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1 CHAIR CLUTTS: All of those in favor? THE BOARD: Aye.
3 CHAIR CLUTTS: Any opposed? Thank you.
Agenda Item No. 4 for possible action: Overview of State
5 Public Works Division Contractor Qualifications Governing
6 Statutes and Regulations, State Public Works Department
7 Application and Scoring. Mr. Nunez?
8 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I'll be going over the actual
qualification forms and the scoring procedure, but before that, I'm going to have Susan Stewart go over the current law and regulations with you first.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?
14 COUNSEL STEWART: Thank you. For the record, Susan Stewart. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This will be a 10,000-foot view of the statutes and the regs, and I welcome any questions at any time you want to drill down further. This is just to kind of give you a general framework of what we do, and then we can go from there.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay.
COUNSEL STEWART: First, you'll see what I've
been -- there's a list under the "discussion," and the
first set of documents you have is just a brief summary of the statutes and regulations. 338.1375, that is the statute that tells us what exactly we are able to take
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1 into consideration when we are evaluating a contractor's qualifications to bid public works.

You'll see there that there's a fairly
straightforward list of what we're able to take into consideration, and then also, that statute requires the Board, this Board, to adopt regulations that implement that criteria, and then the other thing that that statute specifically sets forth is that no one person may have discretion to make the decision whether someone is qualified or not. And you'll see as we get further into the process that Public Works has several steps to make sure that that is in fact followed.

The next statute, 338.1375, it just tells us
the process that the contractor and the Public Works
Board needs to follow. Essentially, the contractor submits the application that's approved by this Board.
The staff are required to investigate the application, make a determination within 45 days, and then we notify the applicant in writing within the time frame if they have been approved. And if not, we include in there very clearly their appeal rights and the time frames that will apply to those appeal rights. We actually cut and paste the statute right into the letter.

Then in 338.1381 , that is the appeal
25 procedure, and I think everyone on the Board has

1 participated in one of those appeals. It's very
straightforward. We have a time frame within which we must respond. We have a time frame within which we have to set the hearing and give them notice. The applicant has the burden of proof in the hearing, and of course the statute sets forth how this Board can handle evidentiary matters that are presented, and then the statute
specifically requires the Board to make a decision at the hearing. So those are your statutes. Those are your governing statutes.

And then this Board has adopted regulations implementing those statutes, and if you look on the next page in your packet, you'll see relevant regulations, and copies of the statutes are also attached here for you. And this is, very broadly, NAC 338.150, through 338.290, and what this does is it puts some, if you will, meat on the bones of what those statutes say. So it defines bidder, principal, personnel. It establishes cost categories.

Several sessions ago, the State Public Works Division statute was implemented where contractors under a hundred thousand dollars seeking qualification had a very streamlined qualification process to encourage them to get experience doing Public Works, so that process is 5 very streamlined compared to the over a hundred thousand
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1 dollar application. So those cost categories are set forth in the regs. The process for submitting the application is set forth, and then the criteria.

And if you look, it drills down as far as what the -- you know, we require a certified statement from the surety of their bonding capacity, we require the past performance history, breach of contract, so it goes through that in a lot of detail what exactly they're required to provide for us. The appeal process is also spelled out in greater detail and then also, the consideration of the contractor evaluations.

One thing I did want to point out is we have a regulation that this Board has approved and the legislature still needs to approve where you'll recall one of the things we expanded in the past performance is we decided that the Board wanted to take into consideration if a contractor was, in essence, litigious. And so we wanted to capture not just was there a breach of contract, but had that contractor initiated litigation? Had that contractor been the subject of an 1 arbitration hearing? And so we have a reg pending that 2 expands 338.240 . And so going forward, that's something, 3 once that gets approved by the legislature, we'll need to
24 amend the qualification application and the scoring to
25 follow up on that process.

I think, unless there's any questions at that point, once we kind of walk through how it is actually applied, it might be helpful to go back if there's any questions on the statute. But that's all I had, unless
5 there were any questions.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Miss Stewart. Any questions before we move on? And we can come back. Mr. Nunez?
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you. Gus Nunez, for the record. What I'd like to do is if you go past all of the pages here under the statutes and the NAC and get over to the page that begins with the application for qualifications on general projects for a period of two years, and what I'd like to do, probably be best as we're going through that, if you don't mind breaking the package a bit, and on this particular tab, taking the last five pages on this tab which is the scoring system, and it says, "Qualifications committee evaluation of application for a two-year period" and have it basically sitting side by side with the actual application. So as we go through, it would probably help a lot just to do it together at the same time. Here is the information, here is how we score it as we go on down. It will probably be better and we'll probably understand it better, get the gist of what each one of the parts mean on all of these
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## sections.

So if everybody is ready, basically, on the
first page of the application, you need to provide your contact information in here. And in addition to that, you need to tell us whether you're applying for the different categories, which is $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 1,000,000$, $\$ 1,000,000$ to $\$ 5,000,000$, or more than $\$ 5,000,000$. You also need to indicate whether you want to be considered between $\$ 25$ - and $\$ 100,000$ for contracts on this particular one here. And that has to -- part of this has to do with some of the manner in which you're scored later on, so keep in mind the categories, especially the ones between $\$ 100,000$ and $\$ 1,000,000, \$ 1,000,000$ to $\$ 5,000,000$, and then over $\$ 5,000,000$.

If we move on to the next page, we get into financial ability. And originally when we looked at this thing, we saw that there's some agencies like DOT where they actually ask for financial statements. We here at Public Works didn't have the staffing or capabilities of really properly reviewing a financial statement, and so what we chose to do was to ask for other information to let us know about where the contractor should be at with respect to what we would allow them to bid on Public Works projects. To that end --
25 (Sean Stewart in Las Vegas arrived to the meeting.)

1 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- we asked for a certified statement from their bonding company. And 3 basically, what we asked them to do is to indicate in that letter their single limit and their aggregate limit. And so, in fact, we're using the surety company and the review of the financial information by a surety company, have them do that for us instead of us doing it, and therefore, that establishes for us the maximum amount that we would consider a bid from a prime.

Obviously, we'd ask them for -- and as you can see here, as you go over here on part one, financial ability, under the scoring system, the valuation, the bonding is a pass/fail in this category. If you cannot bond a project, obviously, you can't bid. So bonding is a pass/fail.

The next one is to provide evidence of a current State of Nevada contractor's license pursuant to Chapter 625. Again, you can see here, part 1B, licensure. And again, that's a pass/fail. I don't think I need to go any further on that. And then the last one here: Has applicant ever filed as a debtor under the United States Bankruptcy Code during the last 5 years immediately preceding the date of application? If yes, please attach a copy of the bankruptcy petition.

And what we do here, we got two C and D

1 CHAIR CLUTTS: If I can interrupt you for a second.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: You bet.
4 CHAIR CLUTTS: I was waiting to see if you
mentioned that. So you said you're looking for projects
in the last five years. In this particular category, I
was trying to find where it's calling for that.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And I may have been off base on that. Typically, we're only looking at the last
five years, but in this particular category, you're
correct. It doesn't say that.
CHAIR CLUTTS: So this particular Tab II is not applicable to the last five years?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct. Yes.
CHAIR CLUTTS: It's any projects at any time during the company, that principal personnel's experience.

COUNSEL STEWART: Well --
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And you can see the successful projects are within the last five years, but I can see that it doesn't say that here, so maybe I missed one. Did you want to say something?

COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan Stewart. Just let me double-check and see what the reg said because what the reg said would govern, and it may
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not be accurately or clearly reflected in here.
CHAIR CLUTTS: And that was one of my
questions is I didn't go back and look at 338.220 in terms of principal personnel, but I was wondering if this particular part was different than subsequent parts, and so I just want to make sure there wasn't any confusion there. It was confusing to me.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. Susan will check on that. And in the meantime, what we'll do is we'll go through how we score this, and then Susan can be looking at that. So in -- I ask you to pull out the last five pages, which includes the evaluation. If you go to the last page of the evaluation, you're going to see something that kind of looks like a spreadsheet, and in here, what we do is -- so you can see it's got personnel and successful.

What this is for is that we'll take the principal personnel projects that are listed on their Part II, and that will go under personnel here. And what we'll do is we'll include the dollar amount of that project. So let's say that someone is applying between the $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 5,000,000$ category, but their bonding is only for $\$ 3,000,000$. So what we would do is now we're only going to -- so at that point, even though they're applying in that category, we're only going to consider
him up to $\$ 3,000,000$.
So now what we want in this scoring here, the way the scoring is performed, is that we look at the projects that are listed and the total amount of the contract. If it's between -- if it's below $\$ 1,000,000$, then he would get a 1 point deduct. If it's between $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 3,000,000$, which would be his limit, his single bonding limit capacity, then it's prorated between $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 3,000,000$ as to how much you deduct out of that point. If it's $\$ 3,000,000$ or more, he gets no deduction. So again, the main thing is that we don't go all the way to 5 . One to five is the category, but if a contractor's limit is less than that because his license may be whatever, but if he's only qualified up to $\$ 3$ because of his bonding capacity, that's what we're going to do. We just go by that.

We typically use the smaller of either the license or the bonding capacity. We've had -- very seldom do we get someone here that says, well, the bonding is $\$ 10,000,000$, but their license is $\$ 5,000,000$, but we've had that issue before, so that's what I'm saying is the least of the two. And so again, that's -if there's no questions on that, we would prorate that and then -- so we just list all of the projects.

Now, if he doesn't list ten project, let's
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1 say he only lists five, the other five will be full
21 -point deductions because we're asking for 10 . So if he 3 -- whatever he misses here, for instance, he'll list nine 4 projects. Well, he's going to at least get a 1-point 5 deduction because he didn't list it. That's how we're 6 currently scoring this.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Can I ask a question again?
8 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure.
9 CHAIR CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts, for the record.
10 So what happens if a contractor has a $\$ 10,000,000$ single
aggregate bonding capacity in whatever aggregate and
doesn't have, say, let's just assume for the moment that
one or all of them are below the $\$ 10,000,000$ market that
they're asking for. Will they still be considered for a
$\$ 10,000,000$ qualification but still have 10 deductions on this form? Do you follow me?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. Let's say okay, on a $\$ 10,000,000$, now you're in the 5 and above category. And you're at $\$ 10,000,000$. So what we would do is if your project that you're listing is below $\$ 5,000,000$,
21 that's a full point deduction. If it's $\$ 10,000,000$ or
22 more, that's zero deductions. And anything between five 23 and ten, then we prorate.
24 CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So you could have a $25 \$ 10,000,000$ bonding capacity and have deductions but

1 still be considered for the above $\$ 5,000,000$ because your 2 bonding capacity is such as long as --
3 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: If that's what you're 4 asking for.
5 CHAIR CLUTTS: As long as your deductions are 6 not -- don't add up below the 120 .
7 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.
8 CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay.
9 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes. So actually, you
10 technically -- your principal personnel could have no experience in the 5 to 10 and no successful projects in the five to ten, so that's a full 10 plus a full 20 , so that's 30 points. So if you have no other blemishes or point deductions in this criteria, you would still pass. You would pass right at 120 points because you start with 150 points, and then we deduct from that. 120 or more is where -- is a passing grade or score is 120 points.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER BENTLEY: I have a question. Member Bentley. What criteria do you use to establish the ranges for upper range, middle range and lower range?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: In the $\$ 5,000,000$ or more category, what we do is -- and we're going to score either principal personnel -- actually, you do the same thing for successful projects -- but let's say you have a
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1 limited license, and your single bonding that you have from your bonding company is $\$ 80,000,000$, your single limit.
4 And so at that point, what we would do is evaluate all of your projects between -- we stop at $\$ 30,000,000$, between 5 and 30. So anything below 5, you get a full deduction. Anything between $\$ 5$ and $\$ 30$ million, you would be prorated, and anything above \$30 million, even though your license is unlimited and your bonding capacity may be $\$ 80$, anything above $\$ 30$ million, we give you no deduction. Does that --

MEMBER BENTLEY: Well, is there anywhere where this criteria is in writing so the person knows what the criteria is?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No. The application is what the applicant or the contractor would look at and 7 submit. The scoring criteria is a public document 8 because they've both been approved by the Board. All of 9 this, both the application form and the scoring system 0 has been brought to prior boards and have been approved 21 in public, so they're public documents, but I suppose 22 unless they actually requested it, we don't make it 23 available. We just say fill out the application, and 24 then we score it in accordance with what the Board has 25 approved.

1 MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay. I understand that.
2 But it sounds to me as though even though this has been approved prior to this, that it's just arbitrarily up to the scoring committee where they decide where the upper, the middle and the lower ranges are.

## ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, you said

 arbitrarily. Actually, the Board has made a judgment call on all of these, and this is the direction that we've gone from the Public Works Board. And these are the limits that they have established for us to work with. We score it based on what is submitted.We will assist -- let's say if someone for some reason submitted an application and it just happens that instead of submitting ten projects on one of these categories, they only submitted five, and that caused them to fail. We'll call them up and say, "Here's the current situation right now. Here's where you're at. You're getting a certain number of deductions because you didn't submit enough projects. Do you have other projects that you could submit?"

We go over all of this with them before we make a final determination and kind of help them out in getting there, so there is some communication and back and forth before we just fail them and say, "Okay. You don't qualify." That's about the extent that we do, but

1 do we automatically give them, "Here's the scoring system and here's how we calculate this thing?" No, we don't.

MEMBER BENTLEY: So it is arbitrary?
4 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Well, it's not
5 arbitrary. I mean, this is what was approved by the
6 Board, and this is what we use as a staff, as your staff.
7 This is what we use. It's been determined that that is 8 the appropriate scoring system, including the top of the range and everything else.

MEMBER BENTLEY: Okay.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't quite -- maybe I don't understand your question.

MEMBER BENTLEY: You're just going around in a circle because to me, there should be some kind of a percentage or something listed there that states and differentiates between upper, middle, and lower range. Otherwise, it's just up the scoring committee to, "Oh, I like this for upper range or I like this for middle range. I like this for lower range."

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, we don't do that. 21 It said the -- in-between $\$ 100,000$ and $\$ 1,000,000$ is 22 either the upper range would be a million dollars or your
23 license or your bonding capacity, whichever is less.
24 That's set. Between $\$ 1$ and $\$ 5$ million, is we score it 25 depending as to -- not between $\$ 1$ and $\$ 5$. We score it

1 based on the range that we use to see your license or your bonding limit, whichever is less.
3 MEMBER BENTLEY: I understand.
4 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And the same thing with
5 five and above, and then we just basically go through the
math at that point. So we don't arbitrarily pick the
limits. The limits are usually, as indicated on the very
8 first page, the contractor picks which category he wants to be in. He'll pick between $\$ 100,000$ to -- and it's got
three categories here: A hundred to a million, a million to five, and then five million. The contractor picks the category he wants to be evaluated in, and then what we use after that is his license or bonding limits to score it. Not whatever we pick. There's parameters for deciding --

MEMBER BENTLEY: I totally understand that, Gus, but my question is that within each one of those parameters, how do you determine what is upper, what is medium, and what is lower? It's not a set for the whole thing. It has to be within each guideline. So what are you using to decide that?

CHAIR CLUTTS: Can I jump in and take a stab at this? I'm following you, Clint, all the way there, and I think that I understand. So I want to just see because I didn't understand up until just a few minutes
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ago. So, Gus, if I could, if you circle $\$ 5$ million, you want a limit -- you want to be qualified for more than $\$ 5$ million, and your bonding capacity, single project capacity is $\$ 20$ million, is it correct to say that the lower limit is $\$ 5$ million and the upper limit is $\$ 20$ million?
7 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: That's correct. THE COURT: Okay. If your bonding capacity is $\$ 30$ million, the lower limit is $\$ 5$ million, the upper limit is $\$ 30$ million?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Correct.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So help me understand.
What is the middle and why is that even relevant, the middle range? Is there just a lower and an upper period?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, a lower and an upper.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. There is no middle. ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: There is no middle, no. The only thing that we would do -- let's say you're applying for $\$ 5$ or more, and your single bonding limit is $\$ 30$ million. The projects that you put in here, if they're between $\$ 5$ and $\$ 30$ million, then we just prorate it in-between there for the deduct. If it's $\$ 30$ or more, then you get no deduct.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So why -- Bryce Clutts

1 again, for the record. Explain to me why you prorate it.
2 If I've got a $\$ 30$ million single project bonding capacity 3 and I've said I want to qualify for more than $\$ 5$ million, 4 why am I being deducted at all and not -- and potentially not able to bid on projects between $\$ 5$ and $\$ 30$ ? That, I think, is the discretion, at least it concerns me, is why are we prorating any deduction at all?

If a bonding company says that the contractor is qualified to do those projects, that is the part that I'm concerned potentially is arbitrary, is the prorating part where that's not described anywhere. That's something that has just been done.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And like I said, keep in mind again that you can have the full 10 points deducted under this category and then the full 20 deduction under the successful projects because you have -- you could have no projects in between the $\$ 5$ and the $\$ 30$ in here in your application and still pass. That was something that the Board, when they approved this, wanted to make sure that that was available, but at the same time, they also approved that if you're applying in a certain category and your project was below the bottom limit that you would get a full deduction, that if you were at or above the limit, that you get no deduction, and then everything in-between gets prorated. That was

Page 24
what was agreed to.
And of course, if you have -- they also
wanted to make sure that if you had no projects in that category but you had the bonding and the license, that you could still be qualified to do that as long as you didn't have other prevailing wage violations or any other things in your record. That was the discussion during the adoption of this here and how it was approved.

Now, if you wanted to say as a policy of the Board in the future that says well, any projects in that category within the range, you get no deduction, that's up to the Board. Keep in mind that the Board also has full discretion. We score it as we see it. You have full discretion as to the outcome if it does get appealed to you.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Ms. Stewart?
COUNSEL STEWART: I just wanted to clarify. For the record, Stan Stewart. The reg does -- first of all, it says to list 10 projects, and this is for principal personnel of the prime. There's no limitation 1 on time frame for this particular part of the 2 qualification.

And what we are asking for -- and this is 4 from the regulation, is -- and I'm going to paraphrase 25 just a little bit, but the qualifications of the
principal personnel of the prime contractor. The prime must include in the application a description, as Gus said, of the principal personnel's qualifications and relevant experience of the principal personnel and list
5 not more than ten Public Works and private construction
6 projects or any combination within the cost category for
7 which the prime contractor is applying that have been
8 successfully completed.
9 So I think that the thinking behind the
10 scoring is we're looking for experience in a particular cost category. And so if it's at that cost category, well, then, there's no reductions. But then if there is, if it's less than that cost category, then there may be deductions. So that's right from the language of the reg.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Member Hand?
7 MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. So what's the -18 in the unlimited category case, right, if it's over \$5 9 million, help me understand the proration in that 20 situation. It's upper limit, right?

AD. To best ind ins Sure. There's two 2 examples. To best understand the $\$ 5$ and above, it's 23 better to look at the examples. One of them would be 24 between -- for the purposes of scoring, one would be 25 between $\$ 5$ million and $\$ 30$ million, and one above --
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1 between $\$ 5$ million and above $\$ 30$ million. Because the
2 Board requested us to use $\$ 30$ million as an upper limit
3 in the $\$ 5$ and above --
4 MEMBER HAND: Okay.
5 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- in this scoring. So 6 let's say you're above $\$ 5$ million but at $\$ 20$ million. So 7 if your projects that you list here is at $\$ 20$ million or 8 more, you get no deduction. If you're below $\$ 5$ million, 9 below the lower threshold, you get a full -- the full 10 deduction. If you're between $\$ 5$ million and $\$ 20$ million, you get a prorated deduction depending as to where the project lands.

Now, that's one example. Now let's talk
14 about the one that -- the person that has an unlimited license and has a -- their single limit bonding is $\$ 80$ million. We are then -- and then he lists these projects. Again, anything below $\$ 5$ million is a full deduction. Anything between -- anything above $\$ 30$ million, not the $\$ 80$ million bonding capacity, anything above $\$ 30$ million gets no deduction. Anything between $\$ 5$ and $\$ 30$ gets prorated.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts. And that occurs
23 because that is what a previous Board directed you to do.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Uh-huh.
CHAIR CLUTTS: So it's not arbitrary in the

1 sense it's not written here necessarily or in any kind of NAC or NRS. It was previously directed from the Board.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. We brought various proposals. We went back and forth with the Board, and this is where we finally landed. It's not just something that we did in a vacuum.

MEMBER BENTLEY: That's what I was trying to find out.

COUNSEL STEWART: Sorry.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, okay.
MEMBER BENTLEY: Sorry, but that's exactly
what I was trying -- how did you get to those parameters? Because --

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. I misunderstood. Yeah, this was all -- the application and the scoring system was all discussed over a number of meetings. It took more than one meeting, believe me, with the Board, and basically this is where we landed with the Board. And the only thing that's been done to the original application that I -- correct me if I'm wrong. Kathy, you've been around this one for a while and Susan, the only thing that we've added to the original application and this evaluation has been on the discipline by the State Contractor's Board. That's just something that came in after several sessions after the
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original prequalifications of bidders law started. It was just added to it later on --

COUNSEL STEWART: Right.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- when we picked up on it.
CHAIR CLUTTS: So with respect to Parts I and II, Mr. Bentley, did you get your question answered now? And is there any other question?

MEMBER BENTLEY: My question has been answered. It just isn't clear, but it has been answered. Yes.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.
MEMBER HAND: Member Hand. I guess in my
follow-up to that, how does someone that's completing an
application self-score themselves if they don't know
that? I mean, I think it's a fair -- maybe that's the
root of Clint's question, is --
MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.
MEMBER HAND: -- is how do you -- because if you've been through it once, you know the game. But if you've not been through it and you want to try to figure out what your score would be, how would you know how to calculate that --

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure.
MEMBER HAND: -- for this section?

1 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Technically, unless you 2 ask specifically, "I want to see your scoring form," 3 which is public information, we would have to release it, 4 that would be the only way. Typically, we just -- we get
5 the application. Hopefully, it is straightforward and
6 truthful and to the point, and then we just score it.
7 And like I said, we do go the extra mile to get back with
8 an applicant and say, "Hey, you've got some prevailing
9 wage deductions. You've got some deductions here. And
10 by the way, in your principal personnel and on your
1 successful projects, if you have other projects that you
2 could include in this range or in this area that you can substitute, then that will eliminate those deductions and you'll be able to pass."
15 I mean, we help them and we go way out of our 16 way in trying to do our best in getting them over that 7 120-point threshold. If they have it, if it comes to a 8 point where they just don't have what it takes to get, 9 you know, 120 points, and then we -- the only thing that 20 we suggest to them at that point is well, if you go to a lower category instead of going all the way to your maximum license and bonding limit, if you, instead of going at $\$ 5$ million, if you lower to $\$ 3$ million, you'll gain all of these points and you'll pass. Do you want to 5 lower your request? And a lot of times, they'll go, "Oh,
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1 yeah. Rather than fail, we'll lower it." So we do a
2 certain amount of help and coaching in trying to get them
3 passed. We just don't score and say, "Sorry" and send
4 them a letter. We get together with them and explain to
5 them, okay. Here's where you're at. If you have
6 projects in this area or if you lower what your request
7 is, then we can pass you. We do try to do the best we
8 can on those areas.
9 COUNSEL STEWART: If I may, for the record,
10 Susan Stewart. I hope it's apparent to the Board that
11 with very few exceptions, when the contractors come here
2 to appeal a qualification denial, it's very -- it's not
3 adversarial. It is a, you know, we go out of our way to,
14 you know, we'll share the scoring sheet. I mean, there's
15 not any animosity on my part or staff's part. Our job is
16 to qualify applicants so that they can perform Public
7 Works. That's what we see our role as, within the
8 statute, the regs and the guidance of the Board has given 9 us. So it's a very nonadversarial process, has been my 0 experience, and I've been here since 2008.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Bruce Clutts, for 2 the record. I'm a believer that if something is broke, you fix it. Otherwise, you just maintain it. And so the biggest question that I have is over the last, say, eight years, do we know how many applications there's been, how

1 many approvals and rejections? And out of those rejections, how many were appealed to even know as a body whether we have a problem, whether something is broke or whether it needs just a little maintenance?

Because I've been here for a little while
now, and we've had a couple of appeals, and I imagine
that you all see a lot of applications. I don't know.
So if -- I don't know if this is a small issue that comes
up every now and then or if this is a much broader issue
so that as a body, we can understand what it is that we should be focused on.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We look at about 300 a year, I would say. I know that when we were looking at -- the reason we had a law that was passed that requires us to do our best effort in getting this form is so that they can be filled out and submitted electronically, and so we were going through a process. In getting there, we ended up with a DocuSign company that actually provides that avenue for us to use, and I'm sure if you've done some mortgage closures lately, you've seen where they can do all of the signing electronically and remotely, and so we've been using that.

We had to come up with a -- well, how many are we going to do a year? How much is that going to cost? And just from a budgetary perspective because they
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1 say, well, in this range, we'll charge you $\$ 3$ per what 2 they call envelope or per application that they process, 3 I think was the quote that they gave us. And so I had Cece, Kathy's predecessor, go back and look over several years and see how many we were looking at, and we came up with a figure of about 300 , is what I remember, that we were averaging per year. I'm sure it varies.

And I guess if I -- right now, I don't have
the last eight years or whatever, five, eight, ten years
that we've had this thing going, how many appeals qualifications and appeals we've had, but I bet you it's less than a dozen over -- since we've had this whole system going, I would guess -- I would be surprised if it's more than a dozen, but I can go back and get you the exact number.

COUNSEL STEWART: I was going to say ten, and I've been here since '08. And I know that I'm recalling not necessarily just contractor qualification appeals, but other matters that have come before the Board. But certainly, I cannot recall more than 10 or 12 at the most.

CHAIR CLUTTS: So we're talking less than 1 percent? Okay.

COUNSEL STEWART: But that being said, we -25 and Gus, you can correct me if I'm wrong -- there are
some -- I discovered a typo. We are going to -- we do have the new reg that's pending, so we will have to revise the application.
4 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And the scoring.
5 COUNSEL STEWART: And the scoring. And so
6 and I did want to -- I know that there was some concern
7 about the penalties that were -- or the deductions that
8 were made for the fines, and so I did want to give the
9 Board a clear understanding of how we got there so that
10 -- because, you know, the contractor may come here, and
they're not happy, and so, you know, they may find something that they can latch onto. And whether it's legitimate or not, who knows. But if the Board has a full understanding of exactly how -- because you weren't here when we, you know, had it approved by prior boards, it just may be helpful for your general understanding.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions before we move on? Part III.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Part III has to do with prior breach of contract. And basically, it just states, "If the applicant has been found to have been in breach of contract by a court of competent jurisdiction during the 5 years immediately preceding the date of the application." And then, "For each such action, the applicant shall include below a description of: The
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1 circumstances surrounding the breach; whether any
2 liquidated damages were imposed in connection with the
3 breach; and any judgment entered against the applicant
4 relating to the action." And then you're asked to
5 provide this information and a description here under
6 this type of form, and then you duplicate as necessary if
7 you have more than one.
8 And then with respect to how we score that,
9 if you go then to the scoring system, is that you take
10 the judgment amount, you divide it by the contract
amount, you multiply it times 10 , and then you multiply
it times -- excuse me. You multiply it times 20 and then you multiply it times 10 , and then that gives you a total 4 amount of deductions.

So, for instance, to give you an example, if you take -- if you have a $\$ 1$ million judgment and a \$20 million contract, that would equal to -- if you divide that, that comes out about a .05. You multiply that times 20 , that equals 1 . You multiply that 10 times 10 , and then you have taken 10 . Then that gives you a 10 -point deduction. One times 10 would be 10 . That's how that looks like. Again, in going back since I've been here, we haven't seen too much of this. As a matter of fact, I don't recall any in this particular area.

COUNSEL STEWART: Excuse me. The only thing

1 I saw was the contractor that did the construction on the Las Vegas courthouse, and he submitted an application and just attached the mediation decision or the arbitration decision, and we started to work with him and try and score it, and his attorney called me and said, "I can't believe he submitted this without talking to me first." And he withdrew his application, and I never heard from him again. So that was the only issue that I've ever seen with this one.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I don't recall having an issue there.

COUNSEL STEWART: No.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: So anyhow, unless you have some questions, and perhaps, you know, you might want to look at this formula here later on and on your own time or whatever and think about it a bit, but that's kind of like what the staff and the Board came up with a while back on that particular matter as to how to score that.

THE COURT: If I could, Bryce Clutts, for the record. What I would suggest is, if the Board is okay with it, is if you just run through it, and if there's a question, we just pause and ask that question. Otherwise, we'll assume there isn't, if that works.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. Move on. Then
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here under part IV, Prior Disqualification From the Contract Award. And where it says, "The applicant was disqualified from the award of any contract pursuant to the NRS," the section, and we need to add a couple more sections to this, we found out today.

I went back and started reading this and
looking at the current law, the NRS, and we need to get through here. And every now and then, the NRS changes, the numbers change, and the 138.7 needs to be changed to 138.45 and 138.95. So, now, this is just housekeeping stuff.

During -- in this case, "During the 5 years immediately preceding the date of application, provide the following information." And so if we -- if they submit that, what we do is for each disqualification here, we're going to deduct 20 points. So at that point, like I said, you can lose up to 30 points, so this is a major, major hit. But we feel that if you've had an issue regarding these matters here, it should be a major deduct.

COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, Susan 22 Stewart. One of the ways the scoring is set up is that 23 no one area -- you could get all of the points deducted 24 in one particular area, and it wouldn't be enough to 25 disqualify you.

1 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Completely. Moving on 2 to Part V5 is past performance. And under past
3 performance, the first thing we look at is wage and hour.
4 In other words, prevailing wage violations. So if you
5 have any prevailing wage violation, we ask you to list
6 them here.
7 And what we do is for each violation, as you
8 can see here under Part V-A under the scoring system,
9 under performance history, for each wage and hour
10 violation, we deduct two points. So again, you'd have to
1 have -- in order to fail, you must have over 15 in this
2 category. You have to have more than 15 violations of 3 wage and hour before you're actually -- at 15 , you just 4 pass. More than that, you fail.
15 COUNSEL STEWART: Which we've seen.
16 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, which we have 7 seen.

Moving on to the next page on the Past
Performance is Discrimination in Employment. So what it
says here, it says, "Give a description of any civil
judgment, findings of fact, administrative proceedings or
2 criminal conviction relating to a violation of any law
3 pertaining to discrimination in employment against or by 4 applicant or principal personnel of the applicant,
25 indicating that the applicant or principal personnel have
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1 violated local, state, or federal laws which pertain to
2 the work of the applicant, during the 5 years immediately
3 preceding the date of the application." So we ask you to
4 list that. Again, any violation in this category. If
5 you go to V, Part VB, discrimination in employment, we
6 deduct 2 points per violation.
7 Moving on to the next page, still under
8 Performance History, and it deals with failed projects.
9 So if the applicant, in the prior 5 years, in projects
10 which exceeded $\$ 25,000$ or more, "If the applicant failed
11 to substantially complete the contract from the deadline
12 for completion specified in the contract, as adjusted by
13 any change order or extension of time award, or if the
14 applicant failed to complete any remaining requirements
15 of the contract within 90 days of substantial completion
16 of the contract or the applicant failed to complete the
7 contract and the remaining work on the project was
performed by others," we ask you to list those projects
here that are any that are in violation of any one of
those bullet points that we have there. We ask them to list it here.

The way we score that is under VC here,
failed projects in the past five years. Again, if you
did not complete the project within the contract time as suggested by the change order, we can -- the staff can

1 deduct anything between 1 and 10 points per offense. The amount of points deductible takes into consideration the amount of projects completed by the applicant and magnitude of the delay of the completion. So obviously, just a 2-3 day delay, it scores pretty low. But if you get into the 30 days plus, it's going to be scoring pretty high.

The same thing here under the second item.
"If the applicant failed to complete any remaining
requirements of the contract within 90 days of substantial completion," then we deduct 10 points per offense. So if you didn't finish your punch list within 90 days, then we're going to deduct 10 points. And then the last one. If the contractor failed basically to complete the work and the remaining work had to be completed by another contractor, then that's pretty egregious. We deduct 20 points. Again, not one of these will fail you. You have to lose 30 points before you get there.

CHAIR CLUTTS: So Bryce Clutts, for the record. So my understanding -- am I understanding correctly that the maximum amount of points deducted for 5 C could be 20 ?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes.
CHAIR CLUTTS: So if you were 30 days late
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1 and then didn't get your punch list done for the 90 days
2 and then failed to complete the job, would you add all of 3 those or would it be a maximum 20?
4 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: No, you would add all 5 of those.
6 CHAIR CLUTTS: So you could, in that
particular section, lose up to 40 points?
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes, you could. Yes.
9 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The next part here, which is Part VI, this is the one that was added recently to our application. Under VI under past performance is: "Have you ever been disciplined or fined by the Nevada State Contractor's Board or other state or federal agency?" So we ask you here basically, it says, "State whether you have been disciplined or fined by the Nevada Contractor's Board or another state or federal agency, such as OSHA, during the 5 years immediately preceding the date of the application. Any discipline or fine imposed pursuant to NRS 624.301 through 624.305, excepting 624.30175 must be disclosed." And then, "Relevant documentation must be attached."

So we ask you to state it, disclose it in the
24 form here, and then if you go to Part VI here under the 25 scoring system, you can see there where we're using the
amount of the fine as to how many points we deduct. I'm going to turn it over real quick over here to Susan, and we -- this basically, in these categories that we got, 1 through 10 , basically came out of the NRS 624 , which is
5 the contractor's NRS. And, Susan, do you want to go over 6 that?
7 COUNSEL STEWART: Sure. So the law was 8 passed that said we need to take into consideration
9 whether a contractor has been fined or disciplined by a
10 state agency or OSHA or other federal agency for conduct related to the performance of their work. So that was the statute. And from that, we developed a reg. And from the regulation, we developed the scoring sheet that you have in front of you, as well as the language that's in the application.

And what I recall I did is I went to Chapter 624, which is the Contractor's Board statute, and they have a section entitled, 'Grounds for disciplinary action.' And it runs -- and it's reflected here in the application. It's NRS 624.301 through 305. And exempt from the violations is specifically 624.30175 , which relates to not paying child support. So it was my opinion, and I presented it to the Board, that while that may be egregious, it is not necessarily related to a contractor's ability to perform their work. So that is a
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violation that we don't ask them to disclose on this application.
Then we -- I looked at the NAC, the
regulations for the Contractor's Board, and they have
NAC -- and you guys have copies of these in front of you -- NAC 624.7251 talks about the specifics, the fine and the amount. And then it also talks about factors that they take into consideration when fining: Has the person exhibited bad faith, ignored warnings, perpetrated one of these violations against a senior citizen or someone with a disability? And so those are factors that the
Contractor's Board takes into consideration when they're assessing these fines. And the person or the contractor that is fined has due process in front of the Contractor's Board before these fines are assessed.

So we took these amounts -- the lowest is 50 ,
the highest is $\$ 50,000$, and we simply listed those on
this score sheet and assessed points. The highest fine
would result in a 20 -point deduction, and $\$ 50$ to $\$ 1,000$ would result in a 2 -point deduction and all points in-between based upon the argument or assumption that a larger fine is because of the more egregious violation. And so that was presented to the former board, and that was what was approved.
I did want to ask one question. Is this --

1 does this read clearly to the Board, the requirement that's here as far as past performance and the listing of what you have to list is clear? And I'm referring to section Part VI, Past Performance? Is there any confusion that you have to report a fine or discipline from a federal agency, OSHA, and/or the Nevada State Contractor's Board? Is that unclear in any way?

CHAIR CLUTTS: Not to me.
COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. All right. Thank you.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Move on to the next section, which is Part VII: Successful Projects. And what we ask you here or ask here is that the applicant lists ten Public Works or private construction projects or any combination thereof that the applicant has successfully completed during the 5 years immediately preceding the date of the application for which the cost of the project is within the cost category for which the application seeks qualifications to submit bids."

And then, of course, for each project, then we ask you to fill out this information that is asked here. Now, as to when we go to then score this, if you look at Item 7 under successful projects, we take each project and we deduct, as it says here, we deduct zero points for projects in the upper range of the cost

1 category, .5 for the middle, 1 point below the range of the cost category, and 2 points -- and deduct 2 points for each project not listed less than 10. So if you look -- again, going back to the last sheet that was in that section, which is that spreadsheet that we were looking at before for the successful projects, we basically score those the same way that we talked about under "Principal Personnel," except this time, we use -- because there is 10 projects and it's a total potential of 20-point deduct on that, we basically score on a 2-point by 2-point per project.

So again, if you're below the range that you're asking for, you're going to get a full 2-point deduct. Or if you don't list any, then you're going to get a 2 -point deduct. If you're at or above that category that you're asking for, and/or -- again, and/or your bonding or license limit, whichever is less, if you're at or above that, then you get no deduct.

And then if you're in-between, then you prorate it from the bottom of the category to your license bonding limit that you're applying for, and in the $\$ 5$ million plus, you don't -- at $\$ 30$ million and above, you get no deduct at all no matter how high your license and bonding limit is. And so basically, the same 25 rules that we use for principal personnel applies to
successful projects except it's on a 2-point basis per project rather than one.

And the last part that we score, and that is
4 a pass/fail. And if you go to Part VIII, basically it's
5 more of I guess you could call it an acknowledgment.
6 You're saying that you're being -- you didn't fail to
7 disclose any material information or falsify any material
8 information and that you're declaring under penalty of
9 perjury that all information provided is complete and
10 correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and we ask you to sign and notarize that.

Because when you go to the scoring system, if you fail to disclose that material, that's a pass/fail situation, or if you falsify any material information, that also is a pass/fail. The prior Board that approved this, they were very adamant about this particular item here, that we want to make sure that everything that was -- all of the applications that were submitted that were full -- that there was a full disclosure and there was nothing there that was falsified.

COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the record. And you'll recall when I started my discussion, one of the criteria that we're specifically charged with taking into consideration is the truthfulness of the application. So that follows along with the statute.
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1 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: The first -- actually, a little bit of history, if you're interested. The first contractor that was ever disqualified by the Board, by us and the Board, was because of this particular item here. Basically, if he would have told the truth, he would have failed, from my recollection, so that's about how it went. Actually, that went through the board. It was 8 appealed, and we had a hearing.
9 MEMBER BENTLEY: I know the answer, but I'm still going to ask for clarification. Under VII, numbers 2 and 3, shouldn't that stipulate each project in the wording there?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah, it is for each project listed, you're correct, how the deduction goes. Oh, I see. Add that. Okay. So add to 1,2 , and 3 for each project. Yes, you're absolutely correct.

MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Good catch.
9 CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Bryce Clutts, for the
20 record. Is my understanding correct that today was 1 really about trying to get an understanding of the whole process, the Board digests that information, and that at a subsequent meeting, provide potential recommendations or no recommendations? Is that the intent? Okay.

Are there any other questions from the Board
before we wrap this part up and move on in the agenda with what's been presented so that we can process that information and come back at the next Board meeting and provide any recommendations that we might have, if any?

MEMBER BENTLEY: I still have one question 6 back on the scoring. I understand everything that's been 7 said, but the very last statement that was made regarding upper, middle and lower, if I understood you correctly, you stated that you did have a criteria established from the prior boards that you used. Is that in writing?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I'm sure -- yes, I'm sure we can go back through the minutes and find them.

MEMBER BENTLEY: I would really like to see anything in writing. If you could send that, I'd appreciate it.

## ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: You bet.

MEMBER BENTLEY: Thank you.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: I'm going to have to go back many, many years, but we'll go dig. Actually, when I came to work here, that was one of the very first things. The law had been passed, and we didn't have the application or the scoring system put together yet, and that was one of the first tasks that I tackled as a deputy. I was a deputy manager at that time. So we'll have to go back to 2001, 2002. But I'm sure we can find
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1 them. It should be in our archives.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Go ahead, Mr. Bentley.
MEMBER BENTLEY: You have to be using it now; correct?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yeah. This is what we've been using since the very beginning except for that last item that we -- and the Contractor's Board, which was added to the law later on.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. So what I'd like to do, moving forward, is if the Board could look at this, and if you have further questions or recommendations at the next meeting that we bring those and that we discuss those and take action if necessary. And then if you could, the information that Mr. Bentley asked for as well as if we could, say in the last eight years, identify the number of applications, rejection, appeals, et cetera.
And if we could have that information prior to the meeting, that would be helpful. Are there any other questions or actions before we move on? Okay.

Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5 for discussion: Legislate Update. Ms. Stewart?

COUNSEL STEWART: Yes, thank you. For the 23 record, Susan Stewart. Very briefly, just a legislative 24 update for the Board. You'll recall, we had given the
25 Board a prior report on proposed bill draft requests that
the Division was going to put forth regarding the administrator's qualifications, delete the Board's review of local revisions to the Uniform Plumbing Code, delete the Division's responsibility through their facility group to inspect UNR and UNLV, exempt amendments to our professional services agreements -- I'm sorry, from the Board of Examiners, and allow the building official to issue permits directly to private contractors.
As of printing, it could have changed. I
haven't checked the website today, but as of printing, the following BDRs are moving forward, and they've actually been assigned bill numbers, and AB 41 revises the administrator's qualifications back to what they were prior to the last session. It also tweaks, if you will, the qualifications for the Board members as well, allowing for the appointment of a Board member that is a licensed contractor or were licensed in the past. SB 44, the building official, will issue permits to private contractors, removing Public Works from oversight of local governments, revisions to the Uniform Plumbing Code, and the final bill that's moving forward is that the Division will not be responsible for inspecting UNR and UNLV facilities. The revisions to or eliminating the requirement that our amendments to professional service agreements from the Board of Examiners did not move
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forward. That's all I have unless anyone has any questions.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Stewart.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: A little housekeeping real quick. I just want to mention that Member Stewart joined us a while back, so I'm going to -- I can't recall exactly at which point in the discussion he came in, but he should be marked --
CHAIR CLUTTS: He's duly noted as late.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- as being here.
COUNSEL STEWART: For the record, I believe the court reporter noted about an hour ago that
Mr. Stewart was here and made a notation in the record.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Oh, good. Thank you. Somebody's on the ball.

And then the other thing that I missed, you've been getting a lot of e-mails and phone calls from Laura Adair, and she's sitting right here right now, so I wanted you to see the face behind the e-mails.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Anything you need, feel free to call Laura or myself, obviously. And if I'm not around, she can chase me down, I'm sure. So she has full access to my calendar. She can even schedule meetings for me.

1 CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you.
2 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: So anything you need.
3 COUNSEL STEWART: And we're thrilled to have 4 her.
5 MS. ADAIR: Thank you.
6 ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Yes. And she will be 7 taking roll call next meeting.

MS. ADAIR: I wasn't sure about that. Okay. Thank you.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: So thank you, Laura. With that, I guess, I'm sorry, I guess we can move on to the next item here.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Moving on to Agenda Item Number VI, again, Ms. Stewart.

COUNSEL STEWART: Thank you. For the record, Susan Stewart. The Public Works Division has been presented with a couple of pieces of proposed legislation, and hopefully you have copies of those. They should have been in front of you. One is entitled, "Contracts Involving Construction Manager at Risk" and then the second one, you'll see in the middle of the page is, "Proposed changes to NRS 338.141." There's also a proposed change to 338.0117 .
And as I've stated in the discussion in your 5 action item, there's a proposal that the State Public
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1 Works Division create a standard form subcontractor list that must be used by all local government public bodies in their bid documents. There's also been the same -and that's this one -- the proposed changes to NRS 338.141 also proposed that the Public Works Division create a standard form affidavit for all bidders to use when they're applying for the bidder's preference. You'll recall the law changed a couple of years ago, and it required if you want to receive the bidder's preference when you submit your bid, you have to provide an affidavit of compliance that says if you're awarded the project, 50 percent of the subcontractors will reside in Nevada, et cetera, et cetera. And the proposal is, is that the Public Works Division create an affidavit for all public bodies to use. Gus and I met with --

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Did you state who came to us?

COUNSEL STEWART: AGC North.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: AGC North and Assemblyman Skip Dailey.

COUNSEL STEWART: Well, I was going to get to that next.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Okay. All right.
COUNSEL STEWART: Sorry. So we met with AGC.
25 We had proposed some changes which you will see at the --
primarily at the end of the bill, and what we had proposed in response to that was that the law require the use of the language that Public Works Division uses so that local bodies would need to use certain language, but it wouldn't be Public Works inserting themselves into the process. Do you want to talk about this one now and then we'll go to this one?
8 goal of the bill that the AGC is trying to be moving
0 through is being sponsored by the legislature, and they're telling us that to try to minimize the number of protests that they get on bids. So as a result of that, one of the areas that we get a lot of protests in is in the listing of sublistings that are required, whether it is the 5 or 1 percent list or the 3 percent list.

The first thing that one of the ways that they -- so they felt that they need to simplify it because the contractors are making a lot of mistakes in this area, and it leads to protests and basically some bids that are actually rejected as being nonresponsive, and they want to minimize that. And so one of the first things they did is they are going to take out the 3 percent list because basically, nobody is using that. We've never used it, and I've never seen it used. I don't know if anyone is using it, but it's not very
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common to see that 3 percent list. Most folks are using the 5 and the 1 percent. 5 percent, obviously, comes in with the bid. The 1 percent comes in two hours after the end of the bid opening.
And again, all of this is to prevent bid shopping, as it were, is the genesis of this particular law in the NRS. And there's been confusion as to, you know, if you're listed under 5, do you want to be listed under 1? If the prime is not performing any of the work, does he have to be listed? And in the forms that we use, we're very specific, and in the areas that we see some mistakes, then we bold it and put it in red on our forms. So they -- the group of contractors up here that are used to bidding our projects -- we like to see everybody use the same form, and the Public Works' form is the best one that we see out there that is the clearest. So we want to use that. My input back to them was, thank you, but --
COUNSEL STEWART: No thank you.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: -- we're not in the business of providing or requiring forms for local government, and sometimes this is seen as -- any of these 23 things could be seen as, you know, Public Works is trying 24 to influence or tell us how to do our forms, and it
25 probably is not going to be well received, number one, by

1 local government, and we would prefer not being the ones 2 that prepare this form. I'm sure that Susan may tell you 3 well, she could be -- there could be concern with respect to liability, I don't know, because we're creating those forms that they have to use.
So we would rather you take our form and the way that we word our form and use the wording. Don't -and then not necessarily quote that you're going to use Public Works. So every time we -- because we may modify our form in the future if we find any problems with it. And then that means that everybody now, we've got to notify everybody out there in the whole state of Nevada that oh, by the way, we've changed our form and you've got to change your form because that's what the law says. We don't want to be in that business at all. So that's pretty much along those lines that we have suggested to them.
Susan has been working with their legal counsel and coming up with wording that they can use. There's also the issue that on some of these forms, sometimes you have to notify them just because you're using federal funds, grant funds. And they're requiring other things above and beyond what is required by state law, and they have to take care of that. So we brought also that to their attention in this area. But am I
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missing anything?
COUNSEL STEWART: I don't think so. This is Susan Stewart, for the record. I have some concerns that Public Works would even have jurisdiction to do something like this. And I'm, you know, typically, Public Works does things through the reg process, so it would be very involved if we were directed to do something like that. So again, like Gus said, our suggestion was is that if the language in the form is working, then, you know, just mandate that the form include the language that makes the form clear. Do you want to talk about the second one?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Sure. So instead of actually mentioning Public Works, just take Public Works out and put what was suggested to them along those lines.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Before we move on, is there action being requested of the Board at this time?

COUNSEL STEWART: Well, we did have another bill to talk about.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And it's along the same lines, so what I'd like to do is then from a policy perspective, that should give us some direction on that.

COUNSEL STEWART: The second bill is -- this 3 is a bill that's been -- Assemblyman?

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Skip Dailey.
COUNSEL STEWART: Yeah, he's an assemblyman.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: And again, I'd hate to be the one -- so we recommend something to a public body. Here's the ranking and they use it, and maybe the contractor doesn't perform and, you know, and it's not our -- if you look at the 341 and why we were created in
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341, boy, it's a long, long ways from looking or
participating with local government in their contracting and practices.

I think the other area that they wanted to include in there was the information required for the selection in the selection process, and we've been, to a certain extent, successful due to the information that is required to be provided. When we get the proposals in as we're scoring and going through the short list and then the interview and proposal, the final scoring is we ask for sufficient information so that everything is disclosed upfront. We ask enough information in -obviously, we get the fee, the general overhead and profit. That's from everyone. We also request that they provide certain information so that their costs of their general conditions can be calculated from and determined, and then of course the only thing left at that point is the cost of the work, which we require that at the end of the process on the preconstruction services, that they give us a GNP, that they do go through a bid process, and at the bid opening, the bids are submitted in a closed envelope, and we're there at the bid opening, and we oversee everything and get copies of everything.

As the bids are opened, copies are made. We
25 get a copy of everything so that as the prime contractor

1 goes through what we call their scrubbing process to make sure they got apples to apples all the way through to determine who the low bidder is on all of the trades, that process, we keep track of all of that, and documentation is given to us and all of that, so we oversee the process, the whole process.

We typically have at least two and usually three project managers at the contractor's office when the bids are open. And again, this -- so the cost of the work, you might say it's an open book-type process. During the selection process, we know the fee, our general overhead and profit, we know what the GCs are going to be, and at the end, we get the cost of the work. So pretty much I look at it as an open book-type contract at that point. We have knowledge of everything. There is nothing left.

And I guess in other jurisdictions because of what they ask or don't ask for, you see some fees that will come in kind of low and get an advantage at that point and then certain contractors that then are using either their GCs or other things as a profit center and playing games with that, basically.

So Skip, Mr. Dailey, likes the way that -the type of information in our process, so he's trying to -- first of all, he tried to put in there that we use our

1 Public Works forms, and then we're trying to, again,
2 let's say -- why don't you then take a look at our forms
3 and whatever you like that's in there, then require it in
4 the law, and then keep that the words Public Works Board
5 forms out of it. And we're encouraging that right now for that to be used in this. And you'll see the comments that we've put together and sent back with them there along these lines in here.
So having said all of that, the main direction, you know, and I've been encouraging the -I've told both AGC and Assemblyman Dailey that I needed to get -- he still kind of insists that they want to use Public Works into staff or forms in these bills, and I would -- I told him as a policy, I'd like to get some direction from our Board because our feeling, gut feeling, is that we shouldn't be in that position. And I told him I would get back with him and see what the thoughts from the Board may be on naming specific Public Works to be involved with what local jurisdictions are doing with respect to the construction management at risk.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Gus, where is -- or Susan,
23 where is the information? In 338.1693, where do I find 24 the language? On which page? The language that's
25 requiring --

1 COUNSEL STEWART: I'm sorry. It's on page 5.
2 CHAIR CLUTTS: How do I know what is proposed language and what is existing language?
4 COUNSEL STEWART: Yes. So I apologize. I
should have put a little legend in there. My proposal,
my proposed additions, are underlined. And then
everything else that's stricken or highlighted are
Mr. Dailey's proposals.
9 CHAIR CLUTTS: So can I -- all of this is
added language. Yours is underlined.
COUNSEL STEWART: All of?
CHAIR CLUTTS: If it's not underlined, is it
Assemblyman Dailey's language, and if it is underlined,
it's yours? Or is there an original language and then
Assemblyman Dailey's language and then your language?
COUNSEL STEWART: Right. Sorry.
CHAIR CLUTTS: How do I differentiate between those?
COUNSEL STEWART: So the highlighted text, as you're going -- page 1, these deletions here on page 3 and the highlighted text.

CHAIR CLUTTS: Nothing that we have is highlighted.
COUNSEL STEWART: Oh, it's not? Oh. My apologies. Susan Stewart, for the record.

Page 62
1 VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Ours is and it's really nice, Bryce.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. It's hard to read from here.
VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Just to comment while we're looking at that, I think that we need to probably have a motion that, you know, what Assemblyman Dailey is asking and what AGC of Reno is asking is for the State
9 Public Works Board to become the monitor for the State of
10 Nevada. I agree exactly with what you've said. If they
1 want to use the forms, which I think is the issue, they
2 want to -- if they want to have a standardized form statewide, I don't think as a Board we have an issue with that. But asking us to administer it in any way, shape, or form, we don't have the manpower, and we definitely don't have the manpower to be sending out a majority of every CMAR selection panel in the State of Nevada. That would be insane. So I don't know if we could put that in a motion or not, but I would be glad to make it.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: We would very much appreciate something along those lines. I don't want to influence the Board in any way, but --

CHAIR CLUTTS: So thank you, Mr. Stewart. Is that a motion?

VICE-CHAIR STEWART: Yes. If you want me to
restate the motion, I can do that.
THE COURT: Does the Board need the motion restated?
CHAIR CLUTTS: There's a motion on the table. Is there a second?

MEMBER BENTLEY: Second.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Any comments or questions? All of those in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Any opposed? The motion carries.

ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: Thank you.
COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the record. And what I will do is I will provide the Board with a clear marked-up copy of what's what. That's okay. And I will send it to each of you individually for your reference. Please do not discuss it among yourselves. It's just for your reference. And then I suspect that this will come up again, and we can discuss it in the future, but then you'll have a clear picture. And I apologize that you didn't get the highlighted copy.
ADMINISTRATOR NUNEZ: What we will do is actually, probably the next time we see these things, it's actually going to be in a bill form, and we'll send it back out to the Board with any of our comments. I'll

1 have to get some -- through Patrick, I'll have to get some approval as to how to testify depending on how the bill comes out, and we'll follow up based on the motion and the direction that I have from the Board, we'll follow up accordingly along those lines. Still, like I said, I still need approval from administration as to how to testify on these things.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Are there any other questions
or comments related to Agenda Item Number 6?
Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for possible action: Board comment and discussion. Any further Board comments or discussion related to today's agenda items?

Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item Number
8: Public comment. Any public comment? Anybody show up down there?

MEMBER BENTLEY: No.
CHAIR CLUTTS: Thank you. Seeing none up here.
MEMBER CATES: I have a public comment. I would like to lodge a complaint with the thermostat czar. 22 This room is freezing. I don't know if maybe -- my legs are icicles.

COUNSEL STEWART: I'm very comfortable. Is 25 anyone else cold?

MEMBER CATES: Is it just me?
CHAIR CLUTTS: I think you're on your own on this one.
MEMBER CATES: I'd like to withdraw my
comments from the record then. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
6 CHAIR CLUTTS: We'll adjourn the meeting at
7 3:45 p.m. Thank you.
8 -o0o-
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| relating (2) | reviewing (1) | 17;25:10,24;26:5; | sheet (4) | 53:10 |
| 34:4;37:22 | 10:20 | 27:16;29:2;30:14;33:4, | 30:14;41:13;42:18; | spots (1) |
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| 4:10 | 16,19,24,25;62:1,3,5, | 41:22 | 64:2,7 | 13:7;27:7,12;29:16; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| spreadsheet (2) | 23,25;63:13,13;64:24 | suppose (1) | therefore (1) | 30:2;46:21;53:9;54:23; |
| 14:14;44:5 | still (13) | 18:21 | 11:8 | 59:24;60:1 |
| stab (1) | 8:14;16:14,15;17:1, | sure (20) | thereof (1) | turn (1) |
| 21:22 | 14;23:18;24:5;38:7; | 6:12;14:6;16:8; | 43:15 | 41:2 |
| staff (6) | 46:10;47:5;60:12;64:5, | 23:20;24:3;25:21; | thermostat (1) | tweaks (1) |
| 6:17;20:6,6;35:17; | 6 | 28:24;31:19;32:7;41:7; | 64:21 | 49:14 |
| 38:25;60:13 | stipulate (1) | 45:17;47:11,12,25; | thinking (1) | twice (1) |
| staffing (1) | 46:11 | 50:23;51:8;53:8;55:2; | 25:9 | 4:15 |
| 10:19 | stop (1) | 56:12;59:2 | though (4) | two (8) |
| staff's (1) | 18:5 | surety (3) | 14:24;18:9;19:2,2 | $4: 14 ; 9: 13 ; 11: 25$ |
| 30:15 | straightforward (3) | 8:6;11:5,6 | thoughts (1) | $15: 22 ; 25: 21 ; 37: 10$ |
| Stan (1) | 6:4;7:2;29:5 | surprised (1) | 60:18 | 54:3;59:7 |
| 24:18 | streamlined (2) | 32:13 | thousand (2) | two-year (1) |
| standard (2) | 7:23,25 | surrounding (1) | 7:22,25 | 9:19 |
| 52:1,6 | stricken (1) | 34:1 | three (2) | type (2) |
| standardized (1) | 61:7 | Susan (19) | 21:10;59:8 | 34:6;59:24 |
| $62: 12$ | stuff (1) | 5:11,15;13:23;14:8, | threshold (2) | Typically (5) |
| standpoint (1) | 36:11 | $10 ; 27: 22 ; 30: 10 ; 36: 21$ | 26:9;29:17 | 13:9;15:17;29:4; |
| 57:18 | subcontractor (1) | 41:2,5;45:21;48:23; | thrilled (1) | $56: 5 ; 59: 7$ |
| start (1) | 52:1 | 51:16;55:2,18;56:3; | 51:3 | typo (1) |
| 17:15 | subcontractors (1) | 60:22;61:25;63:13 | Tiberti (1) |  |
| started (4) | 52:12 | suspect (1) | $3: 13$ times (8) |  |
| 28:1;35:4;36:6; | subject (1) | 63:18 | times (8) | $\mathbf{U}$ |
| State (21) | sublistings (1) | $9: 17 ; 11: 12 ; 18: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 20,54: 11, \\ & 13,19,19,21 \end{aligned}$ | unclear (1) |
| 3:5;5:4,6;7:20; | 53:14 | 20:1,8;27:16;32:13; | title (1) | 43:7 |
| 11:17;27:24;38:1; | submit (6) | $34: 9 ; 37: 8 ; 40: 25 ; 45: 12$ | 12:19 | under (28) |
| $40: 14,14,15,17,23$ | $18: 17 ; 19: 19,20$ | $47: 22$ | Tito (2) | $5: 22 ; 7: 21 ; 9: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:10;43:6;51:25; } \\ & \text { 52:16;55:12,23;62:8,9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 15 ; 43: 19 ; 52: 10 \\ & \text { submits (1) } \end{aligned}$ | T | $\begin{array}{r} 3: 13,22 \\ \text { today (3) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 12,21 ; 12: 5,14 \\ & 14: 19 ; 23: 15,16 ; 34: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $6: 16$ | T | 36:5;46:20;49:10 | 36:1;37:2,8,8,9;38:7, |
| stated (3) | submitted (9) | tab (3) | today's (1) | 22;39:8;40:12,12,24; |
| $47: 9 ; 51: 24 ; 57: 19$ | 12:7;19:11,13,15; | $9: 16,17 ; 13: 12$ | $64: 12$ | 43:23;44:7;45:8;46:10; |
| statement (4) | $31: 16 ; 35: 2,6 ; 45: 18$ | table (1) | together (4) | $54: 8,9$ |
| $8: 5 ; 10: 20 ; 11: 2 ; 47: 7$ | $58: 21$ | $63: 4$ | $9: 22 ; 30: 4 ; 47: 22$ | underlined (4) |
| statements (1) | submitting (2) | tackled (1) | $60: 7$ | $61: 6,10,12,13$ |
| 10:18 | 8:2;19:14 | 47:23 | told (4) | understood (1) |
| States (3) | subsequent (2) | talk (4) | 46:5;60:11,14,17 | 47:8 |
| 11:22;20:15;33:20 | 14:5;46:23 | 26:13;53:6;56:11,18 | took (2) | Uniform (2) |
| statewide (1) | substantial (2) | talked (1) | 27:17;42:1 | 49:3,20 |
| 62:13 | 38:15;39:11 | 44:7 | $\boldsymbol{t o p}(1)$ | United (1) |
| statute (13) | substantially (1) | talking (2) | 20:8 | $11: 22$ |
| $5: 25 ; 6: 5,7,13,23 ; 7: 6$ | $38: 11$ | 32:22;35:6 | total (3) | unless (6) |
| 7,21;9:4;30:18;41:12, | substitute (1) | talks (2) | 15:4;34:13;44:9 | 9:1,4;18:22;29:1; |
| 17;45:25 | 29:13 | 42:6,7 | totally (1) | 35:13;50:1 |
| Statutes (10) | successful (11) | tasks (1) | 21:16 | unlimited (3) |
| $5: 6,16,24 ; 7: 9,10,12$ | 13:20;14:16;17:11, | $47: 23$ | track (1) | 18:9;25:18;26:14 |
| $14,17 ; 9: 11 ; 57: 4$ | 25;23:16;29:11;43:12, | technically (2) | 59:4 | UNLV (2) |
| steps (1) | 23;44:6;45:1;58:7 | 17:10;29:1 | trades (1) | 49:5,23 |
| 6:11 | successfully (3) | telling (1) | 59:3 | UNR (2) |
| Stewart (66) | 12:13;25:8;43:16 | 53:11 | tried (1) | 49:5,22 |
| $3: 11 ; 5: 11,13,14,15$ | sufficient (1) | tells (2) | $59: 25$ | up (27) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21 ; 9: 6 ; 10: 25 ; 13: 18,23, \end{aligned}$ | $58: 11$ | $5: 25 ; 6: 13$ | truth (1) | $4: 4 ; 8: 25 ; 15: 1,14$ |
| $28: 3 ; 30: 9,10 ; 32: 16,24$ | suggest (2) 29:20;35:21 |  | truthful (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 6 ; 19: 3,16 ; 20: 17 ; \\ & 21: 25 ; 24: 12 ; 28: 4 ; 31: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 33:5;34:25;35:12; | suggested (3) | 19:14;25:5;32:9,16; | 29:6 | 18,23;32:5;35:17; |
| 36:21,22;37:15;41:7; | 38:25;55:16;56:14 | 43:14 | truthfulness (1) | 36:17,22;40:7;47:1; |
| 43:9;45:21,21;48:21, | suggestion (1) | term (1) | 45:24 | 54:13;55:19;63:19; |
| 22,23;50:3,5,11,13; | 56:8 | 4:12 | try (4) | 64:3,5,15,18 |
| 51:3,14,15,16;52:18, | summary (1) | terms (1) | 28:21;30:7;35:4; | Update (2) |
| 21,24;54:19;56:2,3,17, | 5:23 | 14:4 | 53:11 | 48:21,24 |
| 22,25;57:2;61:1,4,11, | support (1) | testify (2) | trying (10) | upfront (1) |
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| 58:12 | 19;42:1,22 | working (2) | 10th (1) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| upon (2) | violations (5) | 55:18;56:9 | 4:7 | 3 |
| 12:19;42:21 | 24:6;37:4,12;41:21; | Works (36) | 11 (1) |  |
| upper (14) | $42: 10$ | 3:5;4:6;5:5,6;6:2,11, | 12:2 | 3 (7) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17: 21 ; 19: 4 ; 20: 16,18 \\ & 22 ; 21: 18 ; 22: 5,9,14,16 \end{aligned}$ | W | $\begin{aligned} & 14 ; 7: 20,24 ; 10: 19,24 \\ & 19: 9 ; 25: 5 ; 30: 17 ; 35: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $12(1)$ $32: 20$ | $4: 5 ; 46: 11,15 ; 53: 15,$ |
| 25:20;26:2;43:25;47:8 |  | $43: 14 ; 49: 19 ; 51: 16$ | 120 (5) | $3: 45(1)$ |
| use (25) | wage (7) | 52:1,5,14;53:3,5; | 17:6,15,16,17;29:19 | 3.45 6 |
| 15:17;17:20;20:6,7; | 24:6;29:9;37:3,4,5,9, | 54:23;55:9;56:4,5,13, | 120-point (1) | 30 (6) |
| 21:1,13;26:2;31:19; | 13 | 13;57:13,17;60:1,4,13, | 29:17 | 17:13;18:6;36:17; |
| 44:8,25;52:6,15;53:3, | waiting (1) | 19;62:9 | 13 (1) | 39:6,18,25 |
| 4;54:10,14,17;55:5,7,8, | 13:4 | Works' (2) | 12:3 | 300 (2) |
| 19;57:23;59:25;60:12; | walk (1) | 54:15;57:5 | 138.45 (1) | $31: 12 ; 32: 6$ |
| 62:11 | 9:2 | wrap (1) | 36:10 | 305 (1) |
| used (6) | wants (3) | 47:1 | 138.7 (1) | 41:20 |
| 47:10;52:2;53:24,24; | 21:8,12;57:8 | writing (4) | 36:9 | 338 (1) |
| $54: 13 ; 60: 6$ | warnings (1) | $6: 19 ; 18: 13 ; 47: 10,14$ | 138.95 (1) | 57:4 |
| uses (1) | 42:9 | written (1) | 36:10 | 338.0117 (1) |
| 53:3 | way (18) | 27:1 | 15 (3) | 538.23 |
| using (12) | 15:3,12;21:23;29:4, | wrong (2) | 37:11,12,13 | $338.1375(2)$ |
| 11:5;21:21;31:22; | 10,15,16,21;30:13; | 27:21;32:25 | 150 (1) | $5: 24 ; 6: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 25 ; 48: 3,6 ; 53: 23,25 ; \\ & 54: 1 ; 55: 22 ; 57: 9 ; 59: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 22 ; 43: 7 ; 44: 7 ; 55: 7 \\ & 13 ; 59: 2,23 ; 62: 14,22 \end{aligned}$ | Y | 17:16 | 338.1381 (1) |
| usually (2) | ways (3) | Y | $1 B(1)$ $11: 18$ | 6:24 |
| 21:7;59:7 | 36:22;53:16;58:1 | year (5) | 1-point (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{3 3 8 . 1 4 1} \text { (2) } \\ & 51: 22 ; 52: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| V | website (1) $49: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 15 ; 12: 23 ; 31: 13,24 ; \\ & 32: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 16:2,4 } \\ \text { 1st (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{3 3 8 . 1 5 0 ( 1 )} \\ 7: 15 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | welcome (1) | years (26) | 4:7 | 338.1693 (1) |
| V5 (1) $37: 2$ | $5: 17$ weren't (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 14 ; 9: 14 ; 11: 22 \\ & 12: 2,3,20,21,25 ; 13: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 60:23 |
| V-A (1) | 33:14 | 10,13,20;30:25;32:5,9, |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{3 3 8 . 2 2 0}(\mathbf{2}) \\ 12: 10 ; 14: 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| 37:8 | what's (3) | 9;33:23;36:12;38:2,9, | 2 (6) | $338.240 \text { (1) }$ |
| vacuum (1) | 25:17;47:2;63:15 | 23;40:18;43:16;47:19; | 3:25;38:6;44:2,2; | 338.24 |
| 27:6 | whichever (3) | 48:15;52:8 | 46:11,15 | 338.290 (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { valuation (1) } \\ 11: 12 \end{gathered}$ | 20:23;21:2;44:17 whole (5) | Z | 2:00 (2) | 7:15 $\mathbf{3 4 1}$ (2) |
| varies (1) | 21:19;32:12;46:21; |  | 20 (8) | $57: 25 ; 58: 1$ |
| 32:7 | 55:12;59:6 | zero (2) | 17:12;23:15;34:12, |  |
| various (1) | withdraw (1) | $16: 22 ; 43: 24$ | $19 ; 36: 16 ; 39: 17,23$ | 4 |
| 27:4 | 65:4 |  | 40:3 |  |
| VB (1) | withdrew (1) | 0 | 2001 (1) | 4 (1) |
| 38:5 | 35:7 |  | 47:25 | 5:4 |
| VC (1) | within (17) | 05 (1) | 2002 (1) | 40 (1) |
| 38:22 | 6:18,19;7:2,3;12:15, | 34:18 | 47:25 | 40:7 |
| Vegas (2) | 24;13:20;21:17,20; | 08 (1) | 2008 (1) | $41 \text { (1) }$ |
| 10:25;35:2 | 24:11;25:6;30:17; | 32:17 | 30:20 | $49: 12$ |
| VI (5) | 38:15,24;39:10,12; |  | 2016 (2) | $44 \text { (1) }$ |
| 40:11, 12,$24 ; 43: 4 ;$ | $43: 18$ without (1) | 1 | $4: 7,8$ 2017 | $49: 17$ |
| 51:14 | without (1) |  | 2017 (2) | 45 (3) |
| via (1) | 35:6 |  | $3: 1,6$ | 4:15,16;6:18 |
| 57:6 | wondering (1) | $15: 6 ; 32: 22 ; 34: 19$ | 20-point (2) |  |
| Vice-Chair (4) | 14:4 | $39: 1 ; 41: 3 ; 44: 1 ; 46: 15$ | 42:19:44:9 | 5 |
| 3:10;62:1,5,25 | word (1) | 53:15;54:2,3,9;61:20 | 2-3 (1) |  |
| view (1) | 55:7 | $10(22)$ | $39: 5$ | 5 (21) |
| $5: 16$ | wording (3) | $12: 3,13 ; 16: 2,15$ | $27 \text { (2) }$ |  |
| VII (2) $43: 12 ; 46: 10$ | 46:12;55:7,19 words (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 11,12 ; 23: 14 ; 24: 19 \\ & 32: 20: 34: 11.13 .19 .19 \end{aligned}$ | $3: 1 ; 4: 11$ | $15: 12 ; 16: 18 ; 17: 11$ |
| 43:12;46:10 VIII (1) | words (2) $37: 4 ; 60: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 20 ; 34: 11,13,19,19, \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { 27th (1) } \\ 3: 6 \end{array}$ | 18:6,6;33:23;36:12; |
| $45: 4$ | 37:4;60:4 work (14) | 20,21,21;39:1,11,13; $41: 4 ; 44: 3,9$ | 28(2) | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 2,9 ; 40: 18 ; 43: 16 ; \\ & 44: 1 ; 48: 20 ; 53: 15 ; 54: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| violated (1) | 12:21;19:10;35:4; | 10,000-foot (1) | 4:11,11 | $2,8 ; 61: 1$ |
| $38: 1$ | 38:2,17;39:15,15; | 5:16 | 2-point (6) | $50(2)$ |
| violation (9) | $41: 11,25 ; 47: 20 ; 54: 9$ | 10-point (1) | $42: 20 ; 44: 10,10,13,$ | $42: 16 ; 52: 12$ |
| 37:5,7,10,22;38:4,6, | 58:18;59:10,13 |  | $15 ; 45: 1$ | $5 \mathrm{C}(1)$ |



