

**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**Joy Grimmer**  
*Director*

**Bob Ragar**  
*Deputy Director*

**Wilfred J. Lewis, Jr.**  
*Administrator*

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

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

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

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**  
**Meeting of January 23, 2025**

Agenda Item # 3

SUBJECT TITLE:

**FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:** Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes for:  
**August 28, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting Vol. I (attached)**  
**August 29, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting Vol. II (attached)**  
**September 17, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting (attached)**  
**September 17, 2024, Public Works Board Regulation Adoption Hearing (attached)**

DISCUSSION:

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the August 28, 2024, Public Works Division Board meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 9:16 change "Parks" to "Department"
2. Page 11:11 delete "or"
3. Page 16:14 change "between moving the line moving" to "standing in line."
4. Page 16:17 delete ":into" add "under"
5. Page 22:5 change "in" to "on"
6. Page 24:6 change "Bill" to "Phil"
7. Page 48:9,10, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 19 change "fabs" to "fobs"
8. Page 56:13 change "significant sizing" to "of significant size"
9. Page 59:1 change "locating: to "relocating"
10. Page 77:13 change "humanity" to "humane"
11. Page 78:12 change "utilizing" to "housing"
12. Page 78:13 change "starts" to "utilizes"
13. Page 78:19 delete "those"
14. Page 79:10 change "mission" to "prison"
15. Page 81:24 delete "our"
16. Page 87:5 change "start up" to "flighted out"
17. Page 92:12 change "direct and direct" to "direct and indirect"
18. Page 101:15 change "through's" to "there's"
19. Page 112:19 change "led" to "lead"
20. Page 123:9 change "together" to "to"
21. Page 125:18 delete "the"
22. Page 137:19 change "breath" to "breadth"
23. Page 139:18,21,22,and 24 change "skates" to "gates"
24. Page 140:3,10,14, and 17 change "skates" to "gates"
25. Page 144:13 change "my" to "may"
26. Page 150:20 change "Region" to "Regional"
27. Page 150:22 delete "between"
28. Page 151:7 change "skilled" to "filled"

29. Page 153:16, 17, and 18 change "Casey" to "Kacey"
30. Page 156:21 change "of" to "out"
31. Page 156:23 delete reason
32. Page 157:8 change "Casey" to "Kacey"
33. Page 158:17 change "nurser" to "nursery"
34. Page 161:3 change "Casey" to "Kacey"
35. Page 162:19 change "Casey" to "Kacey"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the August 29, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 4:15 change "Bryan" to "Brian"
2. Page 8:17 change "we have" to "We're"
3. Page 9:19 change "that" to "in"
4. Page 15:3 change "purpose" to "multi-purpose"
5. Page 15:3 change "build" to "building"
6. Page 15:23 change "o" to "of"
7. Page 28:11-14 ????
8. Page 31:6 change "for" to "that"
9. Page 46:11 change "unit" to "university"
10. Page 56:18 change "how are going" to "how are you going"
11. Page 56:23 change "out of" to "about"
12. Page 59:8 delete "Him"
13. Page 65:12 change "person" to "important"
14. Page 81:13 change "trick" to "TRIC"
15. Page 85:4 delete "appeal associated"
16. Page 88:21 change "had had" to "has been"
17. Page 88:21 change "and inadequate" to "and had inadequate"
18. Page 90:12-13 change "Marcus" to "Markus"
19. Page 91:5 change "look" to "long"
22. Page 108:12 change "way" to "well"
23. Page 108:15 change "peel field" to "move"
24. Page 116:2 delete "eye"
25. Page 121:6 change "Marcus" to "Markus"
26. Page 122:19 delete "with"
27. Page 123:10 delete "as"
28. Page 123:15 change "from" to "for"
29. Page 131: 3 change "work" to "working"
30. Page 140:25 change "two" to "ten"
31. Page 167:16 change "shoot" to "shoo"
32. Page 16:20 change "fabs" to "fobs"
33. Page 172:25 change "compute" to "computer"
34. Page 178:1 change "FF&E" to "FTEs"
35. Page 185:23 change "MSLA" to "NSLA"
36. Page 186:2 change "NSOA" to "NSLA"
37. Page 186:19 change "is" to "was"
38. Page 196:8 change "led" to "lead"
39. Page 198:19 change "sever" to "receive"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the September 17, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

1. Page 19:20 change "Childrens" to "Veterans"
2. Page 55:8 change "lump" to "limp"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the September 17, 2024, Public Works Board Regulation Adoption Hearing meeting minutes and recommends their approval with no changes.

**PRIOR ACTIONS:**

None.

**FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:**

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Approve or deny the August 28, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting minutes as amended.
- Approve or deny the August 29, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting minutes as amended.
- Approve or deny the September 17, 2024, Public Works Board Meeting minutes as amended.
- Approve or deny the September 17, 2024, Public Works Board Regulation Adoption Meeting minutes as submitted.

ACTION ITEM:

- Motion to approve or deny the August 28, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.
- Motion to approve or deny the August 29, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.
- Motion to approve or deny the September 17, 2024, Public Works Board meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.
- Motion to approve or deny the September 17, 2024, Public Works Division Regulation Workshop meeting minutes as submitted herein OR as further amended by the Board

PREPARED BY: Susan K. Stewart, Construction Law Counsel

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

---

*September 17, 2024*

---

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

Page 1

1  
2 STATE OF NEVADA  
3  
4 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION VIDEO CONFERENCE BOARD MEETING  
5  
6 TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024  
7  
8 9:00 A.M.  
9  
10 STATE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION  
11  
12 680 WEST NYE LANE, SUITE 103  
13  
14 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89703  
15  
16  
17 THE BOARD: ADAM HAND, Chairperson  
18 JOY GRIMMER, Director,  
19 Department of Administration  
20 PHILIP MANNELLY, Member  
21 ROY WALKER, Member  
22 TITO TIBERTI, Member  
23  
24 FOR THE BOARD: SUSAN STEWART, Esq.  
25 Senior Deputy Attorney General  
  
WIL LEWIS,  
Administrator  
  
BRIAN WACKER,  
Administrator  
  
MARKUS MCENTEE,  
Project Manager  
  
REPORTED BY: CAPITOL REPORTERS  
BY: Nicole J. Hansen,  
Nevada CCR #446, RPR, CRR, RMR  
628 E. John Street #3

Page 3

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA; TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024,  
2 9:00 A.M.  
3 -o0o-  
4  
5 CHAIR HAND: Good morning. This is the time  
6 and the place of the State Public Works Board meeting,  
7 and I apologize. I should have said Member Hand, for the  
8 record, to start. It is the 17th of September at 9:00  
9 o'clock straight up, and welcome and we'll start with  
10 roll call.  
11 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
12 record. We'll start with roll call.  
13 Chairman Adam Hand?  
14 CHAIR HAND: Present.  
15 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Vice-Chair Clint  
16 Bentley?  
17 Member Tito Tiberti?  
18 MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.  
19 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis?  
20 Member Philip Mannelly?  
21 MEMBER MANNELLY: Present.  
22 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member Roy Walker?  
23 MEMBER WALKER: Present.  
24 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member/Director of  
25 Department of Administration, Joy Grimmer?  
DIRECTOR GRIMMER: Present.

Page 2

1	AGENDA/INDEX	
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
3	1. Roll Call	3
4		
5	2. Public Comment	4
6		
7	3. For Possible Action: Election of Chairperson	4
8	and Vice-Chairperson	
9		
10	4. For Possible Action: Discussion and Possible	6
11	Action on the Administration's Recommendation to the	
12	Board for the 2025 Capital Improvement Program.	
13		
14	5. For Possible Action: Discussion and Possible	22
15	Action on the Board's Letter to the Governor	
16	Regarding the State's Deferred Maintenance Needs.	
17		
18	6. For Possible Action:	
19	Board Comment and Discussion	63
20	Board Comments on any Agenda Item	
21	Items to be Included in Future Agendas	
22	Review of Action Items for SPWD Management	
23	Set Future Meeting Dates	
24	7. Public Comment	65
25		

Page 4

1 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, we have a  
2 quorum.  
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you. The next item  
4 on our agenda today is public comment. Do we have anyone  
5 here or down south for public comment today?  
6 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
7 record. We also have an option for folks to call in, and  
8 I not have not been informed that anyone has called in to  
9 make public comment.  
10 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: So Wil Lewis, for the  
11 record. Ms. Chairman, there's no public comments here in  
12 Vegas at present.  
13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you. Chairperson  
14 Hand, for the record. The next item on our agenda, we're  
15 moving quite rapidly this morning -- Item Number 3 for  
16 possible action is: Discussion and possible action on  
17 the election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chair.  
18 And, Ms. Stewart, do you need to talk about  
19 this at all?  
20 COUNSEL STEWART: I will say a few words  
21 about it, Mr. Chairman. Susan Stewart, for the record.  
22 According to our regulations, the term of office of the  
23 Chair and Vice-Chair is two years. As such, two years  
24 ago, so now here it is an agenda item. I will say I did  
25 speak to -- not to influence anyone in any way, shape or

1 form. I did speak to Clint Bentley, who let me know that  
2 he wasn't going to be here, but also did mention when I  
3 pressed him that he would be willing to accept the  
4 nomination for a Vice-Chair if that were the desires of  
5 the board, and the first thing is to accept nominations  
6 for the election of a chairperson.  
7 Do I hear yes, Mr. Walker?  
8 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like to  
9 nominate for Chairperson Adam Hand.  
10 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti. I'll second  
11 that.  
12 COUNSEL STEWART: Do you accept?  
13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I accept. Thank you.  
14 COUNSEL STEWART: Maybe I'm just call for the  
15 motions.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I was going to say.  
17 COUNSEL STEWART: All in favor?  
18 THE BOARD: Aye.  
19 COUNSEL STEWART: Opposed? So moved. And  
20 next is election of a Vice-Chairperson?  
21 Mr. Walker?  
22 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like to  
23 nominate Clint Bentley for the Vice-Chair position.  
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Second.  
25 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti. I second

1 that.  
2 COUNSEL STEWART: All right. All in favor?  
3 THE BOARD: Aye.  
4 COUNSEL STEWART: Opposed? So moved.  
5 CHAIR HAND: Thank you all. The next item is  
6 discussion and possible action on the Administrator's  
7 recommendation to the Board for the 2025 CIP.  
8 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
9 record. I know Administrator Lewis and Brian Wacker are  
10 going to take this agenda item. I did just want to point  
11 out as a preliminary matter that between the board  
12 meeting in August and today, staff is continuing to do  
13 due diligence, get information from the agency, and so  
14 there may be some distinctions between what was presented  
15 in August and what you see today. And of course we can  
16 answer any questions in detail, you know, after the  
17 presentation. Thank you. Sorry, Wil.  
18 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Administrator Wil  
19 Lewis, for the record. Thank you, Susan, for that  
20 explanation. I think it will serve us very well.  
21 To begin my presentation on the CIP, again,  
22 this is the Administrator's recommendation to the board.  
23 We'll be using the same criteria we used a couple of  
24 weeks ago at the CIP agency presentations to the Board.  
25 However, this go-around, we have managed to scale down

1 the \$3 billion dollars worth of agency requests to an  
2 amount that we believe is more defensible and what will  
3 eventually fit into the State's bonding affordability.  
4 Next slide. Before we get too deep in the  
5 presentation, I'd like to just briefly remind the board  
6 of our vision, mission, and philosophy followed by the  
7 facility's maintenance overview and then the nuts and  
8 bolts of this CIP presentation.  
9 Next slide. Our vision is for State agencies  
10 to occupy exemplary facilities, and that has not changed  
11 since the last biennium. Our mission is to provide  
12 well-planned, efficient and safe facilities to house  
13 agencies so that they can effectively administer their  
14 programs. And as a team, our philosophy is to work on  
15 building consensus and to take pride in our work while we  
16 serve with humility.  
17 Next slide. We wanted to share this slide in  
18 response to a question from our CIP presentation a couple  
19 of weeks back regarding the percentages we used for cost  
20 escalation and material cost index. Without getting too  
21 specific, you notice on the escalation chart file cost  
22 estimating firm OCMI, from 2012 to 2019, the national  
23 construction cost escalation hovered right around 3.2  
24 percent. And then from 2019 to 2020, you notice a quick  
25 drop as we dealt with the beginnings of COVID-19.

1 From 2020 to 2022, you notice a big spike up  
2 to 20 percent as we dealt with construction materials and  
3 supplies shortfall. You recall long lead items and long  
4 lead times getting building components like AC systems,  
5 computer chips and the rising cost of fuel and  
6 transportation, so it affected the entire nation. And  
7 then from 2022 to 2023, you notice a severe drop to about  
8 6.8 percent escalation rate. And so we then settled in  
9 around 6.4, 6.8 percent for our projected costs per  
10 projects.  
11 Now, on the other chart regarding the  
12 material cost index, the OCMI report stated that they  
13 expect material costs to maintain stability in pricing  
14 through 2025 with an average year-over-year change likely  
15 to stay within the historical bounds of 2 to 4 percent  
16 for any given material category. And again, just a quick  
17 overview. We would be happy to share this report with  
18 any board member who would like to have a copy of it.  
19 Let's get to the next slide. Now you  
20 probably recall seeing this slide a couple of years ago.  
21 However, we updated it to reflect our current CIP project  
22 numbers. You notice the red graph. The red graph shows  
23 the current deferred maintenance backlog of about \$260  
24 million dollars of maintenance projects. Last biennium,  
25 we funded \$212 million dollars in deferred maintenance

1 projects. This biennium, we're expecting that number to  
 2 be right at about \$313 million dollars.  
 3 The yellow bars on the chart shows CIP  
 4 funding over the past years from 2019 to 2023. The blue  
 5 chart shows backlog the future projected years, and then  
 6 the green charts or graphs show our anticipated project  
 7 for the future. Now you notice we're slowly reducing our  
 8 maintenance project backlog. This is important due to  
 9 this board stressing the deferred maintenance needs  
 10 directly to the governor starting back when we had  
 11 Governor Sandoval in 2016.  
 12 Next slide. Okay. This slide is provided as  
 13 a reminder again just pointing out during our  
 14 presentation last week, we brought this up. This is a  
 15 list by categories identifying each agencies'  
 16 prioritizing criteria for capital construction projects.  
 17 Next slide. I'd like to highlight a few  
 18 things regarding this slide. First of all, we addressed  
 19 all legal requirements for CIP projects first. Then of  
 20 course we take care of project continuations, then  
 21 maintenance projects for all of the central facilities  
 22 including institutional, governmental, public safety,  
 23 forestry, the Guard and so forth.  
 24 One thing that I would like to point out on  
 25 this slide, you notice the four numbered items in the

1 lower right-hand corner.  
 2 The fourth item addresses green building  
 3 standards including ASHRAE 90.1. You'll see later on in  
 4 our meeting or a little later on this morning, we're  
 5 going to discuss the process of changing this requirement  
 6 to state high performance buildings. That's our new  
 7 direction. And for those folks in the room who are  
 8 familiar with listening online are familiar with LEED  
 9 certification, that means as a State, we're no longer  
 10 pursuing LEED's silver standards for all of our projects.  
 11 Next slide. This is a list of our  
 12 maintenance capital construction projects. Instead of  
 13 reading each one individually, we ranked them from top to  
 14 bottom in terms of importance of priority. You notice  
 15 the red verbiage identifying whether the project is a  
 16 continuation or has additional funding for the project,  
 17 whether it's federal highway or from the agency  
 18 themselves.  
 19 The two top projects are connected. First  
 20 one, the Southern Nevada Forensic Facility, is a critical  
 21 project. Due to the demand and statutory requirements  
 22 for timely admission, the Division of Public and  
 23 Behavioral Health must increase capacity provided to  
 24 provide services as soon as possible. Currently, the  
 25 agency is being fined for their failure to provide this

1 statutory obligation. And currently, 130 individuals are  
 2 on a waiting list proposing a 300-bed forensic facility  
 3 to support the need in Southern Nevada is the solution.  
 4 The second project, the Desert Regional  
 5 Center, is connected to it. This project will replace  
 6 three aging buildings and provide the land required for  
 7 that forensic facility. And of course the remaining or  
 8 remainder of the projects on the list are projects that  
 9 we are recommending to push forward by priority.  
 10 Next slide. This is the list of our  
 11 continuation projects. And again, instead of reading  
 12 each one, they're ranked from top to bottom in terms of  
 13 importance. The red verbiage identifies the one project  
 14 with federal funding which happens to be at the top of  
 15 our list, the Northern Nevada Veterans Home. Topping  
 16 that list is Northern Nevada Vet Home. The funding will  
 17 consist of 65 percent federal and 35 percent State  
 18 funding. A recent analysis by the VA indicated a need  
 19 for 649 beds of skilled nursing facility in Nevada. To  
 20 date, there's only 276 beds in operation, leaving a  
 21 deficit of 373 beds needed. This facility will provide  
 22 128 operational beds in the state.  
 23 The second on the list is the FF&E budget  
 24 that we talked about in our last presentation for the  
 25 admin building in Carson, and you'll recall that is a

1 continuation project. As for the remainder on the list,  
 2 again, we've got them listed by priority.  
 3 Next slide. The next two slides are our  
 4 recommendations of capital construction projects. And  
 5 again, I'm not going to read each one. They're all  
 6 ranked from top to bottom. These projects are shovel  
 7 ready. The funding has been identified and attempted  
 8 project schedule has been developed based on durations  
 9 for construction. The completion of each of those  
 10 projects play a critical role in helping us stay ahead of  
 11 the backlog of projects we are currently managing.  
 12 And again, you can see -- well, at the top of  
 13 the list is the parking apron expansion. This is a  
 14 federally-funded project for the Guard. The State will  
 15 cover ineligible costs such as project management, plan  
 16 checking, advertisement, print and so forth, things that  
 17 cannot be covered by the federal funds. And as for the  
 18 remaining project, they're all listed by priority.  
 19 Next slide. This slide here are category of  
 20 projects alone just under \$230 million dollars. At the  
 21 top of the page, we're excited about having the Natural  
 22 History Exhibit project on the list. This project will  
 23 construct a 1,500 square-foot Natural History Exhibit.  
 24 The museum has already begun framing out the exhibit, and  
 25 it will require permitting plans to construct and to be

1 open to the public. We're excited about pushing this  
 2 project forward.  
 3 Next slide, please. Can we get the next  
 4 slide? Sorry about that. This slide here is our capital  
 5 construction planning projects. Again, these planning  
 6 projects are ranked with two of them for the National  
 7 Guard having federal funding available. These planned  
 8 projects are some of our more sensitive and life-safety  
 9 projects being recommended.  
 10 The top project is advance planning of  
 11 culinary, bakery and laundry building at NNCC. The  
 12 current building was built in the 1980s. It was designed  
 13 to serve about 800 inmates. Today, the population has  
 14 doubled. Also, the drainpipes and sewer pipes are  
 15 failing and need to be replaced, so you can see why we  
 16 put that at the top of the list.  
 17 Next slide, please. Next, the next three  
 18 slides are our recommendation for facilities maintenance  
 19 projects. And again, they're ranked -- I won't read each  
 20 one of them from top to bottom. The funding for these  
 21 projects are necessary to mitigate the backlog of  
 22 deferred maintenance projects. At the top of the list,  
 23 the first project is a \$15 million-dollar allocation to  
 24 the Nevada System of Higher Education for deferred  
 25 maintenance projects at the universities. After that,

1 funding available while statewide paving program has  
 2 highway funding available. Again, these projects alone  
 3 category total \$23 million dollars. Over \$23 million  
 4 dollars.  
 5 Next slide. Here is the final slide. For  
 6 each of the categories we presented, we've broken out  
 7 other funding and State fundings available for each.  
 8 We've applied the Board's approved priorities and  
 9 criteria that I mentioned at the beginning of the  
 10 presentation, and we have arrived at a total  
 11 administrative recommendation total of just over \$1.2  
 12 billion dollars of agency requests.  
 13 And so at this point, I'll pause. Does  
 14 anyone have any questions as we go to the last slide?  
 15 And we'll entertain a few questions if anybody has  
 16 anything they want to ask.  
 17 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I'd like to  
 18 start back on slide number five: Facility maintenance  
 19 backlog and funding analysis. With that, we picked up an  
 20 awful lot of new buildings, and from last CIP to these  
 21 new buildings, I understand we do not have our  
 22 maintenance facility, all of our mechanical HVAC  
 23 equipment, it's itemized throughout the state. And from  
 24 that, in the CIP, I kept hearing about chiller, chiller,  
 25 HVAC, chiller, chiller, HVAC. Some were past life or

1 the next four projects are facility maintenance projects  
 2 for HHS, Administration, Administration with Highway  
 3 funds, and then we have a new category which is for  
 4 Corrections. And again, the remaining projects are  
 5 listed by priority.  
 6 Next slide. On this slide, we are listing by  
 7 priority several HVAC projects, security improvements for  
 8 the agricultural division in Sparks. We have a door lock  
 9 project, door locks and controls at High Desert State  
 10 Prison, the culinary renovation at Lovelock Correctional  
 11 Center, as well as drainage improvement at Elko Wildlife  
 12 Office, just to name a few. But again, all of these are  
 13 continuing to be ranked in terms of priority.  
 14 Next slide. You'll notice slide 15. This is  
 15 a category of projects alone again totals just under \$230  
 16 million dollars. And that kind of wraps up our facility  
 17 maintenance projects.  
 18 Next slide. Finally, within this slide  
 19 highlights our recommendation for statewide programs,  
 20 nonlegal projects. And again, I'm not going to read  
 21 them, but they're ranked for the benefit of the board in  
 22 terms of importance.  
 23 On the slide, you'll note that these  
 24 statewide projects are divided by funding sources. You  
 25 might notice that two of the projects have federal

1 past their effective life. The other one that stands out  
 2 was 2019, a chiller has to be replaced because it was  
 3 ineffective and it wasn't working. That's five years  
 4 we're replacing a chiller. Our lifecycle calculations  
 5 calculate that farther.  
 6 So in this maintenance backlog, are we  
 7 assuming what we're expecting or are we targeted by using  
 8 our inventory which would have dates of when our  
 9 mechanical has been installed, a lifecycle analysis, and  
 10 then a prediction? So that is my question. How do you  
 11 get to the numbers on this graph?  
 12 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Wil, do you want me  
 13 to --  
 14 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Go ahead, Brian.  
 15 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
 16 record. That's what's fun. We're in different rooms.  
 17 COUNSEL STEWART: You can't elbow each other  
 18 when you're in different rooms.  
 19 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: We tried. Brian  
 20 Wacker again, for the record. So yeah, thank you for  
 21 that question. And I'll see if I can hit all of the  
 22 points from that because that was a -- you had multiple  
 23 points there. So that was a great question.  
 24 So I guess, you know, really asked about do  
 25 we inventory the mechanical systems around the State and



1 is that reflected on the graph for the future maintenance  
2 needs. The real answer is no, we don't have an active  
3 inventory of the mechanical or other, you know, inventory  
4 we have statewide. We're trying to start this up with  
5 this budget cycle. We've requested we call it an IWS:  
6 Integrated Workplace Management System to inventory some  
7 of those systems. That inventory is going to be for  
8 buildings owned by Buildings and Grounds, and so we're  
9 trying to start that process up.

10 Other State agencies, we would love to have  
11 that inventoried, but we don't have it, and maybe that  
12 can be something we could work on in the future. These  
13 projects that are shown in backlog are projects that are  
14 not -- that we're predicting the future. The way the CIP  
15 is built is we rely on State agencies to request projects  
16 in the CIP. We don't go find these projects for the  
17 agencies, and so we don't really know what's coming down  
18 the pipeline on a lot of these things.

19 I think -- and that kind of plays into your  
20 question a little bit is, you know, when are we  
21 predicting when we have to do equipment replacement. And  
22 yeah, five years is not a good timeline for equipment  
23 replacement obviously. I mean, these things are supposed  
24 to last 20 years plus if maintained correctly, right, and  
25 so we look for the agencies to start to request that as

1 they come up on their timelines needed for replacement.  
2 And that's part of our due diligence too.

3 I know project management staff is very  
4 involved with State agencies and will help with  
5 recommendations where we are -- if we see a need, we'll  
6 say: Hey, you need to request that sort of thing.

7 I know that -- I think what you're talking  
8 about the Northern Nevada State Veterans Home chiller  
9 that's requested for replacement after being there for  
10 only five years, and that was more of a design issue for  
11 the equipment not like a maintenance issue or something  
12 of that nature, so that was -- I'm hoping that's more of  
13 a one-off situation not a repeatable thing because we're  
14 not looking at five years for this equipment because that  
15 did not pencil out for lifecycle cost analysis on that.

16 Did that hopefully get most of what you're  
17 looking for?

18 MEMBER WALKER: It does, but it leads to  
19 followup questions.

20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Of course.

21 MEMBER WALKER: So the State is divided based  
22 from Public Works, our buildings and their buildings,  
23 their being all of the Division, yet they come to -- all  
24 come to the taxpayer to support this. So isn't it in the  
25 State's benefit to, number one, how many -- what's the

1 value of all of our mechanical systems throughout the  
2 state? I'm going to say \$100 million dollars. Is that a  
3 ballpark that would be acceptable?

4 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
5 record. I think it might be higher than that. I think  
6 we'll talk about it at a later agenda item, but we have  
7 the maintenance letter, and I think State facilities  
8 overall, I think so we had \$4.2 billion is the number we  
9 have for risk management for State facilities. That's  
10 not HVAC equipment. So it's \$100 million dollars or  
11 more, and it's not information that we pull together, but  
12 that is something to think about.

13 MEMBER WALKER: Well, Roy Walker. \$100  
14 million dollars of assets that can go 100 times that.  
15 And we spend how much of our State budget on preventive  
16 maintenance because every HVAC system has a preventive  
17 maintenance. Are the divisions doing preventative  
18 maintenance? We don't know.

19 Design warranty. The inadequacy of this  
20 chiller at Northern Nevada Childrens could have been  
21 picked up within a warranty period for design, but since  
22 we don't log and track, we're now coming back to the  
23 State budget to fix all of these errors.

24 I believe if we had a comprehensive  
25 mechanical inventory and someone to manage that inventory

1 not in this two-phase things, but as an overall  
2 mechanical inventory, in time, we're going to save a huge  
3 amount of budget. But since we don't know, we're only  
4 applying graphs to what we know, which is Building and  
5 Grounds, nothing from the State's or from our divisions.  
6 And our divisions are the ones that keep applying for the  
7 chillers, the HVACs, all of this. I believe this is  
8 somebody has to be accountable for this other than the  
9 way it is now: Just let it roll. So I'd like a future  
10 Board agenda to discuss this accountability on our  
11 mechanical systems so we can do this.

12 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
13 record. Member Walker, we have of course all comments  
14 are welcome. You know that. Agenda Item Number 6, we  
15 will specifically ask you for exactly what you would like  
16 agendized for future Board meetings, and we'll add that  
17 to the list.

18 MEMBER WALKER: Perfect.

19 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Administrator Wil  
20 Lewis, for the record. Member Walker, our plan moving  
21 forward is we already hired a deputy administrator from  
22 Buildings and Grounds to begin putting together an asset  
23 management plan where we will keep an active inventory of  
24 warranties and the lifespans of every piece of major  
25 component in State buildings, and we're going to share

1 that with our partners with other agencies so that they  
2 can also track that as well.  
3 I know when I was a director at the College  
4 of Southern Nevada, we had our director of technical  
5 services track all of that, all of the life expectancies  
6 and warranties on all of the major systems on the three  
7 main campuses on all of our facilities, so that's one of  
8 the things we want to do moving forward so that we can  
9 track it so that we can be more proactive rather than  
10 reactive to these type of requests.  
11 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. My next question  
12 is a --  
13 CHAIR HAND: Member Hand, for the record.  
14 Roy, could I just ask a followup question on this before  
15 you move to another one while we're on this topic or  
16 maybe just share a comment that Nevada Department of  
17 Transportation does an excellent job with their asset  
18 management system, and it's inclusive. It's everything.  
19 And it might be worth visiting with them or have this  
20 person at B&G visit with the folks at the Nevada  
21 Department of Transportation I think who do an excellent  
22 job with that.  
23 And in follow-up to Member Walker's question  
24 about the slide, do we have -- I think it's further in  
25 the packet, but I don't want to get distracted. The

1 regarding this slide. So we're looking at Agenda Item  
2 Number 5, and then in your packet is Exhibit B, and it is  
3 the first letter in Exhibit B, and then there's a graph  
4 attached to that so everybody can get there.  
5 Go ahead, Brian.  
6 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Okay. Brian Wacker.  
7 Thank you. So yeah, it would have been nice if we didn't  
8 have \$313 million dollars of maintenance that we're  
9 talking about right now. I was really excited when we  
10 put this graph together two years ago because instead of  
11 that black line, which is the curve of maintenance  
12 backlog, it was going up, up and up, it was coming down  
13 for the first time. Really excited about that.  
14 I think on this graph, it's a little  
15 disappointing to see that it went back up again, and  
16 that's what you're alluding at, although I know looking  
17 at that, one of the problems that we had over the last  
18 two years is we've had a large amount of just  
19 construction escalation over the last two years. We've  
20 seen a lot of our project costs go up.  
21 When Administrator Lewis in his presentation  
22 was talking about the escalation rates in 2022, 20  
23 percent and that year alone, and from 2019 to now, I  
24 think we've had almost a 50 percent construction  
25 escalation, that's at all projects and that's with this

1 projection that we had for '25 and '23, what was the  
2 projected maintenance budget? Was it anywhere near this?  
3 I thought we were going to be going down the way we were,  
4 I thought we plateaued and were predicting our costs were  
5 going down.  
6 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
7 record. The past projections in those graphs are  
8 included in the next agenda item when we talk about the  
9 letter to the governor. It's very related. I'm just  
10 pointing out that that information is in the packet if we  
11 want to look for it.  
12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Again, the reason I'm  
13 asking the question is, we brought this up during the CIP  
14 during the discussion before is again, all this  
15 maintenance stuff that's on the agenda, and so if we  
16 could find that, that would be helpful just to see where  
17 our projection was and what we ended up with now.  
18 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
19 record. It's at Exhibit B of that item, and for the 2025  
20 CIP, we're looking at \$155 million of maintenance.  
21 COUNSEL STEWART: Yeah. So let's let  
22 everybody -- sorry. Susan Stewart, for the record. So  
23 we're going to move ahead, and this is -- we're not in  
24 violation of our agenda because we're very much talking  
25 about this slide and we're looking at historical data

1 maintenance backlog as well.  
2 I think Member Walker has some really good  
3 points too. I really like that we're talking about what  
4 are these agencies doing for what their maintenance  
5 needs, you know.  
6 In particular, I could think about one  
7 project at Corrections. You might have seen it in the  
8 news. There's HVAC issues with the evaporative cooling  
9 at High Desert State Prison. And in our recommendation,  
10 we have a \$58 million-dollar project for that. So that  
11 project alone has really moved the needle on this  
12 maintenance request. So one project, \$313 and \$58  
13 million from that one thing where if that had not become  
14 such an issue, we weren't anticipating having to do all  
15 of the housing units until that really came to the  
16 forefront this summer.  
17 If you would have left us alone, we might  
18 have had a \$10, \$12 million-dollar budget. But because  
19 of what happened, it turned into a \$58 million-dollar  
20 project. So there's things like that. And I don't know  
21 whether that was just due to the age of the units or just  
22 maintenance issues at High Desert State Prison, but we  
23 have things like that pop up and there's dollars  
24 associated with them, so it moves that needle a little  
25 bit.

1 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you for the  
2 explanation. I just had recalled that we thought we were  
3 over the hump, and with the purchase of all of the  
4 buildings, the campus down south and so forth, is that  
5 going to help reduce future maintenance costs?

6 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
7 record. It won't. It will not help maintenance. And  
8 I'm trying to be nice saying it too. And the reason it  
9 won't is because we're moving State employees from leased  
10 facilities to State-owned facilities, so by owning more,  
11 we are going to have to maintain more.

12 I do know like the McCarran Center, we don't  
13 have anything in this CIP recommendation from that  
14 facility. So it's not like, you know, it's not like  
15 we've got 20 percent of the ask because of those  
16 buildings. You know, they are in good shape and we're  
17 moving into them now, but we will have CIP projects there  
18 in the future. So it is coming up the more we own, the  
19 more maintenance we'll have to do.

20 CHAIRPERSON HAND: So does that question  
21 influence -- and I guess I'll step away from it. I  
22 apologize. Member Walker, I apologize for interrupting  
23 your theme there, but I didn't want to walk away from  
24 that.

25 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker again. Now back

1 to another slide: The slide nine. There's one project  
2 on there, the C05 the Hobart Dam. I understand the last  
3 couple of weeks of putting final numbers together, but  
4 this project changed from a \$2 million-dollar project to  
5 a \$4 million-dollar project. That's within the Public  
6 Works all of -- it's under our roof. How is there 100 or  
7 100 percent swing on what was presented to us and now  
8 what's asked for us to fund?

9 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Wil, do you want me to  
10 take this?

11 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Yes, please.

12 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker again,  
13 for the record. Yeah. I wish I didn't have to make that  
14 big of a change in the project. You're correct. And  
15 Hobart, that project is, you know, a facility managed by  
16 Buildings and Grounds, so it is in-house with us. And so  
17 unfortunately, we had the presentation to the Board a  
18 couple of weeks ago with the budget that when we looked  
19 at it closer was not correct.

20 That project in particular is requesting  
21 additional funds for ongoing project at Hobart Dam where  
22 we're halfway most of the way through design on that  
23 project, but because of the federal funding component,  
24 it's been delayed from what we originally thought was  
25 going to happen with that project, and so that's the

1 reason for the additional request is that it's mostly a  
2 cost escalation issue with that project coupled with the  
3 idea of the dam, we're not able to do value engineering  
4 to bring it back within budget. Those projects are very  
5 constrained.

6 I guess I'd like to say yeah, a dam is not  
7 high architecture. It is what it is. You have to take  
8 care of the life-safety needs there. And so  
9 unfortunately, we went to you guys a couple of weeks ago  
10 and had a budget just based on a cost estimate we  
11 received from our team on that; upon closer examination  
12 realized we needed to have some other costs in there  
13 including escalation to when the construction will happen  
14 on that project. So yeah, egg on our face for sure. But  
15 we feel strong that this is the right number that we  
16 presented to you today for that project. And so we want  
17 to get it correct.

18 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I'm glad you  
19 picked it up. You're referring to the egg. It's a

20 little egg, but if we approve \$2 million, you need \$4 --

21 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: It's worse.

22 MEMBER WALKER: -- that's the whole chicken.

23 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: That's right. Yeah.

24 MEMBER WALKER: Then I'd like to move on.

25 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly, for the

1 record. Is there any -- I'm glad Roy picked up on that,  
2 but without going through kind of each one, is there any  
3 other project that experienced a similar change from the  
4 time of presentation a few weeks ago to now that we  
5 should perhaps be aware of?

6 MEMBER WALKER: There are 12 other projects,  
7 and I think all of the other projects, the amounts are  
8 very tolerable and don't approach anywhere like this  
9 percentage of deviation. So I didn't do percent per  
10 project, but to me, they all look okay.

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: That's fine.

12 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
13 record. I'd be happy to give a little synopsis of, and  
14 Roy, Member Walker, did a wonderful job of finding every  
15 one of those, and so his comments may actually provide  
16 that synopsis.

17 MEMBER MANNELLY: Yeah. I trust what Member  
18 Walker said.

19 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. Moving on,  
20 there's a Project C24. Building name --

21 COUNSEL STEWART: What slide, sir?

22 MEMBER WALKER: Slide 11. Building a shade  
23 structure for DMV. And as I read the packet at the time  
24 of presentation, and as I read it in preparation for  
25 today, I see we have a building 65 years old which would

1 be 65 years would without a shade structure. I see a  
2 2016 building, which would be eight years without a shade  
3 structure, and I see 1995 buildings which would be 24  
4 years without a shade structure. So I really don't  
5 believe it's in the State's best interest to spend a  
6 million dollars on a shade structure that has this life  
7 history to it.

8 Instead of this million dollars being spent  
9 here, I would like to move to -- I didn't list them per  
10 slide. It is the Eagle State Park Dam replacement which  
11 in my book, it was from Wildlife, and it was they're  
12 ranked six. And within the slides, it's in the asking  
13 not past maintenance. It's in the request for funding  
14 for design and construct. It is the -- your request.  
15 I'm missing your request. I don't see it, but it is a  
16 dam at Eagle Valley State Park. This dam has been  
17 indicated by FEMA to be a high hazard, which is the  
18 highest hazard that FEMA has in rating our dams. In  
19 fact, the dam is leaking, and it is placed on here. So I  
20 think that that is very well done.

21 Now I would like to refer to the next another  
22 project that was not included, and that was Department of  
23 Wildlife project rank number 7 which was the Kingston  
24 Canyon Dam. The Kingston Canyon Dam has been placed on  
25 FEMA's high-hazard list. It is also leaking. There's

1 There's probably 40 to 50 people that live there with  
2 houses. Below Eagle Valley, below the Ely Dam, there's  
3 one resident, but there's State Highway 50, and it's the  
4 same size. So there's huge issues that I believe we  
5 should be looking at and not doing shade structures. I  
6 don't get the priority. So that's the question.  
7 Unfortunately, a statement.

8 COUNSEL STEWART: That's fine. Susan  
9 Stewart, for the record. Just a couple of things. I  
10 think if you look at the criteria and the priorities that  
11 have been approved by the Board, the public-facing DMV  
12 and the public having challenges accessing services, the  
13 attention that the DMV gets is one of the reasons why the  
14 shade structure was recommended.

15 The second thing is Hobart and Marlette are  
16 part of a water system that provides the sole water  
17 source to Storey County, and that water system is owned  
18 by the State of Nevada and managed by the Department of  
19 Administration, so it's treated differently. Rightly or  
20 wrongly, it's treated differently because of those  
21 circumstances.

22 The other thing is Public Works primarily  
23 builds buildings. And the challenges that we face with  
24 the dams that are being presented to us that it is a  
25 little bit outside of our wheelhouse and a question of

1 safety issues. High hazard from FEMA means life-safety  
2 issues. The valving at the bottom of the dam, the lower  
3 level outlet, the slide valving is not working, so you  
4 can't effectively lower water elevation in the dam so you  
5 can't manage it during storm flows. You're relying on  
6 the overflow structure, and the overflow structure needs  
7 to be replaced from the part.

8 So what is the difference and significance  
9 from one dam to the other dam? I don't understand why  
10 one makes it with the same criteria and another one  
11 doesn't, and then yet there's a third one, Illipah Creek  
12 Dam which again backs up 65 acres of water, and it has  
13 the same issues, but these aren't being addressed. I get  
14 it that over time, a dam that's leaking only gets bigger,  
15 but if we don't start in planning and doing something  
16 now, we're increasing the risk of some kind of  
17 catastrophe.

18 And I would rather spend shade money at DMV,  
19 which I believe DMV, this is their problem creating the  
20 lines. We've given buildings. We've given all kinds of  
21 stuff: Highway Department a \$50 million-dollar computer  
22 system to improve this. I don't want to spend a million  
23 dollars there. I want to spend a million dollars fixing  
24 life-safety issues with this dam.

25 Below Kingston Dam is the Town of Kingston.

1 whether there, you know, if you look at the statute,  
2 whether we are even authorized or required to do those  
3 projects.

4 The other thing is the million dollars for a  
5 shade structure, once you approach these dams, I think  
6 your costs are going to be much more significant than  
7 that.

8 And the final point I want to make is yes,  
9 there's liability associated with the dams. Yes, there's  
10 a need there, and that is weighed against keeping the  
11 doors open for DHHS and welfare offices and Caliente  
12 Youth Center and the well service and things like that.  
13 And so there are always those difficult choices to be  
14 made, and they're made using the Board-approved criteria  
15 which maybe that's something that the Board wants to  
16 suggest we go back and look at again, but I just offer  
17 that as perspective and that's all. Thank you.

18 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. The question I  
19 proposed was not a comparison to Hobart. It was a  
20 comparison to Eagle Valley Dam which did get funding for  
21 design and why that one, having the same risk as these  
22 other or two other dams that have the same risk  
23 classification, that did not make it and two of them from  
24 our paperwork are leaking.

25 So then I'd like to go to wheelhouses. This

1 isn't our wheelhouse. And Hobart still is because I can  
2 see how that's the Public Works versus recreational and  
3 agriculture dams. But let's decide are they or are they  
4 not and get rid of this, I guess, financial budget or  
5 this long-term liability that we have.

6 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: I'd say yeah, Brian  
7 Wacker, for the record. You know, Member Walker, asking  
8 like why one of the three made it in there, they are all  
9 classified as high-hazard dams, right. And so that  
10 classification is one thing.

11 When we looked at what project to recommend,  
12 we're also looking at the state or condition of the dam  
13 of the structure and, you know, based just on our due  
14 diligence, so it's our understanding that the project  
15 that we recommended at Eagle Valley was more critical  
16 than the other two, and so that's why that made it in the  
17 recommendation.

18 The other thing we think of is because the  
19 Eagle Valley project is recommended for planning for  
20 design only, we give a little bit of thought of how much  
21 construction will that planning project come back for  
22 next session. And so that \$1 million-dollar project at  
23 Eagle Valley or it's actually \$2.7 million, these dam  
24 projects typically come back \$15, \$20 million dollars in  
25 construction. And so we picked one of them up but not

1 with Roy. I have some concerns about that one like the  
2 points he made and also is that a place for people to  
3 smoke. I'm not against anyone smoking, but it seems like  
4 a million dollars for people to have shade where they  
5 smoke versus putting it towards money towards a dam, one  
6 is clearly higher priority than the other.

7 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
8 record. If I could suggest the direction then when we  
9 ask for a Board motion on the Administrator's  
10 recommendation is just that what projects you would like  
11 removed and what projects you would like added, and then  
12 that would be part of the motion at the end of the  
13 discussion and the Administrator's recommendation.

14 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. In that request  
15 where the two other dams, we could request the design  
16 only portion of it and not any construction but to have  
17 that due diligence look and evaluate what the  
18 significance of the high-hazard classification.

19 COUNSEL STEWART: Yeah. So when we make the  
20 motion, we'll just delineate in what you want added and  
21 what you want taken out. That's all.

22 MEMBER WALKER: Okay.

23 COUNSEL STEWART: And, Brian, you have a note  
24 of those?

25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the

1 all three.

2 And I'd like to say too, yeah, it's you're  
3 kind of looking at why one versus the others. We split  
4 hairs a little bit. It's just weighing what projects  
5 make into the recommendation versus what's not. The  
6 other two are not bad projects, but we felt they were  
7 just not as critical as the one that was recommended for  
8 funding. You know, if the Board wanted to look at  
9 funding those other projects, we could do something like  
10 that. It's not wasted money because they are needed, and  
11 it's a project that does need to get done eventually.

12 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly, for the  
13 record. My thought is that I would like the staff to  
14 look into that because if we don't do it now, we're going  
15 to be here in two years looking at doing one of those  
16 other two of design and then construction another two  
17 years after or four years. If you do it one or two years  
18 from now and another one, two years from now and the cost  
19 is just going to go up. So we need to do it, right.

20 And so, I mean, based on what Roy said and  
21 what I've seen in the packet and what's been explained, I  
22 think those should have higher priority and be looked at  
23 now because again, they're needed and it's just only  
24 going to get more expensive versus some of the other  
25 things which with the shade structures, I tend to agree

1 record. Yes, I'm making a note. Yeah, thank you for  
2 clarifying it would be for design only because the  
3 projects presented to the Board a couple two weeks ago or  
4 three weeks ago had full construction, but we would like  
5 to do them as planning projects if funded.

6 MANAGER MCENTEE: Markus McEntee, for the  
7 record. Just a note on the shade structure. If we  
8 remove the shade structures, it will not put more money  
9 in the State fund. That is a Highway-funded project. So  
10 that million dollars would come from the Highway fund and  
11 not from the State.

12 MEMBER WALKER: And then -- Roy Walker. I  
13 have one other project that it was proposed though back  
14 to the -- well, it's not a slide. It's not on your  
15 recommendation, and it was proposed by POST, and it's the  
16 emergency vehicle track. When I was on the Board many  
17 years ago, this was proposed and refused at least six or  
18 seven times then, so there's a lot of history to this  
19 project. But why this CIP was significant is higher  
20 education, one of the community colleges also went to the  
21 their citizenship, their reach and asked what did you  
22 want, and they proposed this EVOC course. So it's not --  
23 number one, it's not going away. Number two, it's now  
24 multiplied.

25 So when I look at the budget of the EVOC

1 course in Carson City, it's on the right property. The  
2 land is next to the prison which I wouldn't view as high-  
3 value property for the State, so it's in the right place  
4 versus the one I believe it was in Henderson which has  
5 residential surrounding it. When I looked at the budget,  
6 there was an ungodly amount for building a sound wall  
7 around this. So this EVOC to go through design or  
8 redesign, depending on what it did last time, I think  
9 it's a significant project.

10 Our law enforcement is mandated by the State  
11 to do this. In the packet, they have -- they're saying  
12 they have inadequate training. They say that one lawsuit  
13 of deliberate indifference defense, whatever that means,  
14 can cost more than what this is. This has a potential to  
15 save lives, both our troopers. It was indicated that it  
16 would help with their recruitment, and as our population  
17 increases, our law enforcement increases, and the  
18 increase of a high-speed incidents, I believe, requires  
19 proper training.

20 So I would like to know from the  
21 recommendation just a discussion of how come this is not  
22 in here? I believe it's time with the growth that we  
23 have, with the number of officers, with the number of  
24 increase or statistic increase in high-speed chases.

25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: So Brian Wacker, for

1 comment that these appear to be high. And with this high  
2 budgeting process, I look at it as precluding other  
3 projects to be added to the CIP.

4 And I would ask Susan: Is this another  
5 agenda item for a future meeting?

6 COUNSEL STEWART: Yes.

7 MEMBER WALKER: So do I have to request that?

8 COUNSEL STEWART: I'm going to remind you  
9 when we get to that.

10 MEMBER WALKER: Okay. Perfect.

11 COUNSEL STEWART: All right. Thank you, Roy,  
12 or Member Walker.

13 MEMBER WALKER: I believe I think with those  
14 two agenda items, I'm through with my questions.

15 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
16 record. Thank you, Member Walker, for all of that  
17 positive input. There are -- I just have really two  
18 questions. One is slide seven and LEED, dropping LEED.  
19 I assume there will be some anticipated cost savings with  
20 that? And do you have an estimate of what those are or  
21 ballpark of what that would be?

22 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
23 record. I don't. I know that when we talk about  
24 dropping LEED, we're not dropping, you know, back to  
25 nothing. We're replacing the green building with a high

1 the record. Thank you for that comment. And just to  
2 form kind of the basis of that conversation, the project  
3 we're talking about was is project number 7487. It's  
4 advanced planning for an EVOC, meaning Emergency Vehicle  
5 Operations Course here in Carson City, and they're  
6 requesting planning of \$988,000 of State funding for that  
7 project.

8 And yeah, I understand completely what you're  
9 saying with all of that. I know one thing I do want to  
10 say is a little bit hard when we're putting the  
11 recommendations together is, you know, we always say that  
12 we feel strongly about maintenance because we look very  
13 closely at that. It's harder for us to weigh projects  
14 that are for new facilities, new constructions, things of  
15 that nature. So yeah, I mean, I welcome the comment and  
16 direction.

17 COUNSEL STEWART: And Susan Stewart again,  
18 for the record. If the recommendation is to add that  
19 project then that would -- can certainly be part of the  
20 motion approving the Administrator's recommendation.

21 MEMBER WALKER: Are you remembering?

22 COUNSEL STEWART: I am. And Brian is going  
23 to help me on the dam-dam projects.

24 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. My last comment  
25 would be in the budgeting process for these, an overall

1 performing building standard. Hopefully I said that  
2 correctly. And so we are still looking at building good,  
3 efficient buildings that have a good lifecycle payback  
4 for State facilities.

5 And so we're really it's more of a name  
6 change to a different just looking at a little bit  
7 different pulling back the name "green," which isn't  
8 aligned with any industry standards, but the high  
9 performance building really it's more a nomenclature that  
10 has some standards behind it that we want to move  
11 towards. And it's more in line with what we're already  
12 doing.

13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Well, I can't imagine  
14 there aren't some cost savings also. I would hope there  
15 are because they typically cost more.

16 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
17 record. Yeah, going to a LEED silver -- and to be clear,  
18 we haven't really -- we don't currently certify. We  
19 don't do the certification for the LEEDs, but if you're  
20 following down that process, there should be some cost  
21 savings because it lets us really take our own path on  
22 these buildings.

23 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you. The other  
24 question I have is there's like a whole -- and I didn't  
25 write the slide number down, but all of the pre-planning

1 projects.  
2 COUNSEL STEWART: I think it's 12.  
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I think it's right in  
4 front of me. Yeah. So slide 12. So there are a lot of  
5 pre-planning projects there. And I have two questions.  
6 Member Hand, for the record. I apologize.  
7 Two questions around pre-planning. One is --  
8 and I don't know if you -- off the top of my head it will  
9 probably be challenging, but there are a lot of  
10 pre-planning projects. And I wonder what the or I  
11 question what the, if you will, success or the  
12 followthrough on pre-planning projects is in terms of  
13 percentage. Is it 80 percent of them ultimately go to  
14 construction or 50 percent? Because there's a lot of  
15 pre-planning projects.  
16 And the other thing with preplanning rather  
17 than going and doing work is we just talked about cost  
18 escalation, right, and inflation. And it just so I've  
19 got sort of two questions in one. What is the, I guess,  
20 the criteria for pre-planning and how common is it that  
21 those projects ultimately move forward? Is there a  
22 process or is it just around pre-planning criteria,  
23 decision-making process?  
24 COUNSEL STEWART: Go ahead.  
25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the

1 reserve for this large project. So we do look at on that  
2 dollar amount and we follow that fairly closely -- not  
3 always. It depends on the project. We will also look at  
4 doing a planning project on a small project if we're just  
5 unsure of what the construction ask needs to be so we  
6 don't get it wrong. And so sometimes it's better to slow  
7 down or walk first before you run on a project.  
8 And then I think the last thing was, you  
9 know, what percentage of these projects get funded. I  
10 wish I had that. It would be nice to have a stat in  
11 front of me right now, but the honest answer is is that  
12 it's most of these projects really do get funded. And  
13 for one, one of the Board criteria is continuation  
14 projects we take seriously. And so once it goes into  
15 planning next session, we really do want to go build the  
16 project. It's not a hundred percent though.  
17 There are projects that don't get picked up  
18 the next time through, but there's a reason that it's not  
19 picked up. There's usually a fatal flaw or a critical  
20 issue that doesn't let us move forward with the project.  
21 We don't like to spend money on planning and you put it  
22 in the drawer. It's not fun, but it does happen. So  
23 it's probably honestly an 80, 90 percent sort of thing.  
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I'll ask at the end if we  
25 figure out what that number really is. Member Hand

1 record. And so yeah, thank you for the question, Member  
2 Hand. I think there is a criteria. There is a statutory  
3 basis for when we do advanced planning projects, and  
4 basically what it says, I believe it's NRS, but it's 341  
5 is where it comes from. And it basically says that any  
6 project that is over \$10 million, our recommendation  
7 should be for planning where practicable. It uses the  
8 board "practicable". We don't have to, but we should do  
9 it as an advanced planning project.  
10 I think I really actually do like that little  
11 sentence in the statute because it is good wisdom meaning  
12 when you think through the timing of what these projects,  
13 you know, go through before they are constructed and we  
14 live on a two-year cycle in the CIPs for these large  
15 projects where we do them as planning upfront, it takes  
16 us the better part or two years to get ready for  
17 construction anyway. And so when you talk about future  
18 escalations and things of that nature, it doesn't really  
19 slow a project down to go through planning depending on  
20 the project. And so by doing planning, it lets us align  
21 the budget and work directly for the next CIP ask.  
22 It also keeps us from assigning dollars to  
23 that project in the current CIP where we're not going to  
24 need the funds until two years from now anyway so it lets  
25 us do other projects instead of holding these funds in

1 again. Thank you for the explanation.  
2 And when I think back to the presentations,  
3 you know, this is a pre-planning project or this has been  
4 on the books, and it was blah, blah, blah. And Roy just  
5 brought up POST, and so I was thinking about that driving  
6 here today, you know, because there was a whole slide on  
7 pre-planning projects. Are we using that money wisely?  
8 And is it creating -- opening the door for these huge  
9 increases in costs which we heard during our  
10 presentations that, you know, from many folks that two  
11 bienniums ago was going to be this much and now it's  
12 this. So again, I'll ask for that when we have a motion.  
13 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
14 record. I do want to add so the statute says I think  
15 when the project is in excess of \$10 million dollars that  
16 you design in one biennium and construct in another. I'm  
17 going to add to Roy's list of things that we discussed in  
18 the future is: Does that make sense?  
19 The other thing is the project was requested  
20 a session ago, and there are too many projects chasing  
21 too few dollars. And so, you know, that's part of the  
22 reality that we face. The other thing is is that by  
23 doing the advanced planning, we do get a project in the  
24 queue. And so there is then if you want to call it  
25 pressure, incentive to get the project done. But at

1 least you've got it in the queue so that there's an  
2 investment that's been made, and like I said, an  
3 investment to finish what we started. So just piggy-back  
4 on what Brian had said. Thank you.

5 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like a  
6 little discussion on the biggest bang for our State  
7 dollars, and where that would refer to is the National  
8 Guard. Within the National Guard's ask, there's a  
9 project number 25378, and it's a storm system to correct  
10 some storm damage. And if the project stays under  
11 \$400,000, it's 100 percent federally funded. So my  
12 question would be let's keep or I guess my answer would  
13 be let's keep the project under \$400,000 and do a portion  
14 of it with other funding.

15 I have some other questions along the same  
16 lines. Project number 25332 is \$2.61 federal funded to  
17 one of our State dollars.

18 Project number 25380 is \$5 federal dollars to  
19 our one State dollar.

20 Project 25336 is \$4.7 federal dollars to our  
21 \$1, and there's a whole group in between. So why is not  
22 the recommendation to do \$400,000 worth of storm drain  
23 work that is on the federal dime? We would have to pay  
24 for our staff for that.

25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the

1 be able to bring their own money. And so I just kind of  
2 throw that out there as a foundation for, you know, how  
3 some of these decisions are made.

4 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I agree with  
5 that wholeheartedly that that dollar that the State  
6 spends is a dollar taken away from other projects. The  
7 specifics was I see the 100 percent funding. We could  
8 put that in at minimum cost to us. But if that project  
9 is withdrawn by the client, it's withdrawn by the client.  
10 I don't believe I have any more questions.

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly. I've got a  
12 couple of questions, if I may. So I saw a couple I guess  
13 one question looks like a subsection of project 505 for  
14 paving at the DMV in Reno \$800,000, and I know \$800,000  
15 in the scheme of \$1.2 billion is not a lot, but my  
16 question is that South Reno DMV is almost brand new. I'm  
17 wondering why there's already \$800 grand in paving  
18 required. That's kind of specific, but that jumped out  
19 at me.

20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
21 record. I'll attempt to answer that. So the DMV South  
22 Reno DMV is already, I believe, five years old. Is that  
23 correct? I got a nod, so that means that is correct.  
24 And so in the pavement, in the maintenance world, it's  
25 time to do pavement maintenance on that facility. So

1 record. So that project, particularly 25378, that was --  
2 we closed that project at the agency request after the  
3 agency presentations, so I think they had a funding  
4 issue. So that project was closed, and so they asked  
5 that we don't move forward with that particular project.

6 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. Perfect  
7 response. Now the five-to-one project.

8 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
9 record. I just want to jump in here and just frame  
10 preliminary kind of a foundational issue. A couple  
11 sessions ago, the Board had a discussion about how we  
12 decide to select CIP projects, and one of the things that  
13 came up was some type of equanimity or equality or  
14 something like that.

15 And one of the challenges is is that if we  
16 consider again too many projects chasing too few dollars,  
17 if we consider the federal dollars that the Guard brings,  
18 that means other projects for State agencies that can  
19 never bring money are not going to be selected. And so  
20 the Guard, as I -- and Brian can speak more to this. I  
21 think there are six of their projects in there, and so it  
22 really is it's not like oh, we don't want that money. It  
23 is there is staff time associated with that. There is  
24 State expenses associated with that. And it will be done  
25 at the expense of another agency's needs that will never

1 we'll look to do that on new pavements in the stated  
2 inventory when they're about that age. It's not a  
3 reconstruction. It's just a maintenance activity, and  
4 that's what those are. That's what that project is  
5 looking at.

6 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thanks. And then on  
7 project 507, while we're back there, again, it looked  
8 like it made perhaps a subset, but as I see \$3.2 million  
9 dollars from the Highway Fund for maintenance on  
10 elevators. So I'm just wondering, you know, why is that  
11 -- I guess the question is why is that Highway funding?  
12 In my mind, maintenance of elevators doesn't register as  
13 Highway funds in my mind.

14 COUNSEL STEWART: It's DMV.

15 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
16 record. So it's Highway funds because it's at a DMV, so  
17 it's at a Highway-funded facility is why Highway funds.

18 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thanks. I'll go  
19 through a couple other projects here. It was project  
20 three for the Department of Health and Human Services.  
21 Elevator hoist way at the Northern Nevada Mental Health  
22 facility. And I don't have the description in front of  
23 me, but as I recall, folks can't get to the second level  
24 and sometimes people have to -- I think they said  
25 manually be moved to the second floor. In my mind, that



Page 49

1 seems to fit under kind of ADA and the number-one bullet  
2 point. So the question is: That one is on the not  
3 recommended list. Wondering how that one got, I guess  
4 how it was decided not to do that one. That one seemed  
5 pretty critical to me.  
6 COUNSEL STEWART: Do you have a project  
7 number? Susan Stewart, for the record.  
8 MEMBER MANNELLY: It was number three on  
9 DHHS. Let me see. 7360. Is that a project number?  
10 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah.  
11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Does not have an elevator  
12 to provide ADA accessibility to the second floor. An  
13 employee with disabilities cannot be stationed on the  
14 second floor due to lack of accessibility, and at times,  
15 a patient needs to occupy a room on the second floor and  
16 that patient needs to be transported manually.  
17 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
18 record. Would that have been captured in the ADA  
19 statewide?  
20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
21 record. It could have been. We also put together a  
22 statewide elevator program, and so it didn't fall into  
23 either of those.  
24 I think the honest answer to that question,  
25 Member Mannelly, is it was not something in our due

Page 50

1 diligence looking at that project that we thought it rose  
2 to the level that it needed to get to be funded. It's a  
3 \$6.2 million-dollar project that talks about ADA  
4 accessibility to the second floor, which is a great way  
5 to phrase that as a justification. But, you know, ADA,  
6 you know, accessibility does not mean you have to have  
7 accessibility onto a second floor. We can accommodate  
8 them in another location or the same thing with a  
9 patient. We could accommodate them without the elevator.  
10 And so I think that was part of the thinking behind that  
11 is \$6.2 million dollars needed for that project, we can  
12 accommodate them in another fashion.  
13 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly, for the  
14 record. I want to make sure we're looking at the same  
15 one because the one I'm looking at is \$2.7 million.  
16 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Oh. I might be in the  
17 wrong one.  
18 MEMBER MANNELLY: And honestly, I don't know  
19 what this description means: At times, a patient needs  
20 to occupy a room. Needs to occupy a room on the second  
21 floor, and that patient needs to be transported manually.  
22 I don't know what that means. I don't know if that means  
23 someone picks them up and carries them up the stairs.  
24 I'm not sure, but that's what the description says. And  
25 it says it was requested last CIP too, so it seems like

Page 51

1 it's going to be a recurring one.  
2 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
3 record. Phil, could you give me that number again?  
4 MEMBER MANNELLY: 7360.  
5 COUNSEL STEWART: Page 41.  
6 MEMBER MANNELLY: Page 41 so 882 on our prior  
7 packet.  
8 CHAIRPERSON HAND: 41.  
9 COUNSEL STEWART: 41.  
10 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Oh, okay.  
11 MEMBER MANNELLY: And I'll just add, you  
12 know, DHHS, you know, identified it as number three.  
13 Other projects from DHHS that are listed lower, at least  
14 in their mind, were approved as far as I can tell. And,  
15 you know, to Susan Stewart's point before, I can take a  
16 note down to add that to a motion, but I guess it's just  
17 that one seemed to stand out.  
18 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: I walked down here  
19 with a different book.  
20 MEMBER MANNELLY: Sorry.  
21 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
22 record. The book I walked down here with was my early  
23 July book. So what was the question again?  
24 MEMBER MANNELLY: I guess --  
25 COUNSEL STEWART: Why wasn't it recommended?

Page 52

1 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah. Brian Wacker,  
2 for the record. I still stand by why I was saying why it  
3 wasn't recommended just based on our due diligence, but  
4 it's a \$2.7 million-dollar project. It's not a \$6  
5 million-dollar project. We could look at including that  
6 in the recommendation to the Board if you'd like.  
7 MEMBER MANNELLY: Yeah, I would like that.  
8 That one seems important to me and to fit, you know, the  
9 number one criteria.  
10 So I've got a separate question if we're done  
11 on that topic. On a couple of the NSHE projects, I think  
12 it was Great Basin College and College of Southern  
13 Nevada, during their presentations, both generally said  
14 okay. If we don't start construction, we're going to  
15 lose the one patent or we're going to lose our land. And  
16 during the past meeting, I believe I asked both of the  
17 representatives, you know, is there a backup plan or a  
18 contingency plan? And I'm not sure that there was.  
19 So then I guess the question in my mind is  
20 what role does the State Public Works Board play in  
21 trying to ensure that these institutions don't lose their  
22 land, I guess, or stated another way, is it incumbent  
23 upon us to ensure that they don't lose the land or, you  
24 know, none of those projects are recommended on this  
25 cycle, so are they going to lose their land and what's

1 the impact? And I guess is that our concern or is that  
2 something, you know, they need to deal with?  
3 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
4 record. That is four criteria that's approved by the  
5 Board as far as what we consider when we evaluate a  
6 project. So I have as a future agenda item to take a  
7 look at that.  
8 I do know UNLV had some limitations on  
9 property ownership around their campus and they do manage  
10 that internally to protect those rights, but that is not  
11 something that we would take into consideration. The  
12 other question I have is was that NSHE's number one  
13 recommended project?  
14 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah. Brian Wacker,  
15 for the record. It was not. And that's actually a  
16 really good point too. When we look at the NSHE and  
17 actually just kind of overall, you know, those are often  
18 new construction projects. And how do we weigh those?  
19 Historically, we look at the NSHE rankings on  
20 those projects. We follow those fairly closely from top  
21 to bottom. So those projects where they're worried about  
22 losing land was not at the top of their list. It wasn't  
23 a great concern for them either at least as presented in  
24 that list. I'm not saying it's not a concern.  
25 I do want to say too, some of those projects

1 like most of those NSHE projects are advanced planning  
2 requests only. Those could be reduced even further if we  
3 chose to where oftentimes -- well, what we did was we  
4 followed what the agency asked for. They asked for  
5 design of the whole facility. And that fits that  
6 statutory let's do planning first. You could fund a  
7 programming or a schematic design. You could fund  
8 something smaller just to kind of lump something along if  
9 you chose. So there are some avenues out there that we  
10 could take.  
11 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
12 record. I would take my lead from NSHE and how they  
13 prioritize that project which was why they didn't.  
14 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay.  
15 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah.  
16 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
17 record. Again, when I sat on the NSHE side of the table,  
18 for an example, Phil, we had the northwest campus. The  
19 agreement we had with the BLM is as long as we show some  
20 kind of development within a time period that was agreed  
21 by both parties, everybody was satisfied.  
22 And for that particular project, as long as  
23 we showed that we were doing master planning, we had put  
24 a sign up on the property to secure fencing, that would  
25 suffice.

1 is BLM leasehold for many of those. There are avenues  
2 that they can take to extend the timing on those. And  
3 oftentimes -- I don't want to speak in absolutes because  
4 I don't know what the leasehold agreement says, but  
5 oftentimes, there are avenues to modify or change that as  
6 long as substantive action has been taken to develop the  
7 property. So it's not always a doom and gloom, although  
8 when you're looking for justification, it's advantageous  
9 to say yes, you've got to do it. But it's not always so.  
10 MEMBER MANNELLY: Yeah. And Phil Mannelly  
11 again, for the record. I guess it leads to a follow-up.  
12 Is there anything that we can do such as at this point,  
13 approving a smaller project or building a road or some  
14 infrastructure or something less than a whole new  
15 building to satisfy the leasehold interest or whatever  
16 may be there to ensure that they keep the land or are we  
17 kind of stuck with what they present us and that's all  
18 that we can do and we can't say well, you know what? We  
19 have, you know, a couple million not the whole hundred  
20 million dollars or whatever the project may be, but we  
21 have a couple of million dollars that we can provide you  
22 to do some construction or again, are we constrained to  
23 kind of what's presented to us?  
24 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
25 record. I mean, we could always change what a project is

1 I want to agree with Brian Wacker when he  
2 said that the majority of the projects that we get from  
3 NSHE, they are pretty big projects, but we certainly  
4 would entertain doing some advanced planning for them or  
5 even a lesser project if that would help them. But to my  
6 knowledge, they have not approached us. And when I sat  
7 on that side of the table, we did not go to the State  
8 Public Works Board for us to secure that land. We knew  
9 that was our responsibility and that was our agreement  
10 with the BLM.  
11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thank you.  
12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
13 record. Do we have any more questions from I guess for  
14 Brian before we ask for a motion?  
15 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
16 record. Before we take a motion, that would end my  
17 presentation. I appreciate Brian doing all of the heavy  
18 lifting. Thank you. Thank you, Board, for letting me  
19 present my recommendations.  
20 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
21 record. Before we ask for a motion, I would ask for a  
22 couple of housekeeping items.  
23 Member Walker, do you have a project name or  
24 Brian, do you have a project name of the dam projects so  
25 that I can suggest a motion?

1 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. The first is  
2 project number ID 23140: Kingston Reservoir.  
3 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. Hold on. I'm just  
4 going to write down the name. Kingston.  
5 MEMBER WALKER: Reservoir.  
6 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. Because we have  
7 various numbers.  
8 MEMBER WALKER: And the second is the Illipah  
9 Reservoir. And the third would be the -- dams only --  
10 would be the EVOC course in Carson.  
11 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay.  
12 MEMBER WALKER: I guess the fourth would be  
13 the elevator in Reno.  
14 COUNSEL STEWART: Do we have a project name  
15 for that?  
16 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yes.  
17 COUNSEL STEWART: NNAMHS. And then I'm also  
18 sensing from the Board that there's an interest in  
19 removing the DMV shade structure.  
20 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. In the removing,  
21 I was trying to replace dollar volumes, but the way that  
22 it's funded through the federal or through the Highway  
23 department, I would not have that in my motion.  
24 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay.  
25 MEMBER WALKER: It would be acceptance upon

1 that.  
2 COUNSEL STEWART: All right. So,  
3 Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I'd like to propose a  
4 motion.  
5 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairman Hand, for the  
6 record. Ms. Stewart, you have my permission.  
7 COUNSEL STEWART: Okay. Stewart Stewart, for  
8 the record. The motion is that the Board approve the  
9 Administrator's recommendation as presented with the  
10 ability for the Public Works Division to make technical  
11 adjustments to include, but not limited to typos,  
12 arithmetic errors, slight funding math adjustments, that  
13 it be presented to the governor as the Board's official  
14 recommendation with the following additions: Building  
15 one elevator installation at Northern Nevada Adult Mental  
16 Health Services. Number two: Advanced planning,  
17 Northern Nevada Emergency Vehicle Operations Course.  
18 Number three: Kingston Canyon Dam rehabilitation at  
19 Kingston Canyon Campground, and number 4: Illipah Creek  
20 Dam rehabilitation.  
21 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like to  
22 second and so move.  
23 COUNSEL STEWART: So move. Yeah. And then  
24 we need a second.  
25 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Second. Member Hand, for

1 the record. Second.  
2 MEMBER MANNELLY: I guess before we move on  
3 the agenda item not specifically on the motion, I just  
4 want to general comment that we kind of switched topics,  
5 but to second Chair Hand's comment on the advanced  
6 planning, again just a general comment before we move  
7 agenda items. I second Member Hand's thoughts on the  
8 advanced planning, and I would like to see some of those  
9 stats. And also I think I'd like to perhaps see a little  
10 more -- depending on what the stats are -- analysis of  
11 the viability of the project before we're investing funds  
12 in advanced planning, you know.  
13 For example, I know the public safety  
14 building is now not on the recommended projects, but  
15 that's already millions of dollars have been spent on  
16 advanced planning for that and, you know, there was one  
17 up there for \$10 million dollars for advanced planning on  
18 the office building. So it's a lot of money to be  
19 putting towards advanced planning. So I just think it's  
20 incumbent to understand the viability and likelihood of  
21 approval before we start investing the dollars.  
22 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
23 record. We could add to the later agenda item.  
24 COUNSEL STEWART: Yes. Yes.  
25 CHAIRPERSON HAND: And with that, is there

1 any other discussion?  
2 COUNSEL STEWART: On the motion?  
3 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Can I do a  
4 clarification? Brian Wacker, for the record. Just to  
5 clarify, the Kingston Dam project and the Illipah Dam  
6 project would be for advanced planning only in that  
7 motion, so I just wanted to clarify.  
8 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
9 record. Thank you for the clarification, Brian. If  
10 there's no further discussion, then all in favor. Please  
11 say aye or raise your hand down south or make sure we can  
12 hear you.  
13 THE BOARD: Aye.  
14 COUNSEL STEWART: All right. I see Tito's  
15 hand in the air.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Any opposed? Then with  
17 that, we've passed the motion. And again, thank you all  
18 for the Board preparing to come here and ask the  
19 questions that you did, and thank you to the Public Works  
20 staff for being well prepared and able to respond to the  
21 questions.  
22 And with that, next item on our agenda is  
23 Item 5, and it's for possible action: Discussion and  
24 possible action of the Board's letter to the Governor  
25 regarding the State's deferred maintenance needs.

Page 61

1 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the  
2 record. I'm just going to set the table here and then  
3 I'll let Brian and Wil take over.  
4 Several years ago, the Board was very  
5 concerned that the shiny stuff was getting attention and  
6 the maintenance needs of the State's building inventory  
7 was not being addressed. And so in 2016, at the Board's  
8 request, staff put together a letter and sent it to the  
9 Governor, Governor Sandoval at the time, asking that the  
10 Governor recommend that deferred maintenance projects be  
11 approved at a certain dollar value.  
12 So what you have here today is a request to  
13 do that again, and you have attached as Exhibit A is a  
14 draft of the letter that staff has put together to send  
15 to Governor Lombardo. And then as Exhibit B is the prior  
16 correspondence that has been sent from the Board to the  
17 Governor regarding prior CIPs. And you can see prior  
18 actions. The Board's been taking this action since 2016.  
19 And with that, I will turn it over to Brian and Wil.  
20 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
21 record. Do we have any questions about the letter that  
22 we drafted thus far?  
23 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. When I read the  
24 letter, I came away with the impression that this was all  
25 our deferred maintenance within the State. And from my

Page 62

1 prior conversation, we don't have deferred maintenance on  
2 all of the other divisions defined.  
3 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the  
4 record. This is for the entire state of the products  
5 that would be inside the CIP, so it does not include NDOT  
6 or NSHE would be the two exclusions on that. So these  
7 numbers are inclusive of the entire state.  
8 What we don't have is we don't have  
9 management of all state agencies inside of Public Works.  
10 Buildings and Grounds does only Buildings and Grounds  
11 inside of Public Works so, you know, Corrections, DHHS  
12 are responsible for their own maintenance programs.  
13 MEMBER WALKER: Okay.  
14 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
15 record. Are there any other questions? And I think I  
16 asked the question that was sort of important to me  
17 earlier, and I apologize for getting that out of sequence  
18 making Susan's life difficult.  
19 COUNSEL STEWART: No, that's okay.  
20 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Make me behave. But I  
21 think this is really an important issue. Every CIP, we  
22 see these huge maintenance dollars, and Tito, Member  
23 Tiberti has been awfully quiet today, but he really  
24 championed this in 2016 and he really pushed for it. And  
25 he was absolutely right. I mean, when you look at what

Page 63

1 was going on, it was absolutely right for doing that.  
2 And so thank you, Tito, for doing that.  
3 And I don't have any additional comments  
4 other than I'd like to have this in the subsequent agenda  
5 item. And I have one comment on the letter. The  
6 signature block has a bunch of letters by my name. I'd  
7 ask that that all be removed.  
8 COUNSEL STEWART: They're your letters.  
9 Okay. All right. We do need a motion.  
10 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Just looking around to  
11 make sure everybody is -- Phil Mannelly, for the record.  
12 I'd make a motion to approve the letter with the change  
13 on Chairperson Hand's signature block as requested.  
14 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I will second  
15 the motion.  
16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the  
17 record. Do we have any discussion? Any further  
18 discussion? If not, then all in favor, if you'd please  
19 raise your hand or say aye.  
20 THE BOARD: Aye.  
21 CHAIR HAND: Seeing none that weren't up,  
22 none opposed, with that, the motion carries. Thank you.  
23 The next item on our agenda for discussion is  
24 Board comment and discussion. So we've had a lot of  
25 discussion along the way getting here. I think we have

Page 64

1 sort of a list of items that maybe we could just review  
2 to make sure that we captured everything and there may be  
3 some other things that we want to add. And so there's  
4 agenda, you know, future agenda items and then we've got  
5 Board comments on any agenda item, items to be included  
6 in any future agendas and then review and action items on  
7 State Public Works.  
8 COUNSEL STEWART: If I may. Susan Stewart,  
9 for the record. I have a list. Well, I have hen  
10 scratching, but I'm going to make a list. And then if  
11 you can tell me what I'm missing and certainly, you all  
12 know how to get ahold of me and so we can add things.  
13 I have stats on advanced planning, I have  
14 cost estimates, how Public Works Division puts together  
15 their cost estimates on their projects, I have -- and  
16 this is my own list -- is when we talk about advanced  
17 planning, there may be delays, additional costs  
18 associated with that, we have a statute. Does that mean  
19 we should look at a bill draft request to address that?  
20 I have maintenance inventory on my list. I have looked  
21 to NDOT asset management as a possible resource. I have  
22 further discussion on deferred maintenance and how we're  
23 tracking that success versus we can do better. That's my  
24 list.  
25 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Anybody have anything they

1 want to add to that list?  
 2 COUNSEL STEWART: And Susan Stewart, for the  
 3 record. We can certainly, when we agendize something  
 4 like this, we can certainly make it broad. We can call  
 5 it development of the CIP tracking State assets. And so  
 6 within those umbrellas, kind of the sky is the limit as  
 7 far as future discussions, but yeah. Anything I missed?  
 8 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. That was my  
 9 list.  
 10 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Anybody have anything else  
 11 they'd like to add? We had discussed previously -- and I  
 12 don't know where this fits in the future Board agenda or  
 13 not, but we had discussed doing some site visits. And  
 14 there had been discussion about rotating the meetings  
 15 back and forth between the north and the south. And I  
 16 guess I would ask sort of what the status of that is and  
 17 if we could include those topics on the agenda even if we  
 18 don't necessarily initiate them in the next meet meeting.  
 19 COUNSEL STEWART: So noted, and it will be  
 20 addressed.  
 21 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All right. If we don't  
 22 have any other questions, we have a motion. Actually,  
 23 this is for discussion. We've got public comment coming  
 24 up here, right? The next item on our agenda is public  
 25 comment. Do we have anyone for public comment in the

1 else has any comments they'd like to make.  
 2 MEMBER WALKER: I would like to echo on your  
 3 comments. And I was very pleased to see within the CIP  
 4 the purchase of the two new buildings that came in at  
 5 around \$300 and \$370 a square-foot. I think that's just  
 6 outstanding philosophy to move the State forward in a  
 7 change from trying to build everything.  
 8 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I'm out of agenda. That  
 9 means we're ready to wrap it up. May we have a motion to  
 10 adjourn?  
 11 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I'd make a  
 12 motion to adjourn the meeting.  
 13 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly. I'd second  
 14 that.  
 15 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Any discussion? All in  
 16 favor?  
 17 THE BOARD: Aye.  
 18 (The meeting concluded at 10:50 a.m.)  
 19 -o0o-  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

1 south?  
 2 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the  
 3 record. We have no one down south.  
 4 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Doesn't look like we have  
 5 any here. Do we have any on the phone?  
 6 COUNSEL STEWART: Not to my knowledge. No.  
 7 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All right. Then if we  
 8 don't have any public comment, then I've run out of  
 9 agenda.  
 10 I guess in wrapping up, again, I want to  
 11 thank everybody at the table in both parts of Nevada  
 12 today for all of the work that goes into the CIP. It is  
 13 a huge lift. And I know we, as members that aren't in  
 14 the middle of it every day, that have some exposure  
 15 background to the stuff that you all are doing, we come  
 16 with lots of questions, and those questions aren't  
 17 directed at anybody specifically. They're really  
 18 directed at trying to get the best value for the  
 19 taxpayers. And so again, anything we can do to help  
 20 contribute to that in the process.  
 21 We appreciate what everybody does and I  
 22 certainly do, and I suspect that the other members do as  
 23 well. And again, I would just like to thank you all for  
 24 all of your hard work. Brian, you always have all of the  
 25 right answers. Wil, don't let him move. And if anybody

1 STATE OF NEVADA, )  
 2 )  
 3 CARSON CITY. )  
 4  
 5  
 6 I, NICOLE J. HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the  
 7 State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby  
 8 Certify:  
 9  
 10 That on the 17th day of September, 2024, I was  
 11 present at said workshop for the purpose of reporting, in  
 12 verbatim stenotype notes within-entitled public  
 13 workshop;  
 14  
 15 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1  
 16 through 67, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct  
 17 transcription of my stenotype notes of said public  
 18 workshop.  
 19  
 20 Dated at Reno, Nevada, this 23rd day of September,  
 21 2024.  
 22  
 23 NICOLE J. HANSEN, NV CCR #446  
 24  
 25