

Do Not Copy

In The Matter Of:
*PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING
TELECONFERENCED/LIVE STREAMED OPEN MEETING*

December 9, 2022

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

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

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

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

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

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2022, A.M. SESSION
2 -o0o-
3
4 CHAIRPERSON HAND: This is the time and the place
5 of the State Public Works board meeting. It's February -- I'm
6 sorry, February -- it's Friday, December 9th at 10:02. And
7 this is Chairperson Hand for the record. I apologize for not
8 starting that way. And roll -- roll call.
9 MR. LEFEVRE: Okay. Roll call.
10 Chairman Hand.
11 (Short off the record discussion.)
12 MS. WOODRUM: So for roll call, if people
13 could -- this Homa Woodrum. If you could make sure you start
14 with your name before indicating that you are present.
15 MS. STEWART: Yep.
16 MS. WOODRUM: Thank you.
17 MS. STEWART: How is the volume?
18 MR. WACKER: Yeah, that's as loud as we can get
19 it.
20 MR. LEFEVRE: All right. Let's begin roll call
21 again.
22 Kent Lefevre for the record.
23 Chairman Adam Hand.
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Adam Hand present.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 for the agency.

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the
4 record. The next agenda item is staff presentation on CIP
5 criteria revisions which includes diversity, equity and
6 inclusion as well. Sustainability.

7 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I'll
8 be speaking on this subject. We have some handouts, some
9 materials in our packet that I will go over in depth.

10 Susan is going to talk about diversity, equity,
11 and inclusions, and then Brian Wacker, who is here as our
12 chief of planning, will talk about sustainability.

13 MS. STEWART: Thank you. For the record, Susan
14 Stewart. I think what might be helpful is if I take a minute
15 to orient the Board as far as the information you have in your
16 packet.

17 You'll see in discussion there is an Item
18 Number 1, diversity, equity, and inclusion. There is an
19 overview. A single memo been provided.

20 Then Item Number 2, State Public Works Division
21 current practices. And if you look at that Attachment 2,
22 there's a memo there where we'll talk about current practices,
23 which is our green building standards, net zero preliminary
24 design analysis, and then there's a bill draft request. And

1 And so you'll see the definition there. And I
2 did some research on other states, is there anyone that is
3 implementing this type of program in connection with
4 implementation of their capital improvement programs.

5 And what I came across was DEI is typically
6 associated with hiring practices where you're attempting to
7 address historically underrepresented folks so that you have a
8 more diverse team. It's also the way I -- my research showed
9 it came up was in an organization these are -- they are kind
10 of a foundation, other ethical considerations and how they
11 treat members of their team.

12 So having done that preliminary review, we kind
13 of -- you know, Brian Wacker and Kent and I had several
14 discussions on this and looked at how does that framework fit
15 into the work that the State Public Works division project
16 managers do, and what we came up with was it seemed a little
17 bit outside of their lane, that they wouldn't necessarily have
18 the expertise on a formal basis to review what is the program
19 that the agency is supporting and asking for construction
20 associated with that program.

21 So we thought that went a little bit beyond what
22 the engineers and architects are looking at when they're
23 thinking about a building and structure and mechanical
24 systems.

1 for each of those topics you'll see an associated attachment
2 included with some further backup on each one of those
3 packets. Or each one of those subjects, excuse me.

4 And then the last Item Number 3 is we're going to
5 be talking about AB160 which is legislation regarding window
6 replacements and there are two attachments to that. One is a
7 copy of the bill and then another is a copy of window
8 replacement projects. And we'll dive into each one of those,
9 but I thought an overview of what you have in front of you
10 might be helpful.

11 So the first -- what I'm going to talk about
12 first is we had a request from the Board to take a look at our
13 CIP criteria and how we assess projects coming from -- I'm
14 sorry, I was hearing some very weird background noise. I'm
15 glad it wasn't just me.

16 So okay. So we had a request from the Board to
17 take a look at our criteria and one of the requests included
18 some way to incorporate an analysis or consideration of
19 diversity, equity, and inclusion.

20 And so you'll see the memo that we put together,
21 and it begins with the definition of diversity, equity, and
22 inclusion, because I -- for me I thought it was helpful to
23 really, you know, let's be clear about what we're talking
24 about.

1 So now, we do have a couple programs that we
2 implement that are related to veterans. We also have a small
3 business -- disadvantaged small business program that we
4 implement. Those are the current programs that we implement,
5 but they're unrelated to the CIP.

6 So now, sticking with the formal consideration,
7 we looked at what Utah does. And Utah, they make sure that
8 each state agency gets 1.1 percent of their buildings' value
9 in the Utah CIP.

10 And Brian Wacker can speak to this a little bit
11 more if he would like to, but he understands that in Utah they
12 manage all of the university projects within their CIP so
13 there's a lot of angst, if you will, to make sure everybody's
14 getting their fair share.

15 So when we think about doing 1.1 percent of the
16 total value of the buildings, what we see is our heavy
17 hitters, Corrections, DHSS, they've got the most square
18 footage so they're still going to get the most of the project.
19 So we felt like that really wasn't -- you know, museums are
20 still going to be at the bottom of the list using that
21 criteria.

22 So which moves into our informal implementation
23 of DEI as criteria. And there is nothing formal, but I think
24 in the Board's experience they've seen Kent and other

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

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

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

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

1 was hiring and admissions. And so I didn't see anything on --
2 on a state level where a -- including California -- where the
3 selection of projects for recommendation in the capital
4 improvement program included a DEI analysis.

5 That said, you just listed some entities and if
6 you feel that I missed something, please send me the
7 information and I will report back to the Board on additional
8 information that you have. Hundred percent.

9 MEMBER LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis for the record.
10 I'll definitely give you some recommendations. I know that
11 Georgia's probably doing quite well in leading that force.
12 I've looked at the -- from airport, different things that
13 they're doing in the state, and that might be one place where
14 we can start, as well as Florida. So I'll send that list to
15 you.

16 MS. STEWART: Thank you. Susan Stewart for the
17 record. Thank you very much. And then just one more thing.
18 Piggybacking on what Chairman Hand said, there -- perhaps
19 there is a way to incorporate something into the CIP criteria
20 for museums when they've asked for the same project five times
21 in a row. Maybe the third time is the charm.

22 MEMBER FREED: You get a couple extra.

23 MS. STEWART: That's right. So maybe there's
24 room for more investigation. And certainly I'm outside of my

1 lane suggesting this, but when you mention what you're trying
2 to address, there may be another way to get there. So thank
3 you.

4 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I
5 just have another comment on this too. One of the sister
6 states that we look to a lot right now is Utah because their
7 CIP is about the same size as ours.

8 Their facilities maintenance group is about the
9 same size as ours. They're very much like a sister as far as
10 scale, and they face all of the same problems with the same,
11 you know, kind of demographic that we've got. So it's a good
12 place to, you know, bounce things off.

13 We've had conversations with the Utah department
14 of facilities management several times in the past and they're
15 turning out to be pretty good partners for just processes that
16 we both face, and they do it a different way and we learn from
17 that so...

18 MEMBER LEWIS: Kent, I look forward to hopefully
19 expanding upon that. I'm not sure that Utah is more
20 representative as far as diversity inclusion, but I can look
21 at our own home court. Keep in mind that it was not until the
22 year 2017 that our board became more diverse. And our
23 history.

24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the

1 record.

2 Again I want to thank you for what you all did,
3 and I'm glad we're having a conversation that there will be
4 some follow up.

5 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
6 will -- we can certainly talk about this later in the agenda,
7 but I will make sure that I make a note that we will circle
8 back and have further discussion on this on our next meeting.

9 Okay. So the next memo in Attachment 2, and this
10 is the -- this memo addresses sustainability, our current
11 practices, net zero preliminary design analysis on a couple
12 projects in the bill draft request. And we're going to do a
13 little tag teaming on this, but I think Brian was going to
14 start on this one.

15 MR. WACKER: Thank you. Okay. Brian Wacker for
16 the record. Thank you, Susan. Yeah, I'll go ahead and get
17 started on this. Just to kind of start, I'll be going over
18 the memo in Attachment 2.

19 And just a reminder on what's in the packet in
20 front of you, Attachment to Exhibit A is the green building
21 standard NAC that we follow.

22 Attachment to Exhibit B is an example of our
23 green building design template checklist, and Attachment to
24 Exhibit C is a net zero bill draft request we submitted. So

1 just going back to the memo in Attachment 2.

2 So what we started with is how sustainability is
3 a part of our current process. State Public Works currently
4 implements green building standards as set forth in
5 NAC 341.301 through 341.376.

6 The green building standard focuses on site
7 selection, material selection, water efficiency, energy
8 efficiency, and indoor quality. We currently follow ASHRAE,
9 which is the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and
10 Air-Conditioning Engineers -- I had to look that up -- 90.1.
11 So ASHRAE 90.1, ASHRAE 62.1 and EPA standards as a part of the
12 green building standard.

13 We at public works take a holistic approach to
14 sustainability with the green building standard. The way we
15 approach it is we look at all the building systems and their
16 interactions with the intent to develop a unique solution for
17 each project, and that process and what we typically look at
18 is pretty much laid out in the green building checklist in
19 your packet.

20 We look at each project as a unique system and
21 it's an independent solution each time. And then we also as a
22 part of the green building process, you know, analyze
23 different alternatives with the goal to select an option that
24 has the best lifecycle cost solution over like a 20 to 25-year

Page 21

1 cost period. So currently we try to, you know, make
2 selections that pencil 20, 25 years as a low-cost thing.
3 So the second page of the memo, at the top of
4 this is just a summary of what is in the NAC and the process
5 that we follow. The thing to take away here is that we do
6 implement green building standards on building projects that
7 are over 20,000 square feet.

8 And the process, you know, kind of laid out here,
9 I guess it's a little bit of a weeds, but it's just how we
10 really go about our green buildings.

11 I guess I'll mention Utah again. That's kind of
12 our favorite thing. It's something that we're a little
13 familiar with on how we do our work. But, you know, I did
14 take a look kind of thinking about green building standards,
15 and, you know, Utah has a similar set-up that we do.

16 They developed what they call the high
17 performance building standard, and looking through that
18 document, it's got different names and a different process
19 than we do for our green building standard, but at the end of
20 the day it's also based on ASHRAE 90.1 and really follows a
21 lot of the same processes with a lot of the same solutions
22 that we do.

23 They have a thicker packet for their checklist
24 than we do. They like to write more than we do, and that's

Page 22

1 probably the big thing. It's a little bit more of a formal
2 process than we have, where ours is more laid out in this NAC
3 and we just are simply going more back to straight ASHRAE 90.1
4 for our green building.

5 The last thing on this page, it's just a little
6 report. We did some research and just put some thought into
7 different types of projects that we at public works view as
8 best practices with regards to sustainability.

9 The first thing to take off the list is these are
10 nonmechanical system replacement projects. That's probably
11 the easy, low-lying fruit. The best way to save energy is to
12 put a big fancy new mechanical system in a building. That's
13 the easy one.

14 But past that, you know, you can look at
15 fenestration improvements. Fenestration is really your
16 building envelope, and so you would look a lot at your
17 openings, windows, doors, things of that nature. Then you
18 would look at building insulation, lighting improvements,
19 which really means LED lighting replacement projects. We've
20 done many of those in the past years.

21 And then the rest of the list is probably not
22 really CIP projects, but it's worth mentioning and important
23 that, you know, you know, saving energy on buildings is not
24 just a construction project, you know, operation in a building

Page 23

1 a part of that too. So -- and we probably don't have a great
2 influence on that to some degree but we can help. But, you
3 know, how is the building maintained, does the building have
4 efficient equipment inside of it.

5 You can do energy audits and that's something we
6 could entertain on buildings. That would be a study we could
7 do in a building to look at, you know, how energy could be
8 saved in there.

9 And then also, you know, the last one, just
10 landscaping, you know, make sure you don't over-water, things
11 like that. And that goes into maybe efficient landscaping
12 design or oftentimes it's also kind a maintenance thing,
13 coming back and making sure they haven't just watered
14 everything.

15 The kind of key thing too on here, when I mention
16 fenestration, you know, that actually does kind of tie into
17 this window replacement that we're going to talk about later.

18 So last -- last page on this memo is a little bit
19 of how we've started to I guess work to increase
20 sustainability in our process and, you know, I guess just to
21 kind of say, you know, we started with what we do do which is,
22 you know, green building projects.

23 So we do have sustainability built into our
24 current process, but we are looking forward to increase in the

Page 24

1 sustainability and that starts with a net zero conversation.
2 I guess it's a different word for some of the same things but
3 we continue to kind of grow with that.

4 So what we have done is we've selected two of our
5 current projects to start to look at net zero and what that
6 means for these projects. One of them is the Department of
7 Public Safety project here in Carson City and the other one is
8 the Silverado Ranch DMV down in Las Vegas.

9 The intent of selecting these projects to start
10 to look at net zero is it gives us basically some test cases
11 to do some analysis with these projects with the design team
12 to see how net zero can apply to a construction here for
13 public works, and that will hopefully help us make decisions
14 on how to implement net zero ideas in our projects.

15 So we're finding out right now with the
16 Department of Public Safety building, it's very early in its
17 design about the conceptual level and we're learning that net
18 zero might be about a 3 and a half percent increase for that
19 project.

20 So that's, you know, \$7 million in actual value
21 for that -- for that project. And that is in addition to
22 green building standards. So, you know, green building we
23 think builds an efficient and sustainable building and this is
24 in addition to that.

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

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

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

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

Page 29

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

Page 30

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

Page 31

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

Page 32

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

1 because of the challenges posed by AB160.
2 And with that overview, I'll turn it over to
3 either Kent or Brian who may want to add more about
4 challenges.

5 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. I'll
6 take a swing at this one. So in the Attachment 3 Exhibit B we
7 have a list of projects, basically window projects for the CIP
8 that were attended by the agencies, and it's \$25 million worth
9 of projects so it's not insignificant.

10 But the challenge that we run into is each one of
11 these -- each one of these projects have to be assessed before
12 they can be actually written up into a project so it's a kind
13 of a two-step process.

14 You know, in hindsight it would have been better
15 to make an assessment of every one of these projects two years
16 ago so that we can come to the table and SHPO prepared with an
17 assessment than the spot that we find ourselves in now, which
18 is -- which is when we go to SHPO, the usual answer from them
19 is no, you're not going to replace those windows, they're
20 historic, don't touch them. And it's -- it doesn't take into
21 consideration how much energy we're saving. There's nothing
22 in this bill that says we're going to be saving a lot of
23 energy.

24 What is in the bill is putting film on the

1 windows. That's going to save 2 or 3 percent of energy. And
2 replacing a broken window, yeah, we'll let you do that.

3 But the Bill is more residential driven than
4 commercial facilities. So if we take a look at the building
5 we're in up in Carson City, the Icon building, we could easily
6 replace every single window in that building.

7 MEMBER FREED: Yep.

8 MR. LEFEVRE: And probably cut our energy use by
9 a third because it's single pane glass that was installed back
10 in 1960.

11 From an energy standpoint it's a no brainer. But
12 the hurdle and the challenge is getting SHPO on board to do
13 that, which they've never been on board. They're more
14 interested in how that building looks and how it will look
15 than saving a kilowatt of power. So that's my lowdown on
16 that.

17 And so when we received all these replacements,
18 every one of these buildings is pushing 50 years, if not more,
19 and that throws us into the law AB160. So with that kind of a
20 background, maybe, Brian, you have some other perspective you
21 can add to this.

22 MR. WACKER: Yeah, thank you. Brian Wacker for
23 the record. Yeah, what I wanted to add on that is part of the
24 Bill is we have to do an assessment of these alternatives that

1 are listed there. And the way the Bill is written is if any
2 of these alternatives pencils so that the energy savings from
3 installing that alternative is greater than, you know, the
4 cost of installing that alternative, and I keep using, you
5 know, the film example.

6 So if we save more energy by putting the film on
7 than installing the film, then we cannot move forward with the
8 window replacement because of AB160; we're not allowed to
9 actually replace the window.

10 That's a big challenge base putting film on a
11 window only saves about 10 percent of the energy over actually
12 replacing the window. So this Bill keeps us from replacing
13 the window and is really forcing us to do some of these
14 alternative treatments. And they're fine. Film is fine.
15 Weather stripping is fine. I don't have a problem with doing
16 these things. It's just that it doesn't save the energy that
17 you would replacing the window a lot of times.

18 And so we really have our hands tied, like in the
19 Icon building, the Bill tells us explicitly we have to look at
20 these -- it lists the alternatives we look at, we have to look
21 at them and if any of them saves energy or saves money when
22 you do an analysis for that alternative the window replacement
23 is just -- it's out the window. So it really ties our hands.

24 The other thing, Kent mentioned it a little bit

1 too, is that when this bill was introduced there's a report
2 from 2012, "Saving Windows, Saving Money" report published by
3 the Preservation Green Lab, that was the justification for
4 this bill, and really that report was written with residential
5 in mind and was really written for homeowners as a way to say
6 hey, you don't have to replace your windows, you can do some
7 of these alternative treatments and they're a good use of your
8 money as well.

9 And so that was a basis for this Bill. It's a
10 challenge because some of these alternatives that the Bill
11 says that we have to do are not even applicable to a lot of
12 our buildings. Some of them are, some aren't, but we have to
13 look at these. So it's a challenge and it's keeping us from
14 really being able to move forward with these projects.

15 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. The
16 other thing is the financial, you know, the dollars and cents
17 of replacing windows. We'll be paying prevailing wage on
18 everyone of these windows.

19 And so if you take a look at a new commercial
20 building double pane insulated commercial paned window you're
21 probably somewhere in the 60 buck a square foot range for the
22 material and probably another \$60 a square foot to install it.

23 So installing a high grade commercial window is
24 not cheap. And so that's why we're coming up with \$24 million

1 on all these projects where AB160 doesn't even recognize that
2 a commercial building is going to be more expensive to upgrade
3 than a normal window which a residential person can do by
4 themselves.

5 Some of the language in here -- I reviewed the
6 testimony during the session, and some of the language is
7 well, you can go buy this stuff at JC Penney's or some other
8 store. I'm like yeah, okay. So there you go. That's
9 residential construction.

10 We don't buy our stuff at JC Penney's. We buy it
11 from a manufacturer that makes millions of square feet of this
12 stuff. So anyway. So it's been a challenge and it will
13 continue to be a challenge until this Bill is either amended
14 or rescinded.

15 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Lewis, are you -- you
16 look like you're going to say something.

17 MEMBER LEWIS: Well, Member Kevin Lewis. So I
18 guess those are the options for the Board to -- to consider
19 there; correct, Kent?

20 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. Yes.

21 MEMBER LEWIS: Okay. Either rescind or spend the
22 money, huh?

23 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
24 didn't have anything further on this. We did -- I didn't know

1 if you wanted to talk to the Board about a possible way to
2 attack this with planning dollars going forward.

3 MR. LEFEVRE: Kent Lefevre for the record. We
4 have looked at a number of things; in fact, we looked at the
5 possibility of using some of our planning money to do these
6 individual studies.

7 And a study, for example, on the Icon building I
8 think would probably be anywhere 20, \$30,000 to do a study --
9 just to do a study on what makes sense for that building.

10 And then -- and then we still run the risk of
11 getting turned down by SHPO even after the study. There's
12 nothing out there in the commercial world right now that's
13 going to be single pane. Nothing. I mean you can't even --
14 you can't even hope to get an energy standard with single pane
15 glass so.

16 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. So
17 we're doing 20 to \$30,000 for a study that we know the answer
18 to before we do the study.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Which is something --

20 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
21 don't -- our Bill draft requests are in for the session. So
22 it be for the 2025 session, but we would certainly continue to
23 keep the Board updated. You know, you never know, somebody
24 else may take a look at this and go you know -- you never know

1 what everybody else has in the hopper as far as their direct
2 request, but we would certainly keep the Board informed on
3 this matter.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.
5 I would recommend, yes, since we're looking at the '25 session
6 that we, that gives us time to do a little better analysis and
7 research on how we might be able to come with a correct bill
8 draft request to offset the problems that AB160 has presented
9 to us.

10 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I'm
11 going to suggest, and Homa will tell me if I get it wrong, but
12 when we look at items to be adgended for future board
13 meetings, if you could bring that up then and we'll make sure
14 that it's formalized.

15 MS. WOODRUM: This is Homa. Sounds like a plan.

16 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Homa.

17 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the
18 record. Again thank you for the good work that was done on
19 this. And I got a note here in case -- to make sure we don't
20 forget that when we get to our agenda Item 8. And it looks
21 like the next item on our agenda is the administrator's report
22 to the Board.

23 MR. LEFEVRE: Yes. Kent Lefevre for the record.
24 I'll keep this fairly brief to give everybody an idea of

1 what's going on within the division. Under bullet point 1,
2 staffing, we currently have three vacancies in professional
3 services and ten vacancies in inspections, and we have
4 maintained open recruitments for these positions so we're
5 still continuing to try and find people.

6 We have the -- we have opened the job
7 announcement for the deputy administrator and we have two
8 candidates that have shown interest that are qualified.
9 There's been four applicants but two candidates are qualified
10 for an interview.

11 Bullet point 2, the Board recommended version of
12 the CIP, the 2023 CIP was submitted to the governor's office
13 on September 30th, 2020. And since that time we've met --
14 we've met with the Governor's office, the finance director and
15 administrator to discuss the details of the proposed projects.

16 The GFO has not provided any formal comments on
17 the submittal as they are still waiting the long
18 affordability, but we are in vigorous discussions with them
19 right now and probably will have some formal [electronically
20 indiscernible] I would imagine within the next ten days.

21 Bullet 3, the projects -- just an update on the
22 overall projects were the telling of the 2019 CIP projects.
23 With the exception of ten projects, the work of the 29 CIPs
24 team, sorry, will be completed by the sunset date of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 budget amendments. There's a ton of them, both in the
2 operating budget and sometimes in the CIP. So you could send
3 it later, and if the CIP doesn't look from maintenance
4 perspective the way the Board would hope it looks, we can
5 absolutely, you know, send a letter and then urge a budget
6 amendment as -- so you could -- I would say sooner is better,
7 but it's not the end of the world if gov rec gets finished
8 before the Board sends a letter.

9 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. I
10 was thinking the first week in January as well. So I can
11 certainly poll the Board and see if we can put together a --
12 you know, find a time for an hour. I'm not sure we would
13 necessarily add anything else to the agenda.

14 MEMBER FREED: Right.

15 MS. STEWART: We would just do that. And it
16 would be a very quick remote meeting but then we could address
17 what's obviously important to the Board and the State. So
18 thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Chairperson Hand for the
20 record. Thank you. That's fantastic. I look forward to the
21 one hour meeting before -- before the first week of January.
22 So we'll have to probably review it and all that.

23 MS. STEWART: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Draft a letter and -- have a

1 MEMBER FREED: Move to adjourn. Sorry, Laura
2 Freed for the record. I move to adjourn.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Vice Chairman Bentley.
4 Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All in favor. Opposed? Thank
6 you all.

7 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Kevin.

8 (Motion carries unanimously.)

9 (Proceedings concluded at 11:21 a.m.)

1 meeting, draft a letter, review it, the whole --

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: We have to have two
3 meetings?

4 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record. No.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Okay.

6 MS. STEWART: And to be clear, I was thinking of
7 having the meeting -- this is Susan Stewart for the record --
8 the first week in January.

9 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Get it on.

10 MS. STEWART: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Yeah. Chairperson Hand for
13 the record. Thank you, Clint, for bringing it back up.

14 MS. STEWART: That will make Tito happy.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON BENTLEY: I'll be his friend.

16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Yeah. Be back on his list.

17 Okay. The next agenda item is public comment, and do we have
18 any comment in Carson City or here?

19 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart for the record.

20 There's no public comment here in Las Vegas.

21 MS. WOODRUM: This is Homa Woodrum. No public
22 comment in Carson City.

23 CHAIRPERSON HAND: All right. I think the last
24 item on our agenda is adjournment. Do I have a motion?

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

3
4
5 I, Shellie Loomis, Official Court Reporter for the
6 State of Nevada, Public Works, do hereby certify:

7 That on Friday, December 9, 2022, I was present for
8 the purpose of reporting in verbatim stenotype notes to the
9 best of my ability of the within-entitled session of the
10 public meeting;

11 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1
12 through 51, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct
13 transcription of my stenotype notes of said session of the
14 public meeting to the best of my ability under the
15 circumstances.

16
17 Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 30th day of
18 December, 2022.

19
20
21
22 //Shellie Loomis, RPR//
23 Shellie Loomis, NV CCR #228
24