at  
18 is pretty much laid out in the green building checklist in  
19 your packet.  
20 We look at each project as a unique system and  
21 it's an independent solution each time. And then we also as a  
22 part of the green building process, you know, analyze  
23 different alternatives with the goal to select an option that  
24 has the best lifecycle cost solution over like a 20 to 25-year

Page 21

1 cost period. So currently we try to, you know, make  
2 selections that pencil 20, 25 years as a low-cost thing.  
3 So the second page of the memo, at the top of  
4 this is just a summary of what is in the NAC and the process  
5 that we follow. The thing to take away here is that we do  
6 implement green building standards on building projects that  
7 are over 20,000 square feet.  
8 And the process, you know, kind of laid out here,  
9 I guess it's a little bit of a weeds, but it's just how we  
10 really go about our green buildings.  
11 I guess I'll mention Utah again. That's kind of  
12 our favorite thing. It's something that we're a little  
13 familiar with on how we do our work. But, you know, I did  
14 take a look kind of thinking about green building standards,  
15 and, you know, Utah has a similar set-up that we do.  
16 They developed what they call the high  
17 performance building standard, and looking through that  
18 document, it's got different names and a different process  
19 than we do for our green building standard, but at the end of  
20 the day it's also based on ASHRAE 90.1 and really follows a  
21 lot of the same processes with a lot of the same solutions  
22 that we do.  
23 They have a thicker packet for their checklist  
24 than we do. They like to write more than we do, and that's

Page 22

1 probably the big thing. It's a little bit more of a formal  
2 process than we have, where ours is more laid out in this NAC  
3 and we just are simply going more back to straight ASHRAE 90.1  
4 for our green building.  
5 The last thing on this page, it's just a little  
6 report. We did some research and just put some thought into  
7 different types of projects that we at public works view as  
8 best practices with regards to sustainability.  
9 The first thing to take off the list is these are  
10 nonmechanical system replacement projects. That's probably  
11 the easy, low-lying fruit. The best way to save energy is to  
12 put a big fancy new mechanical system in a building. That's  
13 the easy one.  
14 But past that, you know, you can look at  
15 fenestration improvements. Fenestration is really your  
16 building envelope, and so you would look a lot at your  
17 openings, windows, doors, things of that nature. Then you  
18 would look at building insulation, lighting improvements,  
19 which really means LED lighting replacement projects. We've  
20 done many of those in the past years.  
21 And then the rest of the list is probably not  
22 really CIP projects, but it's worth mentioning and important  
23 that, you know, you know, saving energy on buildings is not  
24 just a construction project, you know, operation in a building

Page 23

1 a part of that too. So -- and we probably don't have a great  
2 influence on that to some degree but we can help. But, you  
3 know, how is the building maintained, does the building have  
4 efficient equipment inside of it.  
5 You can do energy audits and that's something we  
6 could entertain on buildings. That would be a study we could  
7 do in a building to look at, you know, how energy could be  
8 saved in there.  
9 And then also, you know, the last one, just  
10 landscaping, you know, make sure you don't over-water, things  
11 like that. And that goes into maybe efficient landscaping  
12 design or oftentimes it's also kind a maintenance thing,  
13 coming back and making sure they haven't just watered  
14 everything.  
15 The kind of key thing too on here, when I mention  
16 fenestration, you know, that actually does kind of tie into  
17 this window replacement that we're going to talk about later.  
18 So last -- last page on this memo is a little bit  
19 of how we've started to I guess work to increase  
20 sustainability in our process and, you know, I guess just to  
21 kind of say, you know, we started with what we do do which is,  
22 you know, green building projects.  
23 So we do have sustainability built into our  
24 current process, but we are looking forward to increase in the

Page 24

1 sustainability and that starts with a net zero conversation.  
2 I guess it's a different word for some of the same things but  
3 we continue to kind of grow with that.  
4 So what we have done is we've selected two of our  
5 current projects to start to look at net zero and what that  
6 means for these projects. One of them is the Department of  
7 Public Safety project here in Carson City and the other one is  
8 the Silverado Ranch DMV down in Las Vegas.  
9 The intent of selecting these projects to start  
10 to look at net zero is it gives us basically some test cases  
11 to do some analysis with these projects with the design team  
12 to see how net zero can apply to a construction here for  
13 public works, and that will hopefully help us make decisions  
14 on how to implement net zero ideas in our projects.  
15 So we're finding out right now with the  
16 Department of Public Safety building, it's very early in its  
17 design about the conceptual level and we're learning that net  
18 zero might be about a 3 and a half percent increase for that  
19 project.  
20 So that's, you know, \$7 million in actual value  
21 for that -- for that project. And that is in addition to  
22 green building standards. So, you know, green building we  
23 think builds an efficient and sustainable building and this is  
24 in addition to that.

Page 25

1 With the DMV project, that's closer to the end of  
2 its design, so more of a final design, and we're starting to  
3 hear that might be about 15 percent increase in that project.  
4 It's entirely possible that the public safety folks haven't  
5 quite figured out quite how much it's going to cost. They're  
6 still early in the process, and so, you know, it is a  
7 significant increase to incorporate net zero.  
8 And also, you know, really what that increase  
9 really means, you have to slow down -- you know, net zero is  
10 really defined as a like a net zero energy consumption or net  
11 zero greenhouse gas emission goal for these projects, and so  
12 to implement net zero it's kind of I guess -- it's in the  
13 name; you just try to have an -- we look at it as like a net  
14 zero energy use over an annualized year basically.  
15 So what we're finding for these projects is you  
16 try to make a more efficient building. We already have  
17 relatively efficient buildings with the green building  
18 standard. That might bolster that effort a little bit.  
19 But what it really comes down to is to offset  
20 your energy use of these buildings you start to look at, you  
21 know, PV panels, you know, solar electricity on site to offset  
22 your energy use.  
23 And so that's really what the cost increase are  
24 for at the DMV project is -- it's a lot of it is a 15 percent

Page 26

1 increase because we're going to build solar panels until we  
2 offset our energy use. That's what we're finding with those.  
3 And we're hoping that what we find is going to  
4 help us with this bill draft request that we've submitted and  
5 so that's included in your packet as well.  
6 And so the bill draft request is to add to our  
7 standards to achieve net zero energy consumption and net zero  
8 greenhouse emissions where practicable. And that word  
9 practical (sic) is important.  
10 We didn't put in this BDR exactly how we're going  
11 to get there because we're not exactly sure how we want to go  
12 there yet, but the BDR would open that door so that we could  
13 adopt these standards, and hopefully with these test projects  
14 we would get some resolution on how we want to go there.  
15 So the last thing is really just some possible  
16 recommendations for I guess discussion here on how we could  
17 move forward with this. I guess, you know, we've started to  
18 move down that a little bit with that bill draft request and,  
19 you know, I guess we'd be open to, you know, your comments or  
20 suggestions on what you think or what you think we might need  
21 to do. So thank you.  
22 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
23 record. Member Lewis or Vice Chair Bentley, do you have  
24 any --

Page 27

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Not at this time.  
2 MEMBER LEWIS: No.  
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Well, again thank you for  
4 digging into this. Part of this -- this came up during the  
5 CIP and there was some discussion about windows, right. And I  
6 was unaware that the -- that the process already integrated  
7 sustainability or the green building stuff, and so it sounds  
8 like the -- it's interesting that the one project is a  
9 3 percent increase and the other is a 50 percent increase;  
10 that's huge.  
11 And I'm curious, Brian, in those projects, did --  
12 did the consultant do LCA lifecycle assessments in terms of  
13 emissions and tell you what the difference was between the  
14 current designs and the -- and the net zero designs?  
15 MR. WACKER: Brian Wacker for the record. That's  
16 what that 15 percent number is, and so it's a 15 percent  
17 increase to the DMV over our green building standard.  
18 And when I said it's really PV panels, that's  
19 really what it is is how many PV panels do you want to build,  
20 you know, at that building to offset your costs. It might be  
21 a 15 percent increase to get there.  
22 And that's kind of the question. Do we really  
23 want to go through that whole exercise or do we want to get  
24 close to that or, you know, find something that makes sense.

Page 28

1 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
2 record. Yeah, that was -- you answered my question because  
3 the differences are so big here, right, the 3 and a half  
4 percent versus 50 percent, it suggests to me that it's  
5 probably building specific.  
6 MR. WACKER: Um-hum.  
7 CHAIRPERSON HAND: And I hope that there -- there  
8 would still be -- and I don't know if net zero is the right  
9 criteria. I mean that's sort of the buzz word right now,  
10 right, that zero. But that the -- that public works does keep  
11 an eye on sustainability and minimizing consumption.  
12 We had a discussion about water before we ever  
13 got, you know, the more -- the meeting kicked off today and it  
14 just -- it's going to be a bigger part of our future, and so  
15 I'm glad to see that there's some focus on it and some -- an  
16 opening, if you will, of the BDR request --  
17 MR. WACKER: Um-hum.  
18 CHAIRPERSON HAND: -- to continue to do that.  
19 MS. STEWART: Mr. Chair, if I may.  
20 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Yes.  
21 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
22 want to clarify, think Mr. Wacker is saying a 15 percent  
23 increase in costs.  
24 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Yes.

Page 29

1 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Not in emissions.  
2 MS. STEWART: Not 50.  
3 MR. WACKER: Yeah.  
4 MS. STEWART: We're going to have a more detailed  
5 analysis during the 50 percent construction document  
6 deliverable.  
7 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
8 record. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. I  
9 looked down at the document and saw 50 percent there and I  
10 thought Brian said 50 percent.  
11 The point I guess I was trying to get to there is  
12 really what is the difference in lifecycle assessment, not  
13 just cost. Cost is -- part of it is the lifecycle assessment  
14 and the other part of it, and that's what I was really asking  
15 was what the difference in LCA was from the current design to  
16 the designs. Because there's a difference in lifecycle cost  
17 analysis and lifecycle assessment. Lifecycle assessment is  
18 the emissions piece of it.  
19 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. We  
20 have -- these projects are still kind of in the middle of  
21 design. They aren't all the way through. So that assessment  
22 may not have been done yet, but it's possible.  
23 But the other thing I would like to point out is  
24 that we -- we have done two test cases, one in the north and

Page 30

1 one in the south, and of course the climate down here is  
2 completely different than the temperate climate in Carson  
3 City. The buildings are almost about the same size and about  
4 the same, you know, footprint as far as buildings go. But the  
5 other thing I want to say is this is really groundbreaking  
6 work for State of Nevada.  
7 We've had little opportunity in the last ten  
8 years to really try out a net zero building on a new  
9 construction and these are the first chances that we have to  
10 do that. So I'm really excited to see what -- what we learn.  
11 You know, net zero has been out there for ten years at least,  
12 maybe even longer. I've toured net zero buildings in Colorado  
13 that were done by the federal government.  
14 And so I think we're going to learn a lot from  
15 this and it's going to help us and prepare us and prepare our  
16 team to take the next step. And we've got a batch of new  
17 projects coming on at the next CIP and we will be able to  
18 apply that knowledge to those as well.  
19 And the last thing I want to say about this is  
20 basically our standard -- adopted standards is a LEED silver  
21 standard. Even though we don't go through the certification  
22 process with LEED, that's the target we're hitting on all the  
23 construction so...  
24 MS. STEWART: I'm sorry. Susan Stewart for the

Page 31

1 record. I just wanted to point out that in the  
2 recommendations it does -- we will be reporting back to the  
3 Board on this item again as we get more information as Kent  
4 said, as well as the implementation of new regulations will be  
5 a public process and the Board will be very involved in that.  
6 So this is -- this is really just our first swing at this as  
7 far as the Board goes.  
8 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
9 record. Thank you. Glad to hear that Nevada is  
10 [electronically indiscernible].  
11 MS. STEWART: That's right.  
12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: The next item on our agenda  
13 is --  
14 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. We  
15 have one more topic under Item 6.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Oh, sorry.  
17 MS. STEWART: That's okay.  
18 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Go ahead.  
19 MS. STEWART: We turned everything into Agenda  
20 Item Number 6. Susan Stewart for the record.  
21 Kent, did you want me -- I think I was going to  
22 do the -- okay.  
23 Okay. Susan Stewart for the record. You heard  
24 Brian talk about window replacements and one of our challenges

Page 32

1 standing in the way of implementing window replacements is  
2 AB160. And AB160 was passed in the 2017 legislative session.  
3 Buildings over 50 years old, before public works division can  
4 replace windows we have to do a feasibility study of  
5 alternatives.  
6 And we have to move in the -- let me get the  
7 thing here -- office of historic preservation of the State  
8 Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, otherwise  
9 SHPO. And that acronym is S-H-P-O.  
10 And when we were putting together this  
11 presentation for the Board, I went back and looked at the  
12 legislative history and State Public Works Division did not  
13 oppose this bill.  
14 And I was surprised you did not oppose this bill  
15 until I realized that in the 2017 session the State Public  
16 Works division was dealing with the no damage or delay  
17 proposed amendment to our applicable statutes, which was a  
18 huge problem and happened to be sponsored by the same  
19 legislative person.  
20 So we were very much I would say picking our  
21 battles. I'm going to let both Kent and Brian talk a little  
22 bit about the challenges imposed by this bill, but what you  
23 see here attached as Attachment 3, Exhibit B is a list of  
24 window replacements that were not recommended in the CIP

Page 33

1 because of the challenges posed by AB160.  
2 And with that overview, I'll turn it over to  
3 either Kent or Brian who may want to add more about  
4 challenges.  
5 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I'll  
6 take a swing at this one. So in the Attachment 3 Exhibit B we  
7 have a list of projects, basically window projects for the CIP  
8 that were attended by the agencies, and it's \$25 million worth  
9 of projects so it's not insignificant.  
10 But the challenge that we run into is each one of  
11 these -- each one of these projects have to be assessed before  
12 they can be actually written up into a project so it's a kind  
13 of a two-step process.  
14 You know, in hindsight it would have been better  
15 to make an assessment of every one of these projects two years  
16 ago so that we can come to the table and SHPO prepared with an  
17 assessment than the spot that we find ourselves in now, which  
18 is -- which is when we go to SHPO, the usual answer from them  
19 is no, you're not going to replace those windows, they're  
20 historic, don't touch them. And it's -- it doesn't take into  
21 consideration how much energy we're saving. There's nothing  
22 in this bill that says we're going to be saving a lot of  
23 energy.  
24 What is in the bill is putting film on the

Page 34

1 windows. That's going to save 2 or 3 percent of energy. And  
2 replacing a broken window, yeah, we'll let you do that.  
3 But the Bill is more residential driven than  
4 commercial facilities. So if we take a look at the building  
5 we're in up in Carson City, the Icon building, we could easily  
6 replace every single window in that building.  
7 MEMBER FREED: Yep.  
8 MR. LEFEVRE: And probably cut our energy use by  
9 a third because it's single pane glass that was installed back  
10 in 1960.  
11 From an energy standpoint it's a no brainer. But  
12 the hurdle and the challenge is getting SHPO on board to do  
13 that, which they've never been on board. They're more  
14 interested in how that building looks and how it will look  
15 than saving a kilowatt of power. So that's my lowdown on  
16 that.  
17 And so when we received all these replacements,  
18 every one of these buildings is pushing 50 years, if not more,  
19 and that throws us into the law AB160. So with that kind of a  
20 background, maybe, Brian, you have some other perspective you  
21 can add to this.  
22 MR. WACKER: Yeah, thank you. Brian Wacker for  
23 the record. Yeah, what I wanted to add on that is part of the  
24 Bill is we have to do an assessment of these alternatives that

Page 35

1 are listed there. And the way the Bill is written is if any  
2 of these alternatives pencils so that the energy savings from  
3 installing that alternative is greater than, you know, the  
4 cost of installing that alternative, and I keep using, you  
5 know, the film example.  
6 So if we save more energy by putting the film on  
7 than installing the film, then we cannot move forward with the  
8 window replacement because of AB160; we're not allowed to  
9 actually replace the window.  
10 That's a big challenge base putting film on a  
11 window only saves about 10 percent of the energy over actually  
12 replacing the window. So this Bill keeps us from replacing  
13 the window and is really forcing us to do some of these  
14 alternative treatments. And they're fine. Film is fine.  
15 Weather stripping is fine. I don't have a problem with doing  
16 these things. It's just that it doesn't save the energy that  
17 you would replacing the window a lot of times.  
18 And so we really have our hands tied, like in the  
19 Icon building, the Bill tells us explicitly we have to look at  
20 these -- it lists the alternatives we look at, we have to look  
21 at them and if any of them saves energy or saves money when  
22 you do an analysis for that alternative the window replacement  
23 is just -- it's out the window. So it really ties our hands.  
24 The other thing, Kent mentioned it a little bit

Page 36

1 too, is that when this bill was introduced there's a report  
2 from 2012, "Saving Windows, Saving Money" report published by  
3 the Preservation Green Lab, that was the justification for  
4 this bill, and really that report was written with residential  
5 in mind and was really written for homeowners as a way to say  
6 hey, you don't have to replace your windows, you can do some  
7 of these alternative treatments and they're a good use of your  
8 money as well.  
9 And so that was a basis for this Bill. It's a  
10 challenge because some of these alternatives that the Bill  
11 says that we have to do are not even applicable to a lot of  
12 our buildings. Some of them are, some aren't, but we have to  
13 look at these. So it's a challenge and it's keeping us from  
14 really being able to move forward with these projects.  
15 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. The  
16 other thing is the financial, you know, the dollars and cents  
17 of replacing windows. We'll be paying prevailing wage on  
18 everyone of these windows.  
19 And so if you take a look at a new commercial  
20 building double pane insulated commercial paned window you're  
21 probably somewhere in the 60 buck a square foot range for the  
22 material and probably another \$60 a square foot to install it.  
23 So installing a high grade commercial window is  
24 not cheap. And so that's why we're coming up with \$24 million



Page 37

1 on all these projects where AB160 doesn't even recognize that  
2 a commercial building is going to be more expensive to upgrade  
3 than a normal window which a residential person can do by  
4 themselves.  
5 Some of the language in here -- I reviewed the  
6 testimony during the session, and some of the language is  
7 well, you can go buy this stuff at JC Penney's or some other  
8 store. I'm like yeah, okay. So there you go. That's  
9 residential construction.  
10 We don't buy our stuff at JC Penney's. We buy it  
11 from a manufacturer that makes millions of square feet of this  
12 stuff. So anyway. So it's been a challenge and it will  
13 continue to be a challenge until this Bill is either amended  
14 or rescinded.  
15 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Lewis, are you -- you  
16 look like you're going to say something.  
17 MEMBER LEWIS: Well, Member Kevin Lewis. So I  
18 guess those are the options for the Board to -- to consider  
19 there; correct, Kent?  
20 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. Yes.  
21 MEMBER LEWIS: Okay. Either rescind or spend the  
22 money, huh?  
23 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
24 didn't have anything further on this. We did -- I didn't know

Page 38

1 if you wanted to talk to the Board about a possible way to  
2 attack this with planning dollars going forward.  
3 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. We  
4 have looked at a number of things; in fact, we looked at the  
5 possibility of using some of our planning money to do these  
6 individual studies.  
7 And a study, for example, on the Icon building I  
8 think would probably be anywhere 20, \$30,000 to do a study --  
9 just to do a study on what makes sense for that building.  
10 And then -- and then we still run the risk of  
11 getting turned down by SHPO even after the study. There's  
12 nothing out there in the commercial world right now that's  
13 going to be single pane. Nothing. I mean you can't even --  
14 you can't even hope to get an energy standard with single pane  
15 glass so.  
16 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. So  
17 we're doing 20 to \$30,000 for a study that we know the answer  
18 to before we do the study.  
19 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Which is something --  
20 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
21 don't -- our Bill draft requests are in for the session. So  
22 it be for the 2025 session, but we would certainly continue to  
23 keep the Board updated. You know, you never know, somebody  
24 else may take a look at this and go you know -- you never know

Page 39

1 what everybody else has in the hopper as far as their direct  
2 request, but we would certainly keep the Board informed on  
3 this matter.  
4 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.  
5 I would recommend, yes, since we're looking at the '25 session  
6 that we, that gives us time to do a little better analysis and  
7 research on how we might be able to come with a correct bill  
8 draft request to offset the problems that AB160 has presented  
9 to us.  
10 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I'm  
11 going to suggest, and Homa will tell me if I get it wrong, but  
12 when we look at items to be adgencized for future board  
13 meetings, if you could bring that up then and we'll make sure  
14 that it's formalized.  
15 MS. WOODRUM: This is Homa. Sounds like a plan.  
16 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Homa.  
17 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
18 record. Again thank you for the good work that was done on  
19 this. And I got a note here in case -- to make sure we don't  
20 forget that when we get to our agenda Item 8. And it looks  
21 like the next item on our agenda is the administrator's report  
22 to the Board.  
23 MR. LEFEVRE: Yes. Kent Lefevre for the record.  
24 I'll keep this fairly brief to give everybody an idea of

Page 40

1 what's going on within the division. Under bullet point 1,  
2 staffing, we currently have three vacancies in professional  
3 services and ten vacancies in inspections, and we have  
4 maintained open recruitments for these positions so we're  
5 still continuing to try and find people.  
6 We have the -- we have opened the job  
7 announcement for the deputy administrator and we have two  
8 candidates that have shown interest that are qualified.  
9 There's been four applicants but two candidates are qualified  
10 for an interview.  
11 Bullet point 2, the Board recommended version of  
12 the CIP, the 2023 CIP was submitted to the governor's office  
13 on September 30th, 2020. And since that time we've met --  
14 we've met with the Governor's office, the finance director and  
15 administrator to discuss the details of the proposed projects.  
16 The GFO has not provided any formal comments on  
17 the submittal as they are still waiting the long  
18 affordability, but we are in vigorous discussions with them  
19 right now and probably will have some formal [electronically  
20 indiscernible] I would imagine within the next ten days.  
21 Bullet 3, the projects -- just an update on the  
22 overall projects were the telling of the 2019 CIP projects.  
23 With the exception of ten projects, the work of the 29 CIPs  
24 team, sorry, will be completed by the sunset date of

Page 41

1 June 30th, '23.  
2 Under the emergency project which I mentioned  
3 under Tab 4 I believe it was, the consultant was selected and  
4 the CEMAR was selected for that Las Vegas jail remodel acting  
5 under the authority of NAC 341.141. So that is moving  
6 forward. The architect is NIT Architecture and the CEMAR is  
7 Burke Construction.  
8 Under bullet 5, the legislative preparation,  
9 staff -- our staff has built PowerPoints to support the CIP  
10 presentations to the jointly run committees. They have also  
11 built PowerPoints for the Governor affairs committee, and the  
12 Division has submitted three bill drafts for consideration at  
13 the 82nd session.  
14 Those are affecting change order limits,  
15 BDR282011, and BDR28217 which is the long-term planning for  
16 office space, and then the one we discussed here today,  
17 BDR28241, our net zero energy change.  
18 Also our staff has completed the Q and A for all  
19 the adjusted base operating projects. And then lastly, board  
20 vacancy update. Since we last met a potential new board  
21 candidate has been interviewed and recommended. And correct  
22 me if I'm wrong, Laura, it was submitted to the governor's  
23 office for consideration.  
24 MEMBER FREED: Yes.

Page 42

1 MR. LEFEVRE: There remains one vacancy to be  
2 filled by this board and that concludes my update.  
3 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I have a question.  
4 Vice Chair Bentley. On the deputy administrator you said you  
5 had four applicants and two qualified?  
6 MR. LEFEVRE: Two of the four are qualified.  
7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Qualified. What is  
8 the rest of the time frame on that?  
9 MR. LEFEVRE: We have interviews set up for the  
10 20th of December for those two applicants right now.  
11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: So then is the  
12 appointment shortly after that?  
13 MR. LEFEVRE: It will be shortly after that. I  
14 I'll coordinate with that Matt and Laura.  
15 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you.  
16 MR. LEFEVRE: I want to get a deputy before the  
17 session starts.  
18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I would think so.  
19 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Never again for the --  
20 Chairperson Hand for the record. Thank you for the update.  
21 There was -- could you talk about the potential of additional  
22 funding that might be available and how that might impact the  
23 CIP.  
24 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay.

Page 43

1 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Are you repaired to bring that  
2 up?  
3 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record.  
4 Communications with GFO are confidential so I don't know if I  
5 can bring that up in this public forum.  
6 MS. STEWART: You cannot.  
7 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay.  
8 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.  
9 Ongoing discussions with the GFO and the preparation of the  
10 governor's budget is confidential until it's produced.  
11 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
12 record. Thank you. I guess that brings us to agenda Item 8  
13 for possible action. This is a board comment and discussion,  
14 and it includes agenda items, items to be included in future  
15 agendas, review of action items, and then set a future meeting  
16 date.  
17 MEMBER FREED: Laura Freed for the record. So I  
18 was just looking at AB160 and thinking -- looking at the SHPO  
19 website and thinking about what we were just talking about.  
20 Is it possible to -- maybe not next meeting since we're  
21 thinking about '25 session here -- is it possible to go talk  
22 to DCNR leadership once DCNR actually gets an actual permanent  
23 director and see if they would be supportive of changing AB160  
24 in '25, because I think they -- you know, I understand from

Page 44

1 staff SHPO is rather stubborn to work with, but perhaps DCNR  
2 leadership would see new value in doing some of those energy  
3 efficiency projects. Just a thought.  
4 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. It's  
5 written on my to-do list.  
6 MEMBER FREED: Okay.  
7 MS. STEWART: And it seems to me that it's a  
8 valuable conversation to have.  
9 Susan Stewart for the record. I also have DEI  
10 followup, so I will be pestering Member Lewis -- I shouldn't  
11 say pestering. That won't be necessary. Following up with  
12 Member Lewis and reporting back to the Board on that item.  
13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
14 record. So I think the AB160 comment, does that -- addresses  
15 what Member Bentley brought up also? I just want to make sure  
16 it's all in the record.  
17 MR. LEFEVRE: Thank you, yes.  
18 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Are there -- are there any  
19 other items from the past that needed to bring up today?  
20 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. Not  
21 that I'm aware of.  
22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.  
23 I have one question. Six years ago we sent a letter to the  
24 governor along with our CIP regarding how far we were behind

Page 45

1 on paper (ph.) maintenance and the impacts it was having. And  
2 I hate to say this, but I'm not aware that we four years ago  
3 reiterate that to the new governor, and do we need to  
4 reiterate that again to the new governor.  
5 It's a very important issue in light of, and I  
6 just want to make sure that we stay on top of it with the new  
7 governor.  
8 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I  
9 appreciate that recommendation. We did actually send it to  
10 Governor Sisolak two years ago.  
11 MEMBER FREED: That's correct.  
12 MR. LEFEVRE: And I believe it really made a  
13 difference because we got a lot of maintenance projects  
14 approved in the 2011 CIP, and it looks like we're going to be  
15 able to get a lot of maintenance projects in the '23 CIP as  
16 well.  
17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I just wanted to bring  
18 that I know that new projects are sexy and old projects  
19 aren't. So it's so easy for them to get pushed to the  
20 background and I would like to make sure we keep those in the  
21 forefront. That was all. Thank you.  
22 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. Are  
23 you asking whether the board should send a similar letter to  
24 the new governor now?

Page 46

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I was bringing it up  
2 probably as a question whether everyone thought it would be  
3 beneficial for us to do that at this time where we have a new  
4 governor coming. I personally think it can't hurt. It could  
5 possibly help more than hurt but that's my own opinion.  
6 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
7 record. So we had -- you shared some information with us, I  
8 can't remember which board meeting, in terms of where we were  
9 historically and how the deferred maintenance is working away  
10 at the backlog.  
11 So perhaps as an agenda item we could have an  
12 update on that and that would really inform us as to what we  
13 do want to do in terms of the Board and save writing letters  
14 to the Governor.  
15 MEMBER FREED: Laura Freed for the record. I  
16 think you're referring to the diagram we had in our packet on  
17 the -- in the August meeting extending the maintenance curve.  
18 It's either not out because the Governor -- the new governor's  
19 transition team asked all of us department directors to write  
20 a memo to the transition team, and again Mr. Bentley, I made  
21 one of my issues the maintenance and investment in our  
22 existing state infrastructure.  
23 So they've already a heard bit about it from me,  
24 but I'm supportive of sending a new, fresh letter from the

Page 47

1 board. Therefore they're not just hearing it from me, they're  
2 hearing it from people outside the Department administration  
3 and I think that would be very helpful.  
4 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.  
5 Keeping the open meeting law in mind, I think the appropriate  
6 process for that would be that we would have a board meeting.  
7 MEMBER FREED: Yeah.  
8 MS. STEWART: That would be adgendized, it would  
9 be an action item, and then we would suggest a letter for the  
10 Board to approve timing-wise. We would probably need to meet  
11 sooner rather than later to make that happen, but I think it  
12 could happen very easily remotely.  
13 MEMBER FREED: Sure.  
14 MS. STEWART: That would be something that we  
15 could really put something together and make that happen. As  
16 reflected by the comments of the board and our past action,  
17 it's very important.  
18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you. I agree, I  
19 think that it is important.  
20 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
21 have a question for Director Freed. As far as the timing of  
22 that --  
23 MEMBER FREED: Um-hum.  
24 MS. STEWART: -- would you have any insight that

Page 48

1 you could share with the board as far as when we might want to  
2 deliver a letter like that to the new governor and his staff.  
3 MEMBER FREED: Well -- this is Laura Freed for  
4 the record. Well, as you all know, they're working on the  
5 Governor presently as we speak, and that includes the capital  
6 improvement program.  
7 And as you know, the economic forum forecasts  
8 were very favorable and so I think -- I'm guessing, no one has  
9 said this to me, bear that in mind -- I do think they will  
10 look favorably on the CIP as it was recommended by the Board  
11 for the simple fact that it appears to money to be able to do  
12 that.  
13 Having said that, to undermine our -- this  
14 board's commitment to eliminating, may in stack log, which  
15 works in their favor because it frees up, you know, fund  
16 affordability to use the sexy fun projects they all love.  
17 I would say it's got to be sent by -- I hate to  
18 say this, guys, but the first -- probably the end of the first  
19 week of January, because remember the State's going to be in  
20 the second week in January and they will be, you know, sending  
21 the budget to the printer at that point, but it's -- so that's  
22 why it's got to happen really fast in order for them to make  
23 budget decisions.  
24 But here's another thought. There's always

Page 49

1 budget amendments. There's a ton of them, both in the  
2 operating budget and sometimes in the CIP. So you could send  
3 it later, and if the CIP doesn't look from maintenance  
4 perspective the way the Board would hope it looks, we can  
5 absolutely, you know, send a letter and then urge a budget  
6 amendment as -- so you could -- I would say sooner is better,  
7 but it's not the end of the world if gov rec gets finished  
8 before the Board sends a letter.  
9 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
10 was thinking the first week in January as well. So I can  
11 certainly poll the Board and see if we can put together a --  
12 you know, find a time for an hour. I'm not sure we would  
13 necessarily add anything else to the agenda.  
14 MEMBER FREED: Right.  
15 MS. STEWART: We would just do that. And it  
16 would be a very quick remote meeting but then we could address  
17 what's obviously important to the Board and the State. So  
18 thank you.  
19 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the  
20 record. Thank you. That's fantastic. I look forward to the  
21 one hour meeting before -- before the first week of January.  
22 So we'll have to probably review it and all that.  
23 MS. STEWART: Right.  
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Draft a letter and -- have a

Page 50

1 meeting, draft a letter, review it, the whole --  
2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: We have to have two  
3 meetings?  
4 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. No.  
5 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Okay.  
6 MS. STEWART: And to be clear, I was thinking of  
7 having the meeting -- this is Susan Stewart for the record --  
8 the first week in January.  
9 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Get it on.  
10 MS. STEWART: Yes.  
11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you.  
12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Yeah. Chairperson Hand for  
13 the record. Thank you, Clint, for bringing it back up.  
14 MS. STEWART: That will make Tito happy.  
15 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I'll be his friend.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Yeah. Be back on his list.  
17 Okay. The next agenda item is public comment, and do we have  
18 any comment in Carson City or here?  
19 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.  
20 There's no public comment here in Las Vegas.  
21 MS. WOODRUM: This is Homa Woodrum. No public  
22 comment in Carson City.  
23 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All right. I think the last  
24 item on our agenda is adjournment. Do I have a motion?

Page 51

1 MEMBER FREED: Move to adjourn. Sorry, Laura  
2 Freed for the record. I move to adjourn.  
3 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.  
4 Second.  
5 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All in favor. Opposed? Thank  
6 you all.  
7 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Kevin.  
8 (Motion carries unanimously.)  
9 (Proceedings concluded at 11:21 a.m.)  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Page 52

1 STATE OF NEVADA, )  
2 CARSON CITY. ) ss.  
3  
4  
5 I, Shellie Loomis, Official Court Reporter for the  
6 State of Nevada, Public Works, do hereby certify:  
7 That on Friday, December 9, 2022, I was present for  
8 the purpose of reporting in verbatim stenotype notes to the  
9 best of my ability of the within-entitled session of the  
10 public meeting;  
11 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1  
12 through 51, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct  
13 transcription of my stenotype notes of said session of the  
14 public meeting to the best of my ability under the  
15 circumstances.  
16  
17 Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 30th day of  
18 December, 2022.  
19  
20  
21  
22 //Shellie Loomis, RPR//  
23 Shellie Loomis, NV CCR #228  
24







*Do Not Copy*

**In The Matter Of:**  
*STATE OF NEVADA*  
*PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING*

---

*January 4, 2023*

---

*Capitol Reporters*  
*628 E. John St # 3*  
*Carson City, Nevada 89706*  
*775 882-5322*

Page 1

1  
2 STATE OF NEVADA  
3 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING  
4 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2023  
5 CARSON CITY, NEVADA  
6 ---oOo---

7  
8  
9

10 The Board: ADAM HAND, Chairman  
11 TITO TIBERTI, Member  
12 CLINT BENTLEY, Member  
13 KEVIN LEWIS, Member  
14 PHILLIP MANNELLY, Member

14 For the Board: SUSAN STEWART  
15 Construction Law Counsel  
16 KENT LEFEVRE, Administrator

17  
18  
19  
20

21 Reported by: CAPITOL REPORTERS  
22 Certified Shorthand Reporters  
23 BY: CHRISTY Y. JOYCE  
24 Nevada CCR #625  
628 E. John Street #3  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
(775) 882-5322

Page 2

1 A G E N D A  
2 ITEM PAGE  
3 1 - Roll call 3  
4 2 - Public comment 4  
5 3 - For possible action: Discussion and possible 6  
6 action on the board's letter to the governor  
7 regarding the state's deferred maintenance needs  
8 4 - Public comment 8  
9 5 - Adjournment 9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Page 3

1 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2023, 3:00 P.M.  
2 ---oOo---  
3 CHAIRMAN HAND: Chairperson Hand for the record.  
4 It is -- Today is, the date and the time are, let me get  
5 this, January 4th, at 3:00 p.m. straight up. And this is the  
6 State Public Works Board meeting. And we will jump straight  
7 in to roll call.  
8 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay. Kent LeFevre for the record.  
9 Chairman Adam Hand.  
10 CHAIRMAN HAND: Present.  
11 MR. LEFEVRE: Vice Chair Clint Bentley.  
12 MEMBER BENTLEY: Present.  
13 MR. LEFEVRE: Thank you. Member Tito Tiberti.  
14 MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.  
15 MR. LEFEVRE: Member Kevin Lewis. No.  
16 And Member Director of Department of  
17 Administration Laura Freed. No.  
18 And then how do we handle --  
19 MS. STEWART: We have new board member, Phillip  
20 Mannelly.  
21 MEMBER MANNELLY: Present.  
22 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay. Mr. Chair, we have a quorum.  
23 MS. STEWART: Kevin just joined us.  
24 CHAIRMAN HAND: I think we're getting some

Page 4

1 feedback from somebody. Am I the only one getting that?  
2 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. If  
3 everybody could mute their lines unless they're talking.  
4 MS. WOODRUM: And, Susan, this is Homa Woodrum  
5 for the record. I believe we have two entries on Teams for  
6 Mr. Bentley. It might be that the speakers are on for one  
7 and playing in to the microphone for the other. But it looks  
8 like everybody is muted.  
9 MS. STEWART: All right. And, for the record, I  
10 just want to note that Member Lewis has joined the meeting.  
11 Although now I don't see him. So I guess we'll just keep  
12 going. Somebody is in the lobby waiting. Okay. Hi, Kevin.  
13 We've got you now. Thank you.  
14 CHAIRMAN HAND: Okay. Chairperson Hand for the  
15 record. The next item on the agenda is public comment. Do  
16 we have of any public comment this afternoon?  
17 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I  
18 have awesome public comment. You may notice we have a new  
19 person attending virtually. I would like to introduce Phil  
20 Mannelly. He was appointed by Governor Sisolak December  
21 22nd, 2022. And Phil serves the position of the board with  
22 construction law experience. Phil is currently a partner at  
23 McDonald Carano. And he's met with Adam. He met with me.  
24 He met with Kent. He met with Director Freed and has our

Page 5

1 warm welcome and we're thrilled to have him as a member of  
2 the board.  
3 And maybe he wants to say something. I didn't  
4 want to put him on the spot, but I told him I would give him  
5 the opportunity to just say hello.  
6 MEMBER MANNELLY: Thank you. Phil Mannelly for  
7 the record. Thank you, Susan, for that introduction and kind  
8 words. I'm really excited to be part of the board and really  
9 grateful that Governor Sisolak appointed me to this position.  
10 I look forward to getting to know all of you better and to  
11 work with all of you. I grew up in Gardnerville and  
12 graduated from high school there, moved away for college,  
13 undergrad and law school, and have now been back in northern  
14 Nevada practicing law for just over six years.  
15 And I love the State of Nevada and look forward  
16 to being able to give back a little bit and serve in this  
17 capacity and, like I said, work with all of you. So thank  
18 you again.  
19 CHAIRMAN HAND: Okay. Welcome. Member Hand for  
20 the record. Thank you, Phil, again, and welcome. We're  
21 really glad to see you join the board and looking forward to  
22 working together.  
23 And, with that, we'll go to our one item for  
24 possible action today is discussion and possible action on

Page 6

1 the board's letter to the governor regarding the state's  
2 deferred maintenance needs. And, Kent, are you going to take  
3 the lead on this one?  
4 MR. LEFEVRE: Yes. Kent LeFevre for the record.  
5 So, Agenda Item Number 3 is the letter, the draft  
6 correspondence to the governor and prior correspondences to  
7 Governor Sisolak and Governor Sandoval. And so I would ask  
8 the board members the they have any comments on the draft  
9 letter as written. I know of only one comment that needs to  
10 be corrected and that is the fiscal years at the last  
11 sentence right before the signature line from fiscal year 21.  
12 It's actually fiscal year 24 and 25. But I would be happy to  
13 entertain any other comments from the board.  
14 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record. Any  
15 questions from the members?  
16 Tito, you're speechless?  
17 MEMBER TIBERTI: I think one thing I do say is  
18 this thing is very, very important. And I plan to talk to  
19 this governor about deferred maintenance. I don't think we  
20 can allow these buildings to deteriorate like they have the  
21 last 15 years. And I think this is a very important letter.  
22 So I congratulate us on making it important so he'll see it  
23 coming. Thank you.  
24 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record.

Page 7

1 Thank you, Tito.  
2 Any other thoughts? If not, then is there a  
3 motion?  
4 (The court reporter interrupts)  
5 MS. STEWART: Clint, Susan Stewart for the  
6 record. We're having a lot of trouble with your -- with  
7 feedback from your line. In fact, we couldn't understand  
8 you. And I know what you said. So perhaps I would ask  
9 another member to make the motion instead.  
10 MEMBER LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis. I'll make his  
11 motion.  
12 MS. STEWART: Okay. So I'm going to restate the  
13 motion, if I may. The motion is to approve the letter with  
14 the one edit to correct the fiscal year in the last sentence  
15 of the letter.  
16 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.  
17 I'll make that motion to approve this letter.  
18 MS. STEWART: All right.  
19 MEMBER LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis. I'll second.  
20 MS. STEWART: All right. There's been a motion  
21 and a second.  
22 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record.  
23 We'll go ahead and vote then. All in favor -- Do you want  
24 our hands raised?

Page 8

1 MS. STEWART: Yep.  
2 CHAIRMAN HAND: All in favor say aye and a hand  
3 raised if that helps.  
4 (The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion)  
5 CHAIRMAN HAND: All opposed? And, it looks like  
6 no one abstained, so the motion carries. Thank you.  
7 Tito, I guess, thank you for initiating this  
8 process several years ago with the work that went in to the  
9 previous version. I'm really glad that we are, again,  
10 carrying the energy forward with the new leadership in the  
11 governor and hopefully again we'll get the support that we  
12 got in the past and the buildings will still be here when we  
13 fall off the board and still in good shape. Again, thank you  
14 for getting us to where really initiating the process to get  
15 us to where we are today.  
16 And, with that, that's our only agenda item  
17 today, unless something has changed. I know we have public  
18 comment is the only other agenda item. And so is there any  
19 comment, public comment, in Carson or in the south?  
20 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. No  
21 public comment here in the north. And I do not see any  
22 public comment in the south.  
23 CHAIRMAN HAND: Member Hand for the record. In  
24 asking for a motion to adjourn, I would like to thank

1 everybody for being here today. And, again, thanks for  
2 keeping the ball rolling on this important issue. And I want  
3 to wish everybody a happy new year and thank you for your  
4 service.

5 MS. STEWART: Thank you. Susan Stewart for the  
6 record. We'll make that change and we'll get it to the chair  
7 for his signature and we'll get it to the governor right  
8 away.

9 CHAIRMAN HAND: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

10 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.

11 I'll make a motion to adjourn this meeting.

12 MEMBER LEWIS: I'll second it. Member Kevin  
13 Lewis.

14 CHAIRMAN HAND: All in favor.

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

16 CHAIRMAN HAND: It looks like there are none  
17 opposed and none abstained. Thank you all.

18 (Hearing concluded at 3:11 p.m.)

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 STATE OF NEVADA        }  
2 CARSON CITY            } ss.

3  
4 I, CHRISTY Y. JOYCE, Official Court Reporter for  
5 the State of Nevada, Public Works Division, do hereby  
6 certify:

7 That on Wednesday, the 4th day of January, 2023, I  
8 was present at the State Public Works Division, 515 E. Musser  
9 Street, Carson City, Nevada, for the purpose of reporting in  
10 verbatim stenotype notes the within-entitled public meeting;

11 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages  
12 1 through 9, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct  
13 transcription of my stenotype notes of said public meeting.

14  
15 Dated at Reno, Nevada, this 20th day of January,  
16 2023.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

CHRISTY Y. JOYCE, CCR  
Nevada CCR #625



**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 4

SUBJECT TITLE:

Introduction of new Board members:

- Philip Mannelly, Esq.
- Jack Robb, Director of Department of Administration

DISCUSSION:

- Jack Robb, Director of Department of Administration appointed by Governor Lombardo, serves on the Board pursuant to NRS 341.020(2).
- Philip Mannelly was appointed by former Governor Sisolak to fill the vacancy created by Sean Stewart's resignation. As a licensed attorney practicing construction law, Philip's appointment meets the requirements of NRS 341.020 (2)(a)(2).

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not Applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Not Applicable.

PREPARED BY:

Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General and Construction Law Counsel





**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

Buildings & Grounds Section  
Phone: (775) 684-1800

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

Buildings & Grounds Section  
Phone: (702) 486-4300

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 5

SUBJECT TITLE:

2023 Legislative Session Update

- I. CIP
- II. SPWD Bills
- III. Other relevant Bills

DISCUSSION:

CIP Update

Administrator LeFevre will provide an update.

SPWD Bills

SPWD proposed the following:

SB 52 – adding a consideration of ‘net-zero’ to standards SPWD is required to adopt.

SB 25 – implements a process for long-term planning for state office space.

SB26 – raises dollar thresholds on SPWD contract change order limits.

Other relevant bills

Construction Law Counsel will provide a brief update on legislation in the 2023 Legislative Session that may impact SPWD.

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not Applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Not Applicable.

PREPARED BY:

Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General and Construction Law Counsel





**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 6

SUBJECT TITLE:

Public Workshop, Executive Order 2023-003 Regulation Review

DISCUSSION:

Executive Order 2023-003

- Survey Results
- Staff Recommendations
- Public/stakeholder Input
  - Written submissions
  - Other stakeholder input

Memo – State Public Works Division Regulation Review

Exhibit A – Governor’s Executive Order 2023 -003

Exhibit B – Informational Report – Executive Order 2023-003

Exhibit C – Survey Questions and Results

Exhibit D – Notice of Public Workshop

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not Applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not Applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Not Applicable.

PREPARED BY:

Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General and Construction Law Counsel



**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 12, 2023

RE: State Public Works Division Regulation Review

---

Governor's Executive Order

Executive Order 2023-003 requires that all Executive branch agencies and boards conduct a review of all regulations. (Exhibit A, Executive Order 2023-003) The Executive Order directs agencies to “undertake a comprehensive review” of their regulations and provide a report detailing how SPWD regulations can be “streamlined, clarified, reduced, or otherwise improved to ensure those regulations provide for the general welfare of the State without unnecessarily inhibiting economic growth.” The Executive Order requires SPWD to report the name, address, business, phone number, and email address of all who participate, either by completing the survey, submitting other written comments, or public comment during the Workshop.

The Governor's Office issued guidance on implementation of our regulation review (Exhibit B, Informational Report – Executive Order 2023-003). Prior to submitting their report, SPWD must hold a public hearing seeking input from industry stakeholders, to: (i) vet their recommended changes; (ii) solicit input as to the merits of those changes; and (iii) identify other regulatory changes stakeholders feel are worthy of consideration.

SPWD Survey

In preparation for the public meeting, SPWD emailed a survey to over 600 SPWD vendors and contractors seeking their input on SPWD regulations. Participants had 2 weeks to respond. The survey was also posted on SPWD's website. (Exhibit C, Survey questions and results) Survey questions were crafted in compliance with the Executive Order, seeking comments on how SPWD regulations can be improved, and/or deleted. Participants were asked to identify how regulations impacted on business either adverse and beneficial.

Workshop Notice

On March 28, 2023, SPWD staff provided notice of a Workshop to be held in compliance with Executive Order 2023-003. (Exhibit D, Notice of Public Workshop) The Notice provided a summary of the survey results, and SPWD staff suggestions regarding regulations that could be deleted or revised.



The Notice was emailed to 600 vendors/contractors, sent to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for posting, posted on SPWD's website, and physically posted at SPWD's offices, both North and South.

### Workshop Presentation

The agenda for the workshop will be as follows:

- Survey Results
- Staff Recommendations
- Public/stakeholder input
  - Written submissions
  - Other stakeholder input

Survey Questions and Results – Survey directions told participants to only comment on regulations under SPWD jurisdiction. For example, NAC 338.005 – 338.125 are under the Labor Commissioner's authority.

### Survey Results

An overview of the survey results are as follows:

- 22 total responses
- 7 responses regarding regulations outside SPWD authority

Remaining responses were as follows:

### NAC 338

- No changes Necessary
  - 4 comments
- Construction Manager at Risk
  - 4 comments
- Qualification of Bidders: subcontractors
  - 1 comment
- No Details
  - 1 comment
- Veteran's Preference
  - 1 comment
- NAC 338 and 341 (Delete all)
  - 1 comment

### NAC 341

- Administration
  - 2 comments
- Green Building Design Measures
  - 1 comment

### Staff Recommendations

The survey solicited comments and input on both NAC 338 and 341, however staff only made recommendations for NAC 341 as that Chapter only impacts SPWD. NAC 338 applies to local government, NDOT, NDOW, and Parks. Recommendations are as follows:

#### **1. Green Building Design Regulations –**

NAC 341.341 Simple payback period defined. Delete: unnecessary and redundant.

## 2. NAC General Provisions –

NAC 341.065 Contract documents; insurance. Delete unnecessary and redundant.

NAC 341.086 Alternative bids. Delete, unnecessary and redundant as this requirement is included in contract documents.

NAC 341.127 Review of proposals regarding local adoption of *Uniform Plumbing Code*. Delete as unnecessary and redundant.

NAC 341.136 Selection of professional consultant for project: Procedure for selection with assistance of committee. Revise, and raise threshold of \$250,000 required for committee selection to \$1,000,000. Obsolete. As prices increase, requiring a formal selection process and consultant presentation on projects over \$250,000 wastes resources, and does not add value.

# Exhibit A



## EXECUTIVE ORDER 2023-003

### **Order Freezing the Issuance of New Regulations and Requiring a Review of Existing Regulations by All Executive Branch Agencies, Departments, Boards and Commissions**

**WHEREAS**, state regulations should protect workers, consumers and the environment, while promoting entrepreneurship and economic growth; and

**WHEREAS**, state regulations can become outdated, result in unintended consequences, create conflicts or impose an unnecessary burden on citizens, businesses or government entities; and

**WHEREAS**, it is in the best interest of the state of Nevada that its regulatory environment be concise, transparent, stable, balanced, predictable and thoughtfully constructed; and

**WHEREAS**, Nevada's current regulatory structure is too often unfocused and inefficient, contains regulations that are obsolete and includes regulations that are unnecessarily onerous, thereby limiting the economic potential of the State; and

**WHEREAS**, Article 5, Section 1 of the Nevada Constitution provides that, "The Supreme Executive Power of this State shall be vested in a Chief Magistrate who shall be Governor of the State of Nevada;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, by the authority vested in me as Governor by the Constitution and laws of the State of Nevada, it is hereby ordered as follows:

#### **SECTION 1**

Every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall undertake a comprehensive review of the regulations subject to its enforcement. On or before, May 1, 2023 each department, agency, board and commission shall provide a report to the Governor's office detailing how the regulation subject to its enforcement can be streamlined, clarified, reduced or otherwise improved to ensure those regulations provide for the general welfare of the State without unnecessarily inhibiting economic growth.

#### **SECTION 2:**

As part of its report, every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall provide a list of not less than ten (10) regulations recommended for removal, ranking them in descending order of priority.

#### **SECTION 3:**

Prior to submitting their respective reports, every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall hold a public hearing, after having provided reasonable notice consistent with Chapter 233B of the Nevada Revised Statutes, to key industry stakeholders, to: (i) vet their recommended changes; (ii) solicit input as to the merits of those changes and (iii) identify other regulatory changes stakeholders feel are worthy of consideration. Stakeholder input shall be reflected in the summary of findings and recommendations included in each submitted report.

**SECTION 4:**

Unless specifically exempt from this Executive Order as set forth in Section 5, no new regulations shall be proposed, approved or acted on by any executive branch agency, department, board or commission until such time as this Executive Order is rescinded.

**SECTION 5:**


The following regulations are not subject to the suspension set forth in Section 4:


- (a) Regulations that affect public health;
- (b) Regulations that affect public safety and security;
- (c) Regulations that are necessary in the pursuit of federal funds and certifications;
- (d) Regulations that affect the application of powers, functions and duties essential to the operation of the executive branch agency, department, board or commission at issue;
- (e) Regulations that affect pending judicial deadlines; and
- (f) Regulations necessary to comply with federal law.


Until the suspension of this Executive Order, each executive branch department, agency, board and commission that intends to continue with the enactment of a proposed regulation under an exception to the freeze set forth in Section 4 shall submit a report to the Governor's office identifying which exemption the proposed regulation falls within and detailing the problem the regulation addresses or the value to the public of the regulation, how the regulation addresses the problem or the benefits provided by the regulation, why alternate forms of regulation are insufficient to address the problem and whether other regulations currently address the problem.



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Nevada to be affixed at the State Capitol in Carson City, this 12th day of January, in the year two thousand twenty-three.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Governor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary of State

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

# Exhibit B



## **Informational Report – Executive Order 2023-003**

Pursuant to Executive Order 2023-003, a report must be submitted with the following information:

### **Section 1 - Comprehensive Review of Regulations**

*Every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall undertake a comprehensive review of the regulations subject to its enforcement. On or before, May 1, 2023 each department, agency, board and commission shall provide a report to the Governor's office detailing how the regulation subject to its enforcement can be streamlined, clarified, reduced or otherwise improved to ensure those regulations provide for the general welfare of the State without unnecessarily inhibiting economic growth.*

The report must include for **each** regulation identified in the comprehensive review that can be streamlined, clarified, reduced, or otherwise improved to ensure that the regulation provide for the general welfare of the State without unnecessarily inhibiting economic growth:

1. The citation of the regulation with clear indication of the proposed modification in blue italics and matters to be omitted in red and bracketed.
2. A clear and concise explanation on why such change should occur.
3. Information for each public meeting held to discuss the proposed regulation change, as mandated by Section 3 of Executive Order 2023-003, which must include:
  - a. The date of the meeting(s) and number of persons who attended;
  - b. Information for each person who provided public oral or written comment or testimony on the regulation:
    - i. Name of person;
    - ii. Name of entity or organization represented and address (if applicable);
    - iii. Contact telephone number;
    - iv. Electronic mail address; and
  - c. A summary of each person's public oral or written comment or testimony.
4. The estimated impact on any business, person, or agency if the change is to occur, which must include:
  - a. The adverse and beneficial effects;
  - b. The positive or negative economic impact; and
  - c. Cost savings to the state or agency.
5. In the event your agency has sufficient justification for an exemption to this Executive Order, as described below and in Section 5, please submit a list of requests for any such exemption to [dktedford@gov.nv.gov](mailto:dktedford@gov.nv.gov). Qualifying purposes for an exemption include:
  - a. Regulations that affect public health;
  - b. Regulations that affect public safety and security;
  - c. Regulations that are necessary in the pursuit of federal funds and certifications;
  - d. Regulations that affect the application of powers, functions and duties essential to the operation of the executive branch agency, department, board or commission at issue;
  - e. Regulations that affect pending judicial deadlines; and
  - f. Regulations necessary to comply with federal law.

### **Section 2 – Regulation for Removal**

*As part of its report, every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall provide a list of not less than ten (10) regulations recommended for removal, ranking them in descending order of priority.*

The report must include for **each** of the ten (10) regulations recommended for removal (ranked in descending order of priority):

1. The citation of the regulation with matters to be omitted in red and bracketed.
2. A clear and concise explanation of the need for the elimination of the regulation.
3. Information for each public meeting held to discuss the proposed regulation elimination, as mandated by Section 3 of Executive Order 2023-003, which must include:
  - a. The date of the meeting(s) and the number of persons who attended;
  - b. Information for each person who provided public oral or written comment or testimony on the regulation:
    - i. Name of person;
    - ii. Name of entity or organization represented and address (if applicable);
    - iii. Contact telephone number;
    - iv. Electronic mail address; and
  - c. A summary of each person's public oral or written comment or testimony.
4. The estimated impact on any business, person, or agency if the change is to occur, which must include:

- a. The adverse and beneficial effects;
- b. The positive or negative economic impact; and
- c. Cost savings to the state or agency.

**Section 3 - Mandatory Meeting and Report**

*Prior to submitting their respective reports, every executive branch department, agency, board and commission shall hold a public hearing, after having provided reasonable notice consistent with Chapter 233B of the Nevada Revised Statutes, to key industry stakeholders, to: (i) vet their recommended changes; (ii) solicit input as to the merits of those changes and (iii) identify other regulatory changes stakeholders feel are worthy of consideration. Stakeholder input shall be reflected in the summary of findings and recommendations included in each submitted report.*

**Executive Order 2023-03 – Template**

Name of department, agency, board, or commission: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Director: \_\_\_\_\_

Director Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 1 - Comprehensive Review of Regulations / Section 3 – Mandatory Meeting and Report**

The above-named department, agency, board, or commission conducted a comprehensive review of the regulations subject to its enforcement that can be streamlined, clarified, reduced, or otherwise improved to ensure those regulations provide for the general welfare of the State without unnecessarily inhibiting economic growth. The regulations identified for Section 1 of Executive Order 2023-03 are listed below with the information as required on page 1 of the instruction sheet on the following pages of the report:

<b>Regulation/ Information as required on page 1</b>	<b>Page number</b>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	
16.	
17.	
18.	
19.	
20.	
21.	
22.	
23.	
24.	

25.	
26.	
27.	
29.	
29.	
30.	

**Section 2 – Regulation for Removal / Section 3 – Mandatory Meeting and Report**

The above-named department, agency, board or commission conducted a comprehensive review of the regulations subject to its enforcement and identified the following ten (10) or more regulations recommended for removal. The regulations identified for Section 2 of Executive Order 2023-03, ranked in descending order of priority, are listed below with the information as required on page 1 of the instruction sheet on the following pages of the report:

<b>Regulation/Information as required on page 1</b>	<b>Page number</b>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	
16.	
17.	
18.	
19.	
20.	
21.	
22.	
23.	
24.	
25.	
26.	
27.	
28.	
29.	
30.	
31.	
32.	
33.	

34.	
35.	
36.	
37.	
38.	
39.	
40.	

# Exhibit C





16 Dan J. Peterson Company	338	Unfocused and inefficient;Obsolete;Unnecessarily onerous;Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Eliminate	Outdated	Yes	Positive	No adverse all positive	Yes	341	Unfocused and inefficient;Obsolete;Unnecessarily onerous;Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Completely delete the requirem in this day & age it is unnecessary	Yes	Positive	no aderse, all beneficial by reducing government interference	No	
17 Carpenter Sellers Del Gatto Architects	0	Unnecessarily onerous;	No changes are necessary. I am not clear on why the survey does not allow		No	Positive	0	No								
18 American Institute of Architects (AIA)	341	All of the above;	Streamline the process and expedite reviews in a timely manner. Raise the limit when the SPWD takes over a projects and leave the management with the local entities that are more familiar with the documents and their campus.	The existing system is laborious and adds too much time and costs to the expediting of public buildings and major renovations. If the campus have design professionals, they would be better prepared to address the construction of public works.	Yes	Positive	Should increase donations to universities and provide better stewardship of the donated monies. The state would need to find a better way to fund the SPWD.	Yes	338	All of the above;	Eliminate the limits on the number of Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) and Design/Build (D/B) projects that can be performed in a fiscal year.	The limitations of alternate delivery methods has forced many institutions to use design/bid/build. Design, bid , build is the less flexible solution and forces intuitions to work with the lowest bidder that plans to recoup any losses by change orders and delaying the project, forcing the institutions to take drastic resources to complete the work.	Yes	Positive	It would force construction firms to be better at bidding projects, educate their workforce and be more efficient with their processes. It would force basic construction firms to become familiar with CMAR or D/B and not continue the fleecing of public institutions that are at times ill equipped to address the change order tactics of some contractors.	No
19 CORE	338.62	Unnecessarily onerous;	Remove requirements for specific bid form.	Many qualified and otherwise responsive bids have been Disqualified on the technicality of not using or improperly filling out CMAR's bid form. This has cost the State and other public agencies millions of dollars.	Yes	Positive	Pros: More inclusive and competitive bid results. Cons: Might take a little digging to find some incidental data in sub proposal.	No								
20 NSHE	338.5	Limiting the economic potential of the state;	Provide a greater bandwidth to use design / build more often vs CMAR. Remove the design / build limits of the size of the contracts and remove the limits of the number of times we can use design / build.	Currently CMAR process lends itself to design change orders that would not happen under the design / build contractor. This costs the project and the State more money than the original contract bid.	Yes	Positive	Adverse - less use of CMAR as a contract. Beneficial - the State and project will save money using a design / build process.	No								
21 Saarem Consulting Engineers	341.311	Unfocused and inefficient;	The prime consultant's fee should be able to take into consideration the effects of inflation as does the contractor's budget for the project which has an inflation adder.	To entice good consultant's and compensate them fairly since contractors are afforded inflationary increases.	No	Negative	More prime consultants providing proposals for State projects.	No								
22 Saarem Consulting Engineers	341.083	Unfocused and inefficient;	Rules around having to accept the lowest bidder should be reviewed	Lowest bidders tend to have a high number of change orders in order to recoup profit left our during the low bid process. Change order fees almost always seem to be excessive.	Yes	Positive	Slightly higher bid at first, but fewer change orders resulting in less overall cost	No								

# Exhibit D

NOTICE OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP  
Executive Order 2023-003  
Compliance Regulation Review

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, in compliance with the Governor's Executive Order 2023-003, the State Public Works Board and the State Public Works Division (SPWD) will hold a public workshop to consider survey results, public comment, and staff comments regarding portions of chapter 338 and 341 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC).

The regulation review includes the following:

**1. Summary of Survey Results.** SPWD distributed a survey seeking input from stakeholders as directed by the Executive Order. The survey was also posted on SPWD's website. Stakeholders had 2 weeks to respond. SPWD posted the survey on its webpage and distributed the survey to 600+ stakeholders on February 27, 2023. The list of stakeholders was compiled from the following:

- Active State of Nevada/Public Works Vendors
- Pre-Qualified Contractors
- Consultants lists obtained from SPWD's Professional Services Section

An overview of the survey results are as follows:

- 21 total responses
- 7 responses regarding regulations outside SPWD authority

Remaining responses were as follows:

NAC 338

- No changes Necessary
  - 4 comments
- Construction Manager at Risk
  - 4 comments
- Qualification of Bidders: subcontractors
  - 1 comment
- No Details
  - 1 comment
- Veteran's Preference
  - 1 comment
- NAC 338 and 341 (Delete all)
  - 1 comment

NAC 341

- Administration
  - 2 comments
- Green Building Design Measures
  - 1 comment

The survey results are available under the tab SURVEY RESULTS at: [www.publicworks.nv.gov](http://www.publicworks.nv.gov)

Also, for consideration at the Workshop, State Public Works Division staff make the following recommendations as required by EO 2023-003:

**1. Green Building Design Regulations –**

NAC 341.341 Simple payback period defined. Delete: unnecessary and redundant.

**2. NAC General Provisions –**

NAC 341.065 Contract documents; insurance. Delete unnecessary and redundant.

NAC 341.086 Alternative bids. Delete, unnecessary and redundant as this requirement is included in contract documents.

NAC 341.127 Review of proposals regarding local adoption of *Uniform Plumbing Code*. Delete as unnecessary and redundant.

NAC 341.136 Selection of professional consultant for project: Procedure for selection with assistance of committee. Revise, and raise threshold of \$250,000 required for committee selection to \$1,000,000. Obsolete. As prices increase, requiring a formal selection process and consultant presentation on projects over \$250,000 wastes resources, and does not add value.

**The workshop is scheduled to begin at 9:00 am on April 12, 2023, and will be conducted by video conference between the following locations:**

**State Public Works Board  
515 East Musser, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701**

**and**

**State Public Works Board  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104**

Members of the public may make oral comments at this meeting. Persons wishing to submit written testimony or documentary evidence in the excess of two typed, 8 ½” x 11” pages must submit the material to the attention of the Administrator, State Public Works Division, to be received no later than April 5, 2023, at the following address:

State Public Works Division  
515 East Musser, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4263

Written comments, testimony, or documentary evidence in excess of two typed pages will not be accepted at the time of the hearing. The purpose of this requirement is to allow adequate time for the review of the documents.

Members of the public who are disabled and require reasonable accommodations or assistance at the meeting should notify the State Public Works Board, 515 East Musser, Suite 102, Carson City, Nevada 89701-4263, Phone (775) 684-4141, at least 24 hours prior to the date of the workshop.

This “Notice of Workshop” and the topics regarding the Division regulation review have been sent to all persons on the agency’s mailing list. The Notice of Workshop is also available on the SPWD website: [www.publicworks.nv.gov](http://www.publicworks.nv.gov)

Copies are on file for inspection and copying at the following locations during normal business hours:

State Public Works Division’s offices located at:  
515 East Musser, Suite 102,  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4263

and

State Public Works Division’s offices located at:  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104.





**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

Buildings & Grounds Section  
Phone: (775) 684-1800

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

Buildings & Grounds Section  
Phone: (702) 486-4300

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 7

SUBJECT TITLE:

Board comment and discussion

DISCUSSION:

- Board Comments on any Agenda Item
- Items to be included in future agendas
- Review of action items for SPWD Management
- Set Future meeting dates

PRIOR ACTIONS:

Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS/ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Informational.

PREPARED BY:

Assistant to the Administrator





**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Jack Robb**  
*Director*

**Matthew Tuma**  
*Deputy Director*

**Kent A. LeFevre**  
*Administrator*

**Carson City Office:**  
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Phone: (775) 684-4141

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (775) 684-1800*

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION**  
***PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION***

**Las Vegas Office:**  
2300 McLeod Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Phone: (702) 486-5115

*Buildings & Grounds Section*  
*Phone: (702) 486-4300*

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
Meeting of April 12, 2023

Agenda Item # 8

SUBJECT TITLE:

Public Comment

DISCUSSION:

Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which actions may be taken. At the Chair's discretion, public comment will be limited to 3 minutes per person.

PRIOR ACTIONS:

Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS/ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Not applicable.

ACTION ITEM:

Not required.

PREPARED BY:

Assistant to the Administrator