

**In The Matter Of:**  
*State of Nevada*  
*Public Works Division Board Meeting*

---

*July 25, 2017*

---

*Capitol Reporters*  
*208 N. Curry Street*

*Carson City, Nevada 89703*

Page 1

1  
2 STATE OF NEVADA  
3 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION BOARD MEETING  
4 TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2017  
5 2:30 P.M.  
6 CARSON CITY, NEVADA  
7 ---oOo---  
8  
9  
10 THE BOARD: BRYCE CLUTTS, Chairman  
11 SEAN STEWART, Vice Chairman  
12 GUS NUNEZ, Administrator  
13 CHRIS CHIMITS, Deputy Administrator  
14 PATRICK CATES, Member, Director  
15 TITO TIBERTI, Member  
16 ADAM HAND, Member  
17 CLINT BENTLEY, Member  
18  
19 FOR THE BOARD: SUSAN STEWART, ESQ.  
20 Construction Law Counsel  
21 JEFF MENICUCCI, ESQ.  
22 Deputy Attorney General  
23  
24 LAURA ADAIR,  
25 Administrative Assistant IV

REPORTED BY: CAPITOL REPORTERS  
BY: Christy Joyce, CCR  
Nevada CCR #625  
123 West Nye Lane  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
(775)882-5322

Page 3

1 TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2017, 2:30 P.M.  
2 ---oOo---  
3 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. This is the time and the  
4 place of the State Public Works Board meeting for July 25th,  
5 2017, at 2:30 p.m. Agenda Item Number 1, roll call.  
6 MS. ADAIR: Bryce Clutts.  
7 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Present.  
8 MS. ADAIR: Sean Stewart.  
9 MEMBER STEWART: Here.  
10 MS. ADAIR: Clint Bentley.  
11 MEMBER BENTLEY: Here.  
12 MS. ADAIR: Tito Tiberti.  
13 MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.  
14 MS. ADAIR: Adam Hand.  
15 MEMBER HAND: Present.  
16 MS. ADAIR: Patrick Cates.  
17 MEMBER CATES: Present.  
18 MS. ADAIR: Okay. And also joining us by phone  
19 is Kristina Shea. Kristina, can you hear us all right? I'm  
20 sorry. Kristina, can you hear us?  
21 MS. SHEA: Yeah, I can hear you, Laura.  
22 MS. ADAIR: Thank you.  
23 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. We have a quorum.  
24 Agenda Item Number 2, public comment. Is there  
25 any public comment in the south?

Page 2

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
1 - Roll call	3
2 - Public comment	3
3 - Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes - January 27, 2017	4
4 - CIP update	5
5 - Legal update	15
6 - Administrator's report on agency activities	24
7 - Board comment and discussion	43
8 - Public comment	44
9 - Adjournment	44

Page 4

1 MEMBER BENTLEY: No.  
2 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: I don't see any public comment  
3 here in the north either.  
4 Agenda Item Number 3 for possible action.  
5 Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes  
6 for January 27th, 2017, which are attached. Are there any  
7 comments prior to accepting the approval of the minutes?  
8 MEMBER BENTLEY: I have one on page 30, Line 21.  
9 It's change Bruce to Bryce.  
10 MS. STEWART: Page 30, Line 21, Bruce to Bryce.  
11 And that would be -- For the record Susan Stewart. That  
12 would be in addition to the changes that I recommended in  
13 your action item request.  
14 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Also on page 24, line 18, I  
15 would change that from Stan to Susan.  
16 MEMBER CATES: Stan Stewart, huh?  
17 MS. STEWART: I've been called a lot of things.  
18 Never Stan.  
19 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Also on page 22, line 23, I  
20 think it's important that \$30 be referenced as 30 million at  
21 least with an M or something.  
22 MEMBER BENTLEY: We have numerous statements in  
23 here that say five and 30 instead of five million and 30  
24 million all the way through.  
25 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Yeah. I think those need to be



Page 5

1 identified because in some places it's just not consistent.  
2 We don't want to reference it was either five dollars or \$30.  
3 Are there any other comments? I would entertain  
4 a motion for acceptance and approval with the comments made.  
5 MEMBER HAND: So moved. Member Hand. So moved.  
6 MEMBER CATES: I'll second.  
7 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: All those in favor.  
8 (The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion)  
9 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Any opposed? Motion carries.  
10 Agenda Item Number 4, update on capital  
11 improvement plan. Mr. Nunez.  
12 MR. NUNEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gus Nunez  
13 for the record. Chris Chimits is going to take us through  
14 the outcome of the CIP from 2017.  
15 MR. CHIMITS: Thanks, Gus. Chris Chimits for the  
16 record. So under prior actions, last August, we had a  
17 two-day meeting over there at the library. And this board  
18 reviewed all the agency requests. We solidified the entire  
19 CIP program. And then again on September 8th this board met  
20 again and finalized the board rec and the administrator's  
21 recommendation in to one final CIP program that was sent to  
22 the governor on October 1st.  
23 So on the second page where you see the yellow  
24 and blue highlighting at the bottom, it's page one of 12. I  
25 want to get there in your packet. Okay. So what this is,

Page 6

1 this is a copy of what came out of the legislature at the  
2 finish, okay. It's dated June 30th, 2017, up in the upper  
3 right-hand corner.  
4 And what I did here was highlight in yellow the  
5 projects that the governor added to your recommendation from  
6 last summer and in blue what the legislature added to your  
7 recommendation. And I thought we could go over those today  
8 so that you would be aware of how the CIP was altered from  
9 what you approved last summer or last fall.  
10 The first one on page one of 12 is C-12. It's a  
11 remodeling of the different mechanical electrical plumbing  
12 systems and security locks for housing unit eight at Southern  
13 Desert Correctional Center. It's a six and a half million  
14 dollar job. It was determined to be the most economical and  
15 the quickest way to get 400 beds back on line for the  
16 Department of Corrections. So the governor added that in to  
17 the CIP.  
18 The next one is item C-13, which is a 36 million  
19 dollar CIP project to construct the Northern Nevada Veterans  
20 Home off of Galetti Way and Kietzke Lane next to the NAMS  
21 campus up there. This will be 102,000 square foot building  
22 that will house 96 veterans. The governor added that in.  
23 C-14 is a 1.7 million dollar project that would  
24 demolish the Kinkade office building which is immediately  
25 south of us across the street here. The governor put that

Page 7

1 in. And I would note that that's going to be the first  
2 project out of the barrel for construction because the  
3 current administrator demanded that it get done by December  
4 15th. And so we're going to complete it by December 15th. I  
5 just wanted that on the record.  
6 MEMBER TIBERTI: Excuse me. I couldn't hear  
7 that. Who demanded that?  
8 MR. CHIMITS: Our administrator.  
9 MEMBER CATES: Mr. Nunez.  
10 MR. CHIMITS: He wanted to see that building down  
11 to the ground before he ever retired. We're considering  
12 putting folding lawn chairs up on our roof and selling them  
13 for \$500 a pop.  
14 The next item is in blue. It's C-15. This is a  
15 50 million dollar project that was added to your CIP by the  
16 legislature. There are four of these projects that we'll go  
17 through. This is the first of four. And I mentioned it's a  
18 50 million dollar project to build a new 220,000 square foot  
19 medical school at UNLV. The 50 million dollars is pretty  
20 much just a head start on the planning and a portion of the  
21 construction.  
22 At this time it appears to us that this will be  
23 roughly a 230 million dollar effort. The unique thing about  
24 this project is that the funding was allocated to IFC, not to  
25 the State Public Works Board. So it's incumbent on the

Page 8

1 public works and UNLV to appear before IFC with a plan for  
2 the project that defines the scope, the budget, the schedule,  
3 and the financing mechanisms.  
4 And then once we've done that at IFC, then  
5 they'll allocate a portion or all of the money to us to  
6 proceed with this project.  
7 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts for the record.  
8 Mr. Chimits, can you just for everybody's information, IFC,  
9 can you just explain what that is?  
10 MR. CHIMITS: Yes. IFC is an acronym for interim  
11 finance committee. It's a portion of the legislature which  
12 oversees financial decisions in between sessions.  
13 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you.  
14 MR. CHIMITS: If you could now turn to page ten  
15 of 12 in this executive summary of the CIP, page ten of 12.  
16 Down at the bottom you'll see some blue highlighting. The  
17 next one that the legislature added is P-07. It's an  
18 advanced planning for a health and science building at the  
19 College of Southern Nevada. It's a 3.4 million dollar  
20 project that we'll undertake to do the planning for that.  
21 The next one, P-8, is the same thing. It's  
22 advanced planning but for an education and academic building  
23 at Nevada State College. That one was pushing 3.5 million  
24 dollars. We would do advanced planning feasibility studies,  
25 help fine tune their master plan and the programming at



1 Nevada State College to get that project under way.  
2 The last one is P-9, which is another project at  
3 UNLV. It would do advanced planning for the College of  
4 Engineering at UNLV. And that one was a three and a half  
5 million dollar planning project that was added to the CIP by  
6 the legislature.  
7 So those are the projects that altered or changed  
8 to the CIP from what this board released last summer and  
9 fall. And so I would stand by for any questions about any of  
10 them.  
11 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts for the record.  
12 Mr. Chimits, what was the request? What was our request for  
13 the CIP and what was the final number?  
14 MR. CHIMITS: Okay. If you go just one page  
15 further on page 12, the final allocation from the state was  
16 161 million dollars. And there was 246 million dollars of  
17 outside money for a total of 407 million dollars for this  
18 CIP.  
19 And I believe that the requests when they came to  
20 us at first were 1.2 or three billion dollars. So this would  
21 be a fourth to a third of what was requested.  
22 MR. NUNEZ: The boards -- Gus Nunez for the  
23 record. The board's recommendation to the governor was  
24 around 240 million.  
25 MR. CHIMITS: Oh, I'm sorry. Is that what you

1 the work identified, get the cost of it established, get a  
2 construction -- design a construction schedule established,  
3 and then also provide an explanation of how the remaining  
4 funds to complete the project would be raised and the time  
5 for raising those.  
6 So I think that was the intention behind the  
7 plan.  
8 MR. NUNEZ: Mr. Chairman, let me -- Just one  
9 small clarification. The way the bill actually -- Gus Nunez  
10 for the record. The way the bill actually reads is typically  
11 the words appropriated is through the public works division  
12 of the Department of Administration is what you typically see  
13 in the CIP bill, which you saw this time around. This one  
14 was a separate bill that included the medical school and the  
15 engineering school at UNLV. But with respect to the medical  
16 school, the money was appropriated to the interim finance  
17 committee. And then for the interim finance committee then  
18 to allocate the money to the public works division for the  
19 planning of this medical education building and beginning of  
20 construction. And then the rest of the bill with all the  
21 different clauses was pretty much along the lines of what you  
22 typically see in a CIP bill, which basically the main -- the  
23 main topics that I always see there is that the project will  
24 be managed in accordance with NRS 341, which is the NRS that  
25 creates the public works board, the public works division,

1 asked?  
2 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Yeah. So 240 million and the  
3 final is 407 million?  
4 MR. CHIMITS: 407.  
5 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: These are definitely different  
6 days, aren't they?  
7 Any other questions or comments regarding Agenda  
8 Item Number 4?  
9 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.  
10 Chris, I didn't understand that hybrid interim finance  
11 committee and state public works board. I didn't grasp where  
12 this is going to end up being. If it goes, who is going to  
13 administer the construction?  
14 MR. CHIMITS: Okay. Chris Chimits for the  
15 record. This was the first CIP project where the bill  
16 allocated the money to the interim finance committee of the  
17 legislature. Normally, and in this case all of the rest of  
18 the CIP projects, the funds were allocated to the State  
19 Public Works to execute the projects. In this case with C-15  
20 the funding was allocated to the interim finance committee.  
21 And I believe the purpose of that was that the project was  
22 ambiguous enough and introduced at such a late date in the  
23 session that they elected to provide the funding to IFC and  
24 require that the State Public Works division as well as UNLV  
25 appear before them and sort the thing out, get the scope of

1 and how we -- and it tells us how to manage projects and that  
2 all contracts have to be signed by the attorney general's  
3 office. And that's typical of all CIP's.  
4 The other thing obviously typical is that the  
5 funds have to be there before we sign contracts and the state  
6 money spent last. In other words, agency money, like donor  
7 money in this case gets spent first and then state money gets  
8 spent last.  
9 Because at the time the bill went through, there  
10 was no -- there was no time to create a specific scope and  
11 budget like we typically -- you typically see on all CIP  
12 projects. That didn't occur this time. They just allocated  
13 50 million. Where the 50 million came from, 25 and 25, I'm  
14 not sure. But they did not have your typical project cost  
15 estimate and your typical narrative that you see on all the  
16 projects that we present. That wasn't done at the time that  
17 was approved by the legislature. So we're creating that now  
18 and getting ready to go to IFC to present that to them.  
19 So then at that point what should happen is that  
20 the money then hopefully will be then allocated -- the  
21 appropriate money that was appropriated to IFC will then be  
22 allocated to public works to proceed with the project.  
23 I don't know if, Patrick, I don't know if you  
24 know -- want to add anything else to that based on recent  
25 meetings and things.



1 MEMBER CATES: For the record, Patrick Cates.  
2 There have been a series of meetings over the last few weeks  
3 with UNLV, NSHE, public works, Legislative Council Bureau,  
4 governor's office, about the bill and how we move forward  
5 with this project because it was not standard, not having  
6 gone through the CIP process.  
7 There was some question as to whether public  
8 works would manage this project or not because there's  
9 existing law that says that if 25 percent or less of the  
10 funding comes from the state that the university can manage  
11 the project themselves. That was something we discussed. I  
12 think that we were pretty unanimous between the attorney  
13 general's office and LCB legal and other parties involved  
14 that the bill was unequivocal that the public works board is  
15 charged with managing this project and that supercedes any  
16 existing statute.  
17 So I think we've settled that and are just  
18 continuing to move forward with the project plan to go to IFC  
19 to request the funding and to start work on the design.  
20 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti for the record.  
21 I'm glad I just heard that. Because when I first got on the  
22 board -- Was it 1920 or -- I was immediately -- I'm on the  
23 UNLV foundation and I had all of my buddies there attack me  
24 that they really need to -- I need to shape up the public  
25 works board. And I thought I've gone too far getting on

1 Works Board has a lot more experience in managing these types  
2 of projects for the public than these university people.  
3 So even though they're my friends and I'm part of  
4 it, I'm with what Patrick Cates suggested that we go where  
5 we're going. So that's just my comment.  
6 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Tiberti.  
7 Are there any other comments or questions  
8 regarding Agenda Item Number 4?  
9 Hearing none, we'll move to Agenda Item Number 5,  
10 legal update. Ms. Stewart.  
11 MS. STEWART: Thank you. For the record, Susan  
12 Stewart, construction law counsel. I'm going to give the  
13 board a brief update on the past legislative session,  
14 starting with work we're doing with our contracts,  
15 regulations, and some follow-up from the contractor  
16 qualification process and discussions we had at our last  
17 meeting.  
18 Starting with the legislature, I've attached a  
19 summary of bills that were proposed by the State Public Works  
20 Division in the 2017 session. We had four bills that were --  
21 that we proposed from the State Public Works Division. The  
22 only one that didn't pass was Assembly Bill 72. We were  
23 trying to get the board out of overseeing local government  
24 changes to the plumbing code. The certain plumbers  
25 organizations proposed an unacceptable amendment, in my

1 these boards.  
2 And I think, Gus, I brought you down and we met  
3 with the president at the time. I forget who it was. And  
4 ever since then there's been this just chomping at the bit by  
5 the university and a lot of the boosters that this bubbly  
6 father called the State Public Works Board just meddles and  
7 doesn't know what they're doing. And I happen to be around  
8 construction a long time. And I think the last people that  
9 know about construction is all of these donors and guys at  
10 UNLV, even though they're my friends. And so I really get  
11 nervous on behalf of the state because I have a lot of  
12 respect for the State Public Works Board in the process.  
13 It's not easy.  
14 On the other hand, when I heard all of this, and  
15 I'm glad what Mr. Cates just said makes me feel better,  
16 because I know there's a big push all the time and we've had  
17 I think three administrations since, Gus, you and I met with  
18 the president of UNLV. But a lot of the main guys are still  
19 there that just want to be contractors and developers with  
20 donor money and state money. And I don't think it's healthy.  
21 And so I'm kind of struggling and I'm not looking  
22 to cause ways. But when I heard Chris Chimits say that, I  
23 was concerned. But what I heard Patrick Cates say, I feel a  
24 lot better. Because I do think it's a long way to get this  
25 big complicated project. But I really think the State Public

1 opinion and the administrator's opinion to the State Public  
2 Works Division's bill, and we didn't pursue AB 72 through the  
3 session. And one of the reasons we thought it was  
4 unacceptable is it had absolutely nothing to do with our  
5 bill. So it wasn't a stretch.  
6 As you'll recall, we proposed Assembly Bill 41 in  
7 the 2015 session on the very last day of the session. The  
8 administrator's qualifications were changed without any  
9 notice to us or testimony. And it required that the  
10 administrator have a Master's degree and made a few other  
11 changes as well.  
12 AB 41 was passed. It was way too much work.  
13 Sorry for the commentary. The current provision now says the  
14 administrator must be a licensed engineer or architect or in  
15 the alternative hold a Master's degree or a doctoral degree  
16 in civil or environmental engineering, architecture, public  
17 administration, or a related field.  
18 So we consider that a win because those  
19 qualifications are in the alternative. And that was  
20 important to us that a licensed engineer or architect be able  
21 to serve as the administrator.  
22 You'll see in the summary that I've just put a  
23 notation here that this particular piece of legislation will  
24 not require any changes to our regs and/or our contract  
25 documents.



1 Mr. Chimits.  
2 MR. CHIMITS: I would like to thank Member Cates  
3 for that language. That was your idea. You pushed to get  
4 that through. And I think that did a lot for the benefit of  
5 our agency. So I just wanted to thank you.  
6 MEMBER CATES: Thank you. It was the issue that  
7 almost killed the bill entirely.  
8 MS. STEWART: Yes. It would -- It just seemed so  
9 straightforward and then all of a sudden it's the most  
10 complicated.  
11 MEMBER CATES: So, I guess, maybe just briefly  
12 kind of what happened with the bill is this was an ominous  
13 bill and it dealt with qualifications of several different  
14 state positions. It affected DHHS, administrators. They had  
15 something in there about a medical officer having outside  
16 employment. And it went to government affairs. And  
17 initially they had some questions around some of the other  
18 provisions. They also had some questions about the  
19 administrators.  
20 So we were asked to have a follow-up meeting with  
21 Assemblymen Brooks and Daly to discuss the provisions of the  
22 bill. And I simply restated that this had been changed at  
23 the 11th hour and we didn't think it was good policy. I  
24 personally felt that this person needed to be a licensed  
25 engineer or architect. And they seemed satisfied with that.

1 And the comment I think that came from Brooks was if that's  
2 what the guy who is appointing the person wants then I'm good  
3 with that.  
4 When I went back to workshop where you don't have  
5 an opportunity to make any public comment, another member  
6 objected to that provision and stripped it out of the bill.  
7 And then the bill was up in assembly ways and  
8 means, I believe, the next day, if I remember correctly. It  
9 was a very short turnaround. And I went to that committee  
10 and asked them to change it and was promptly flogged pretty  
11 well for going around the committee the bill had just come  
12 out of.  
13 I did notify the committee members of my concern  
14 but wasn't able to meet with them. Assemblyman Swank  
15 questioned that pretty heavily and asked to meet off line.  
16 And I met with her and went through this proposal to have  
17 both provisions in there. She was okay with it. I went back  
18 to the chairman of government affairs. He was okay with  
19 that. And we got the bill through.  
20 MR. CHIMITS: Thank you.  
21 MS. STEWART: Easy-peasy.  
22 MEMBER CATES: Sausage.  
23 MS. STEWART: All right. Onward and upward.  
24 Senate Bill 44, as the board may recall, this bill simply  
25 allows our building official to issue a building permit to a

1 private contractor. We had a couple issues come up where we  
2 wanted private contractors to perform work on state lands.  
3 And under the current law, the building official could not  
4 issue a building permit directly to a private contractor.  
5 And so this just simply -- Senate Bill 44 allows that.  
6 I've taken a look at our regulations and there's  
7 not -- we won't need to change our regs and there's not going  
8 to be any necessary changes to our contract documents either.  
9 Finally, Senate Bill 45, as far as bills that  
10 have passed from the State Public Works Division, our  
11 facility condition analysis group was required to inspect UNR  
12 and UNLV buildings, something that we have never had the  
13 staff to do. UNR and UNLV performed those services  
14 themselves. And so the bill was simply cleaned up to reflect  
15 the actual facts of how those services are performed. Again,  
16 we won't need to change our regs or contract documents.  
17 We have some other legislation that will have  
18 relatively minimal impact on the work done here at public  
19 works. Senate Bill 246 made some revisions to NRS Chapter  
20 338 pertaining to CMAR. There was a change in the  
21 advertising requirement that ended up simply really muddying  
22 the waters. But it's not -- we can work with it.  
23 The one concern that we do have is several  
24 sessions ago we worked hard to make the CMAR legislation,  
25 which is in 338 and the 1600 series, stand on its own so that

1 there were no cross-references, so that you weren't looking  
2 back to the hard bid sections to muddy the water.  
3 And, unfortunately, SB 246 does reference back to  
4 the hard bid on sections of NRS 338. But, again, it simply  
5 makes a change as far as the advertising requirements that  
6 the CMAR has to do for subcontractors. Now it pertains to  
7 subcontracts over a hundred thousand dollars.  
8 Another change that was made is that a CMAR  
9 cannot substitute an employee that was part of the CMAR team  
10 presented during the selection process when we actually go to  
11 contract with the CMAR. There's no bate and switch there.  
12 It's something that typically we're able to handle when we  
13 select the CMAR and make clear that the employees are going  
14 to be available that are actually presented during the  
15 selection process.  
16 They did clarify that the proposed fee must  
17 include the cost of general overhead and profit, something  
18 that public works already does, but now it's clarified in the  
19 statute specifically. And they did add a floor to the  
20 percent that the scoring can count for now. It cannot be  
21 less than five percent or more than 20 percent. And the 20  
22 percent was there and just added the five percent.  
23 The other changes they've made is that the CMAR  
24 must provide each subcontractor a form that's approved by the  
25 public body on which the subcontractor's proposal must be



Page 21

1 submitted. And we actually think that's a great idea and it  
2 will make it easier for apples to apples so that all of the  
3 subcontract bids come in on the same form.  
4 It also extended the sunset on the CMAR  
5 legislation in NRS 338 to 2021. We will need to change our  
6 regulations and contract documents to accommodate some of  
7 these changes.  
8 The last bill is Assembly Bill 160. It amends  
9 NRS 701-B and pertains to window replacement in public  
10 buildings and adds some additional factors that the Public  
11 Works Division must consider when replacing windows in public  
12 buildings. We're not going to have to change our regulations  
13 or contract documents as a result of AB 160.  
14 The one thing that isn't in my update that I did  
15 want to mention to the board is you'll recall at our last  
16 meeting Assemblyman Daly had proposed some legislation that  
17 would insert the Public Works Division in to local  
18 government, CMAR selection process, and require other local  
19 governments and public bodies to use public works forms. And  
20 that bill did not move forward and was not approved. So that  
21 will not be an issue that we have to address as a result of  
22 the 2017 session.  
23 Is there -- I'm going to move on in my agenda  
24 unless there's any questions about the legislative session.  
25 Okay.

Page 22

1 Contracts. Several years ago -- Actually, I came  
2 in right on the tail end of it in 2008. The State Public  
3 Works Division had hired Gerald Katz. He's a risk management  
4 expert and expert in contract development in the all matters  
5 construction. And in 2006, 2008 he helped the State Public  
6 Works Division rewrite all of their construction contracts.  
7 We are in the process of hiring Mr. Katz again to assist me  
8 in writing design build contract documents. Mr. Katz is also  
9 going to do a review of all of our other public works  
10 contract documents.  
11 And the good news is you'll recall we had a  
12 partial settlement of the JM litigation. And as part of the  
13 settlement, we were able to recover \$340,000 in attorneys  
14 fees that public works funded because my position is  
15 representing the state. That is the money that we will use  
16 to pay Mr. Katz for his services. So that money is being put  
17 to -- put to good use. And, incidentally, he's going to  
18 charge us a fraction of that. Very reasonable.  
19 Moving on, we will have to go through the reg  
20 process again this year and we need to adopt the 2018  
21 building codes. And there will also be some minor changes  
22 that we need to make as a result of new legislation.  
23 And, finally, the last piece of my contractor  
24 qualification process is at our last meeting, at Chair  
25 Clutts' request, we went back and looked, first of all, first

Page 23

1 to see when the board decided the current contractor  
2 qualification and scoring procedure. And then we also put  
3 together a matrix going back the last six years of the number  
4 of applications and appeals. And my understanding was  
5 primarily to see is there a problem with the qualification  
6 process.  
7 You have attached to your packet is an e-mail  
8 that I sent. And Chairman Clutts doesn't remember getting  
9 it. And I hope the other members of the board did receive  
10 the e-mail. And I sent minutes from the meeting dating back  
11 to January 29th, 2002, where you can see that the board  
12 approved the qualification of bidder's score sheet. And then  
13 also attached to that is the summary that was put together  
14 that shows the number of applications submitted and then the  
15 appeals that the board has heard over the last six years.  
16 And that concludes my presentation. And I'm  
17 happy to answer any questions.  
18 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.  
19 Are there any other questions or comments  
20 regarding Agenda Item Number 5?  
21 MEMBER BENTLEY: No.  
22 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: The only comment --  
23 Member Clutts for the record. The only comment that I would  
24 have is for those of you who may not have done the math, over  
25 the last six years, there's been 1727 applications, of which

Page 24

1 there's been 12 appeals, which is basically .007 percent of  
2 the applications are appealed. I only bring that to  
3 everyone's attention as we move forward in determining  
4 whether or not this is a process that we want to revisit,  
5 change, modify, amend, et cetera, just to keep that in mind.  
6 My concern last meeting was do we have a process  
7 that is broken or do we have a process that needs to be  
8 maintained. My opinion is that we have a process that needs  
9 to be maintained and amended appropriately as we move  
10 forward. But in my opinion definitely not broken. I'll  
11 leave that to the rest of the board for any discussion.  
12 Okay. Hearing none, move on to Agenda Item  
13 Number 6, administrator's report. Mr. Nunez.  
14 MR. NUNEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the  
15 record, Gus Nunez, administrator. I'll just quickly go  
16 through the items that we have listed here, starting with the  
17 budget. A little bit of background, the State Public Works  
18 Division manages five budgets account. Two of those budget  
19 accounts functions are things that the board oversees, that  
20 being the professional services section, which includes the  
21 building official function. That's in account 1562. And the  
22 facilities section, which also funds the board for meetings  
23 and any related trial expenses. And that's budget account  
24 1560.  
25 The other budget account on the building and



Page 25

1 grounds section, which also includes the leasing function,  
2 and that's budget account 1366, which is the Marlette Lake  
3 water system.  
4 The fifth budget account funds the administrative  
5 function of the division, which is budget account 1540. This  
6 budget account is funded by the other four budget account,  
7 which are all -- which have been all funded from fees  
8 collected for service provided to other state agencies or  
9 local government in the case of the Marlette Lake water  
10 system.  
11 With respect to staffing, there were no  
12 significant budget changes to the division, except for the  
13 additional staffing for the professional services section.  
14 We originally requested three more project managers and eight  
15 new building inspectors to take care of the increases in the  
16 capital improvement program.  
17 We're also planning right now a work program for  
18 additional staffing to manage the project at the legislature  
19 audit to the capital improvement program. We may be in need.  
20 We're going through that analysis right now and we'll have to  
21 go to IFC for that work program.  
22 We started the process for AE selection and in  
23 some cases contracting for not only design services but also  
24 we're selecting contractors for those projects that utilize  
25 the construction management at risk procurement process.

Page 26

1 We have approximately 94 projects in the 2017  
2 capital improvement program. Ten of those projects will  
3 utilize the CMAR process. The remaining projects,  
4 approximately 84 projects, will utilize the condition of  
5 design bid bill process.  
6 There are five projects that meet the threshold  
7 for formal AE selection for the Nevada Administrative Code.  
8 And we are currently advertising for those projects.  
9 Maybe what I should do, and I forgot, I should  
10 have -- Why don't I pass this out. And those are a list of  
11 all the projects in the 2017 -- And you should have copies of  
12 those there. I sent them over to Tammy to pass over to you.  
13 MS. STEWART: Show him what it looks like.  
14 MEMBER CATES: It's big.  
15 MR. NUNEZ: It's 11 by 17. Tammy should have  
16 passed that out.  
17 MEMBER TIBERTI: I don't think -- I don't have  
18 that. This is hand-delivered to governor Brian Sandoval from  
19 Sean Stewart.  
20 MR. NUNEZ: That's one of the -- another matter  
21 that I'll be discussing later on. This should have been an  
22 eleven, yeah, 11 by 17 piece of paper with all of the  
23 projects.  
24 MS. STEWART: Laura, will you follow up with  
25 Tammy and see if you can see if she can get that to them,

Page 27

1 please. Thank you.  
2 MR. NUNEZ: The list of projects basically  
3 delineates all of the projects that are in the CIP. And on  
4 the far right-hand corner it lists, under constructor  
5 selected, actually is the procurement method selected list,  
6 whether it's going to be construction management at risk or  
7 the typical design get built procurement process. And then  
8 for the planning projects, of course, those say NA on most of  
9 those.  
10 In pink, we have highlighted, if you look at that  
11 in pink, and as soon as you get it, the five projects that  
12 meet the threshold for formal AE selection. And, like I  
13 said, we're advertising for those and we'll proceed with  
14 that. Typically that's a two-step process. We short list  
15 with a three-member committee, two members from public works  
16 and one from the agency. Those short-listed firms then move  
17 on to final selection at an interview level process. And the  
18 interview committee consists of five members on the interview  
19 committee. And that's three members from public works and  
20 two members from the agency. And none of those five can be  
21 members and serve in the short-listing committee. So that's  
22 just the way it's set up in the Nevada Administrative Code  
23 right now. That's the formal selection.  
24 In yellow, we show a few projects there that  
25 we're going to hold open pending formal selection projects.

Page 28

1 Those are projects that will require services from firms that  
2 will be applying for the formal selection or they're  
3 architectural-type firms that will be going after the larger  
4 projects. And the reason we do that is just so that these  
5 projects will go through an informal selection process.  
6 And what we do is those firms that applied for  
7 those five projects and were not successful, we give them a  
8 shot at those first before going away from that. Since they  
9 took an effort to come in and submit a statement of  
10 qualification, we'll try to match them to whatever projects  
11 we have left over after that through the informal process.  
12 It is not -- It does cost money to go through the  
13 selection process, putting statement of qualifications  
14 together, and then in some cases even attending the interview  
15 process. And obviously not all of them are going to be  
16 successful. So we've always, if they go through that effort,  
17 we feel they have an interest in doing business with us, and  
18 if they have a good track record, we try to match them to  
19 those other projects that go through a -- that we can do  
20 through the informal process based on what the NAC  
21 requirements are. The other ones, of course, the ones in  
22 pink they meet the threshold for formal selection.  
23 The other -- The rest of the projects are --  
24 which is 80-some of them, go through an in-house informal  
25 selection process. Most of those projects are for deferred



1 maintenance in the mechanical, electrical, and other areas  
2 that we have in the CIP for deferred maintenance. Some of  
3 them are structural, actually. We have a few structural  
4 projects in here.

5 And those, again, go through an informal process.  
6 Part of what we do is we -- I typically get a list of  
7 businesses that we've been doing business with the last five  
8 years, how they've been performing. We also ask the PM's who  
9 their preference is. Chris and I review all of that and then  
10 give the PM's direction as to how to proceed with the rest of  
11 the selection process. But it's for only -- But, like I  
12 said, it's a fairly informal process.

13 And usually what I typically do at the end of  
14 that process, I bring it as an informational matter back to  
15 the board and just to allow transparency to the process. And  
16 you guys get to see what the end results were in that -- in  
17 the formal and informal process through the AE selection.

18 If you have any questions along the way, please  
19 stop me at any point, and I'll answer questions.

20 The last item here that I had that I wanted to  
21 update you on is the letter that the chairman wrote to the  
22 governor on deferred maintenance. That was last -- November  
23 of last year. At the direction of the board, the chairman  
24 sent a letter to the governor regarding the need to address  
25 the current back log of the deferred maintenance projects.

1 legislative budget cycle. And last biennium the governor's  
2 office of finance, the governor's office asked us for budget  
3 concepts in the spring. So we will present one of these as  
4 one of those concepts. I think it was well-received. They  
5 thought it was a good idea but maybe not the best time.

6 I think one of the discussions we had that if you  
7 increase the rent on public -- on buildings and grounds  
8 managed buildings, that is one thing. But to do it across  
9 the board, you would have to assess it on buildings for the  
10 agencies that own and operate themselves, to which they're  
11 paying nothing. Well, they're paying for maintenance, but  
12 they're not paying any rent. They're not paying in to a pot  
13 of money.

14 And one of the barriers is the biggest square  
15 footage we have is corrections. And they're all  
16 general-funded. So the amount of money that you need to  
17 start that was pretty substantial, and they were just a  
18 little gun shy about doing that. But we're hoping to engage  
19 with them early in the next cycle and make some progress on  
20 the issue for the next biennium.

21 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts for the record.  
22 What was the funding for deferred maintenance in this  
23 session?

24 MR. NUNEZ: I have it right here in this packet.

25 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: And the second part of that

1 The letter made recommendations for the level of funding and  
2 established and also another recommendation was established a  
3 separate source of funding to meet this need.

4 The recommendations were well received and we  
5 received some very positive comments. However, it was  
6 determined at that time that this matter needed additional  
7 time to implement. I have now, just the last couple of  
8 months, I've had some discussions on this matter with  
9 Director Cates. And the steps that we'll be taking here in  
10 the very near future I agreed that we should put a white  
11 paper together based on the research and information that we  
12 presented to the board on this matter a while back. And then  
13 at that point, Director Cates will have the information to go  
14 start the discussion again with the governor's finance  
15 office, and hopefully include at least the funding part to  
16 get it included in the budget instructions for next biennium  
17 at least is our hope at least to get the beginning started.  
18 If not implemented in full at least hopefully get partial  
19 implementation of the funding during this next budget cycle.

20 That concludes my report to you all unless you  
21 have any questions or, Patrick, if you wanted to add anything  
22 to that last item.

23 MEMBER CATES: For the record, Patrick Cates. I  
24 would just add that we will be starting a process after the  
25 end of this calendar year to start preparing for the next

1 question would be is how does that compare to prior years.

2 MR. NUNEZ: Well, it is much higher than prior  
3 years. If you go back to item number --

4 MS. STEWART: Page nine.

5 MR. NUNEZ: -- item number four, page nine,  
6 you'll see there's a subtotal in there for all of the  
7 projects. And right now that's at, let's see, other funding  
8 is at 8.5 million dollars and state funding at 88.7 million  
9 dollars. So if you add that together, that will be about --

10 MS. STEWART: A hundred million.

11 MR. NUNEZ: Darn close. About 90 -- About 97  
12 million dollars. 97 million dollars. And typically we've  
13 been funding about 65 in this same category here, except  
14 for -- except for '09, '11, and '13. And especially in '11.  
15 In '11 there was about 30 million dollars of bonding  
16 capacity. Three million went to other bonding requirements  
17 that the state had. That dropped it down to 27. Then ten of  
18 that went to NSHE for their deferred maintenance needs, 10  
19 million of that, so that left 17 million dollars for the  
20 biennium for '11 to take care of the deferred maintenance  
21 needs for the State of Nevada.

22 And that year really kind of was the worst year  
23 so far that I've seen. I've been here, you know, 16 years, a  
24 little over 16 years. And that is the worst deferred  
25 maintenance that we had was '11. And it was just basically



1 there was just no money at that point. And the capacity of  
2 the state went down to almost nothing and one of the reasons  
3 why we should find a separate social funding for deferred  
4 maintenance and actually leave GO bonding for capital  
5 construction.  
6 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: So we requested 114 million and  
7 we got 97; correct?  
8 MR. NUNEZ: Uh-huh. And now that's where it's  
9 at.  
10 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: So it's a 17 million dollar  
11 delta. And so 141 was the estimate for the next biennium.  
12 So I just think obviously in those discussions the continued  
13 discussion is we don't want to bite off -- The reality is  
14 it's growing. So at some point you got to start chewing.  
15 MR. NUNEZ: And if you have a copy of the -- By  
16 now hopefully you have it. There is a copy that was passed  
17 out to you, which is a copy of the letter that Chairman  
18 Clutts sent over to the governor. And we -- The last page of  
19 that shows the deferred maintenance backlog and funding  
20 analysis that we did at that time with this. And we were  
21 obviously requesting, as you see here, we were recommending  
22 114, 141, and 127 over the next -- this biennium and the next  
23 two biennium. And hopefully that will stabilize the deferred  
24 maintenance down to 80 million dollars from there on out.  
25 Obviously, as we move forward with this, that's

1 Carson City.  
2 MEMBER CATES: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a  
3 follow-up question?  
4 So, Gus, if I'm interpreting the information you  
5 provided correctly, if 80 million is a sort of steady state  
6 of deferred maintenance estimated, so the amount of money  
7 that's in this biennial budget, although not as much as we  
8 requested, is still whittling down that backlog; is that  
9 correct?  
10 MR. NUNEZ: Yes, that is correct. And I think  
11 that what -- And, of course, that's based on what we know  
12 today with existing inventory.  
13 MEMBER CATES: Okay.  
14 MR. NUNEZ: If you then take advantage of a  
15 different funding source and upgrade your inventory, I think  
16 that will have an effect on that 80 million dollars. But  
17 right now based on what we know, that's our best guesstimate.  
18 MEMBER CATES: If I could just make one other  
19 comment. So the interesting thing with the competing for  
20 general obligation bond money for deferred maintenance versus  
21 new construction, you know, if you don't invest in the new  
22 construction then the deferred maintenance climbs. Part of I  
23 think what the legislature did with these projects is they  
24 added all of these advanced planning projects, the state put  
25 a lot of new projects on the train to be completed in future

1 something that we need to monitor. That was just our best  
2 guesstimate at the time with respect to what was happening at  
3 that time.  
4 If you find a separate source of funding for your  
5 deferred maintenance and you leave your GO bonds available  
6 for capital construction, then you're able to upgrade your  
7 inventory instead of dealing with an old inventory. Like we  
8 just did, for instance, DMV on East Sahara, we got rid of the  
9 old one and built the new one. Now we're in the process of  
10 doing the same thing here in Reno. That automatically will  
11 wipe out. As soon as you build this new building, you wipe  
12 out on those two DMV, you immediately wipe out seven to ten  
13 million dollars of deferred maintenance just like that.  
14 So, in addition to being in a more cost-efficient  
15 building that not only serves the citizens of the state but  
16 from an operational perspective, from a utilities and  
17 maintenance perspective, much, much better also. So I think  
18 those are the type of things that I think the state can  
19 benefit from by finding a different -- not having deferred  
20 maintenance compete with capital project. Having a complete  
21 separate source of funding and then having some money over  
22 here on the side with respect to GO bonds to go ahead and  
23 upgrade your infrastructure, facility infrastructure. And we  
24 certainly are very much in need of that, if you go around to  
25 some of our facilities around the state, particularly in

1 biennia. And I wouldn't say they've obligated future  
2 legislature reports, but they've certainly laid it out where  
3 there's a whole lot of bonding capacity that is going to be  
4 needed to do those projects. To me that's all the reason we  
5 need to find a different funding source for deferred  
6 maintenance and keep plugging away at it.  
7 MR. NUNEZ: And also, I think, for the next  
8 biennium hopefully we all look at that seriously is the cost  
9 of leasing, you can -- in southern Nevada you can own for the  
10 cost of leasing. And it's getting pretty close to that here  
11 in northern Nevada right now. And that's going to escalate  
12 quite a bit here in the next couple two or three years. I  
13 think one of our concerns right now with respect to the CIP  
14 is inflation. And we have five percent inflation, which was  
15 when we were going over this, the recommendation, to the  
16 governor a year ago in August, in September, five percent  
17 seemed very adequate. I can tell you that today it's not.  
18 It scares me to death. Five percent inflation over the next  
19 two years, with everything that's going on here in Vegas and  
20 here in northern Nevada, it's just we're going to have to be  
21 extremely careful how we start these projects. Because if  
22 it's started, it's going to have a big influence on how well  
23 you finish and how successful you're going to be on bid date.  
24 So there's some things that we're going to have to do as we  
25 get going on some of these larger projects.



1 But be that as it may, I think that's the issue  
2 in the current CIP. But through lease purchase we can  
3 certainly -- The cost of leasing space continues to go up,  
4 especially right now, at a considerable pace as the vacancy  
5 rate keeps going down. We see pretty good increases over the  
6 last year, year and a half. And I think it may accelerate  
7 here in the future.  
8 So I think lease purchase makes -- makes a lot of  
9 sense. And then you stabilize your cost if you finance.  
10 Lease purchase allows you to finance these projects over 30  
11 years. You're going to stabilize your cost over the next 30  
12 years instead of seeing the rent go up or your lease cost go  
13 up every year. The way we have it now, you sort of cap it  
14 for the next 30 years. At that point you own the building.  
15 Yes, you're going to have to do some upgrades at that point  
16 and in the meantime typical deferred maintenance needs in the  
17 building. But we keep -- We easily design buildings here for  
18 45, 50 years. And then we use them for a hundred.  
19 But anyhow, it sort of stabilizes your -- You can  
20 then really drive your own train with respect to what we're  
21 going to pay for office space, at least for that much.  
22 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. Mr. Chimits.  
23 MR. CHIMITS: Chris Chimits for the record. On  
24 this schedule if it would be okay to just kind of marinate in  
25 this for just a minute or two. The goal or the objective is

1 of conversation left to have as far as who's paying, is it a  
2 flat 36 cents across and what's fair for everybody. Are we  
3 all going to help corrections out with their facilities. And  
4 they'd be happy about it. So there's more conversation to  
5 come about that.  
6 But that was our objective here is to separate  
7 the sources and then get ourselves to an equilibrium. That's  
8 what we're trying to portray in this.  
9 MEMBER HAND: Member Hand for the record. Chris,  
10 you just talked about corrections. What percentage of the  
11 total state square footage is corrections? Just to give some  
12 sense of --  
13 MEMBER CATES: I don't remember the numbers. I  
14 thought it was a majority.  
15 MR. CHIMITS: Between a third to a half of our  
16 square footage. And their clients that they serve are not  
17 easy on our buildings. That compounds it.  
18 MR. NUNEZ: Corrections, HHS, with our hospitals,  
19 and those, again, are 24-7 operations. It's like the  
20 corrections there cost a little bit more to maintain.  
21 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts for the record.  
22 Mr. Nunez, going back to the AE selection process, this  
23 sheet, I notice that on the delivery method there's no design  
24 build. Is there a reason for that?  
25 MR. NUNEZ: Design build, we typically use,

1 to get over here to the right-hand side of the page where  
2 you've got the blue column matching the green column.  
3 They're at equilibrium there. The rate, 36 cents a square  
4 foot per month, as Gus mentioned, for the amount of inventory  
5 that the state has right now is about an equilibrium,  
6 deferred maintenance need versus income coming off the square  
7 footage that we own right now. So that's where we want --  
8 That would be the goal.  
9 To get there, over on the left-hand side of the  
10 page here, you see where that green bar requested deferred  
11 maintenance. In other words, the 36 cents a square foot  
12 started in 2017, and it was a good idea. Wrong time, as  
13 Member Cates mentioned, so that got deferred to 2019, where  
14 the green bar will actually start. Instead of '17 it started  
15 in '19.  
16 And then we needed, because of the backlog of  
17 deferred maintenance, which is shown in that faded blue color  
18 bar, and we're gaining on it. You can see it coming down.  
19 But in order to augment the 36 cents a square foot, we've got  
20 to keep asking for deferred maintenance the way we have been  
21 in the CIP for the next -- Well, 2017, '19, and '21 in order  
22 to get us a booster shot, if you will, to get us to  
23 equilibrium here. That's what we're trying to convey in  
24 this.  
25 And then I agree with Patrick where there's a lot

1 architect, we use for design build is the project that can  
2 be, number one, well-defined at the very beginning. Like you  
3 would in, let's say, a general office building. You can  
4 define that. Or a parking structure, you can define that  
5 very well.  
6 And, number two, is that you have a client. To  
7 us a client would be an agency because that's what we work  
8 for. The agencies are our client providing them with  
9 facilities that would not be changing their mind all the way  
10 around the design process. It defeats the design process.  
11 And it just happens that on this particular CIP we right now  
12 don't have anything like that. We -- The only thing that  
13 approximates that that would be pretty close would be the  
14 project that we're going to be designing for motor pool,  
15 Fleet Enterprises, at the Sawyer Building site there, which  
16 we have some extra land down toward the east end of the  
17 property.  
18 MR. CHIMITS: Southeast.  
19 MR. NUNEZ: Southeast. And, unfortunately, we  
20 for that project we -- the only money that the agency  
21 requested this biennium was design. The agents didn't have  
22 the wherewithal -- They're a fee-based agency. They didn't  
23 have the wherewithal to design and find the construction. So  
24 we couldn't go design build.  
25 But a facility like that where you basically have



1 an office, very small office, to handle the clientele coming  
2 in to pick up cars and things and supervisor, maybe a  
3 bathroom and a break room. The rest of it is basically  
4 maintenance-based for maintaining cars and then storage, you  
5 know, outside storage for the vehicles.  
6 And so that you can define very well. Very  
7 definable and it could be done. But if you don't have all of  
8 the money to do it up front, it's just not feasible to do.  
9 But that would be the closest one that I see in  
10 here that could be design build. All of our other projects  
11 are just not in that classification.  
12 MR. CHIMITS: Chris Chimits for the record. The  
13 other thing that Susan mentioned in her presentation is we're  
14 working on developing our design-build documents, that we  
15 have those in the same condition that we have our CMAR. We  
16 know how to operate in those things. Those documents have  
17 been finely-tuned. And we've been trained on them. We're  
18 not there with the design-build documents.  
19 MR. NUNEZ: The last design -- Gus Nunez for the  
20 record. The last design-build project that we done here at  
21 public works was in 2003 for the Bryant Building. Oh, excuse  
22 me. No. We did another one. It was the automotive -- auto  
23 technology building at SNC on the Cheyenne Campus. That was  
24 design build also. Because, again, the office building here,  
25 just like I mentioned, you can define that pretty well, you

1 And you got to keep up with the contract. So they don't like  
2 to stop once they start building. But anyway.  
3 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. Any other questions on  
4 Agenda Item Number 6? Comments?  
5 Okay. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 7 for  
6 possible action, board comment and discussion. Is there any  
7 board comments on any agenda item? Any items that you wish  
8 to be included in future agendas?  
9 The only question I had there is what is the  
10 status of the replacement, if any, of Member Gorda?  
11 MR. NUNEZ: I got a call from LCB yesterday and I  
12 returned it. I missed the return call. And I can't  
13 remember --  
14 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Rick Coombs?  
15 MEMBER CATES: Rick Coombs at LCB.  
16 MR. NUNEZ: Rick Coombs called me about -- the  
17 only message was want to talk to you about Mason Gorda's  
18 replacement. And I called him back and I said, you know,  
19 that's the leader of the senate. He wasn't available. So I  
20 left him a message. And I've been trying to contact him  
21 again to see if he needed any additional information on that.  
22 We need to get either the senate to make an appointment.  
23 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: Okay. Review of action items  
24 for State Public Works Division management. Anything there?  
25 Okay.

1 know, for a general office building.  
2 The auto technology building was very well  
3 defined. Because if you go in there, if you've walked in  
4 recently in to the service department of an auto dealership,  
5 when you walk in, that's what that place looks like. The  
6 only difference is it's over here on the side they have a  
7 number of classrooms, about six classrooms, attached to that.  
8 Other than that the building is just -- just like what you  
9 would -- like you would see at a maintenance service at a car  
10 dealership, auto car dealership. Very well definable, you  
11 know, with all the stalls and everything else, slab-on,  
12 built-up concrete, roof, very simple building.  
13 The one was very successful. I think design  
14 build on that went ten, 11 months. Although it took a little  
15 bit of time to get in to the bridging document. It took us  
16 three months in the bridging document. The design-build  
17 process went very, very well. Getting that building turned  
18 around in ten months is pretty good.  
19 It puts an additional burden here on the staff  
20 because, you know, that's all fast track. And you've got to  
21 be able to -- Our client checking in here, the building  
22 officials, and the PM's has the design packets come in, you  
23 got to substantiate what they proposed on and what we  
24 required the bridging documents are being met by that design  
25 that comes in. And you also got to plan check it for code.

1 As far as a future meeting date, I guess it will  
2 be set if and when we need it.  
3 MS. STEWART: Well, we will be moving forward on  
4 the regs, so that will probably be the next meeting. And  
5 then, of course, typically what we do is we'll roll in any  
6 business with that that needs to -- We'll do it all at one  
7 time.  
8 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: All right. Moving on to Agenda  
9 Item Number 8, public comment. It doesn't appear anybody  
10 showed up down there.  
11 MEMBER BENTLEY: None.  
12 CHAIRMAN CLUTTS: There's none up here. Given  
13 that, we will adjourn at a quarter to four. Thank you.  
14 (Hearing was concluded at 3:45 p.m.)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25