

Joe Lombardo
Governor



Joy Grimmer
Director

Bob Ragar
Deputy Director

Wilfred J. Lewis, Jr.
Administrator

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

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

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

STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD
Meeting of January 23, 2025

Agenda Item # 3

SUBJECT TITLE:

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

DISCUSSION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

ACTION ITEM:

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

PREPARED BY: Susan K. Stewart, Construction Law Counsel

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

September 17, 2024

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

1
2 STATE OF NEVADA
3
4 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION VIDEO CONFERENCE BOARD MEETING
5
6 TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024
7
8 9:00 A.M.
9
10 STATE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION
11
12 680 WEST NYE LANE, SUITE 103
13
14 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89703
15
16 THE BOARD: ADAM HAND, Chairperson
17 JOY GRIMMER, Director,
18 Department of Administration
19 PHILIP MANNELLY, Member
20 ROY WALKER, Member
21 TITO TIBERTI, Member
22
23 FOR THE BOARD: SUSAN STEWART, Esq.
24 Senior Deputy Attorney General
25
26 WIL LEWIS,
27 Administrator
28
29 BRIAN WACKER,
30 Administrator
31
32 MARKUS MCENTEE,
33 Project Manager
34
35 REPORTED BY: CAPITOL REPORTERS
36 BY: Nicole J. Hansen,
37 Nevada CCR #446, RPR, CRR, RMR
38 628 E. John Street #3

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

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

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

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 form. I did speak to Clint Bentley, who let me know that 2 he wasn't going to be here, but also did mention when I 3 pressed him that he would be willing to accept the 4 nomination for a Vice-Chair if that were the desires of 5 the board, and the first thing is to accept nominations 6 for the election of a chairperson. 7 Do I hear yes, Mr. Walker? 8 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like to 9 nominate for Chairperson Adam Hand. 10 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti. I'll second 11 that. 12 COUNSEL STEWART: Do you accept? 13 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I accept. Thank you. 14 COUNSEL STEWART: Maybe I'm just call for the 15 motions. 16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: I was going to say. 17 COUNSEL STEWART: All in favor? 18 THE BOARD: Aye. 19 COUNSEL STEWART: Opposed? So moved. And 20 next is election of a Vice-Chairperson? 21 Mr. Walker? 22 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like to 23 nominate Clint Bentley for the Vice-Chair position. 24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Second. 25 MEMBER TIBERTI: Tito Tiberti. I second</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 the \$3 billion dollars worth of agency requests to an 2 amount that we believe is more defensible and what will 3 eventually fit into the State's bonding affordability. 4 Next slide. Before we get too deep in the 5 presentation, I'd like to just briefly remind the board 6 of our vision, mission, and philosophy followed by the 7 facility's maintenance overview and then the nuts and 8 bolts of this CIP presentation. 9 Next slide. Our vision is for State agencies 10 to occupy exemplary facilities, and that has not changed 11 since the last biennium. Our mission is to provide 12 well-planned, efficient and safe facilities to house 13 agencies so that they can effectively administer their 14 programs. And as a team, our philosophy is to work on 15 building consensus and to take pride in our work while we 16 serve with humility. 17 Next slide. We wanted to share this slide in 18 response to a question from our CIP presentation a couple 19 of weeks back regarding the percentages we used for cost 20 escalation and material cost index. Without getting too 21 specific, you notice on the escalation chart file cost 22 estimating firm OCMI, from 2012 to 2019, the national 23 construction cost escalation hovered right around 3.2 24 percent. And then from 2019 to 2020, you notice a quick 25 drop as we dealt with the beginnings of COVID-19.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 that. 2 COUNSEL STEWART: All right. All in favor? 3 THE BOARD: Aye. 4 COUNSEL STEWART: Opposed? So moved. 5 CHAIR HAND: Thank you all. The next item is 6 discussion and possible action on the Administrator's 7 recommendation to the Board for the 2025 CIP. 8 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the 9 record. I know Administrator Lewis and Brian Wacker are 10 going to take this agenda item. I did just want to point 11 out as a preliminary matter that between the board 12 meeting in August and today, staff is continuing to do 13 due diligence, get information from the agency, and so 14 there may be some distinctions between what was presented 15 in August and what you see today. And of course we can 16 answer any questions in detail, you know, after the 17 presentation. Thank you. Sorry, Wil. 18 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Administrator Wil 19 Lewis, for the record. Thank you, Susan, for that 20 explanation. I think it will serve us very well. 21 To begin my presentation on the CIP, again, 22 this is the Administrator's recommendation to the board. 23 We'll be using the same criteria we used a couple of 24 weeks ago at the CIP agency presentations to the Board. 25 However, this go-around, we have managed to scale down</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 From 2020 to 2022, you notice a big spike up 2 to 20 percent as we dealt with construction materials and 3 supplies shortfall. You recall long lead items and long 4 lead times getting building components like AC systems, 5 computer chips and the rising cost of fuel and 6 transportation, so it affected the entire nation. And 7 then from 2022 to 2023, you notice a severe drop to about 8 6.8 percent escalation rate. And so we then settled in 9 around 6.4, 6.8 percent for our projected costs per 10 projects. 11 Now, on the other chart regarding the 12 material cost index, the OCMI report stated that they 13 expect material costs to maintain stability in pricing 14 through 2025 with an average year-over-year change likely 15 to stay within the historical bounds of 2 to 4 percent 16 for any given material category. And again, just a quick 17 overview. We would be happy to share this report with 18 any board member who would like to have a copy of it. 19 Let's get to the next slide. Now you 20 probably recall seeing this slide a couple of years ago. 21 However, we updated it to reflect our current CIP project 22 numbers. You notice the red graph. The red graph shows 23 the current deferred maintenance backlog of about \$260 24 million dollars of maintenance projects. Last biennium, 25 we funded \$212 million dollars in deferred maintenance</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Of course.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 MEMBER WALKER: Perfect.

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

1 that with our partners with other agencies so that they
2 can also track that as well.
3 I know when I was a director at the College
4 of Southern Nevada, we had our director of technical
5 services track all of that, all of the life expectancies
6 and warranties on all of the major systems on the three
7 main campuses on all of our facilities, so that's one of
8 the things we want to do moving forward so that we can
9 track it so that we can be more proactive rather than
10 reactive to these type of requests.

11 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. My next question
12 is a --

13 CHAIR HAND: Member Hand, for the record.
14 Roy, could I just ask a followup question on this before
15 you move to another one while we're on this topic or
16 maybe just share a comment that Nevada Department of
17 Transportation does an excellent job with their asset
18 management system, and it's inclusive. It's everything.
19 And it might be worth visiting with them or have this
20 person at B&G visit with the folks at the Nevada
21 Department of Transportation I think who do an excellent
22 job with that.

23 And in follow-up to Member Walker's question
24 about the slide, do we have -- I think it's further in
25 the packet, but I don't want to get distracted. The

1 projection that we had for '25 and '23, what was the
2 projected maintenance budget? Was it anywhere near this?
3 I thought we were going to be going down the way we were,
4 I thought we plateaued and were predicting our costs were
5 going down.

6 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the
7 record. The past projections in those graphs are
8 included in the next agenda item when we talk about the
9 letter to the governor. It's very related. I'm just
10 pointing out that that information is in the packet if we
11 want to look for it.

12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Again, the reason I'm
13 asking the question is, we brought this up during the CIP
14 during the discussion before is again, all this
15 maintenance stuff that's on the agenda, and so if we
16 could find that, that would be helpful just to see where
17 our projection was and what we ended up with now.

18 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the
19 record. It's at Exhibit B of that item, and for the 2025
20 CIP, we're looking at \$155 million of maintenance.

21 COUNSEL STEWART: Yeah. So let's let
22 everybody -- sorry. Susan Stewart, for the record. So
23 we're going to move ahead, and this is -- we're not in
24 violation of our agenda because we're very much talking
25 about this slide and we're looking at historical data

1 regarding this slide. So we're looking at Agenda Item
2 Number 5, and then in your packet is Exhibit B, and it is
3 the first letter in Exhibit B, and then there's a graph
4 attached to that so everybody can get there.

5 Go ahead, Brian.

6 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Okay. Brian Wacker.
7 Thank you. So yeah, it would have been nice if we didn't
8 have \$313 million dollars of maintenance that we're
9 talking about right now. I was really excited when we
10 put this graph together two years ago because instead of
11 that black line, which is the curve of maintenance
12 backlog, it was going up, up and up, it was coming down
13 for the first time. Really excited about that.

14 I think on this graph, it's a little
15 disappointing to see that it went back up again, and
16 that's what you're alluding at, although I know looking
17 at that, one of the problems that we had over the last
18 two years is we've had a large amount of just
19 construction escalation over the last two years. We've
20 seen a lot of our project costs go up.

21 When Administrator Lewis in his presentation
22 was talking about the escalation rates in 2022, 20
23 percent and that year alone, and from 2019 to now, I
24 think we've had almost a 50 percent construction
25 escalation, that's at all projects and that's with this

1 maintenance backlog as well.

2 I think Member Walker has some really good
3 points too. I really like that we're talking about what
4 are these agencies doing for what their maintenance
5 needs, you know.

6 In particular, I could think about one
7 project at Corrections. You might have seen it in the
8 news. There's HVAC issues with the evaporative cooling
9 at High Desert State Prison. And in our recommendation,
10 we have a \$58 million-dollar project for that. So that
11 project alone has really moved the needle on this
12 maintenance request. So one project, \$313 and \$58
13 million from that one thing where if that had not become
14 such an issue, we weren't anticipating having to do all
15 of the housing units until that really came to the
16 forefront this summer.

17 If you would have left us alone, we might
18 have had a \$10, \$12 million-dollar budget. But because
19 of what happened, it turned into a \$58 million-dollar
20 project. So there's things like that. And I don't know
21 whether that was just due to the age of the units or just
22 maintenance issues at High Desert State Prison, but we
23 have things like that pop up and there's dollars
24 associated with them, so it moves that needle a little
25 bit.

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

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

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

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

25 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker again. Now back

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

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

11 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Yes, please.

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: It's worse.

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

23 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: That's right. Yeah.

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

25 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly, for the

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

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

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: That's fine.

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

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

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

21 COUNSEL STEWART: What slide, sir?

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

1 be 65 years would without a shade structure. I see a
2 2016 building, which would be eight years without a shade
3 structure, and I see 1995 buildings which would be 24
4 years without a shade structure. So I really don't
5 believe it's in the State's best interest to spend a
6 million dollars on a shade structure that has this life
7 history to it.
8 Instead of this million dollars being spent
9 here, I would like to move to -- I didn't list them per
10 slide. It is the Eagle State Park Dam replacement which
11 in my book, it was from Wildlife, and it was they're
12 ranked six. And within the slides, it's in the asking
13 not past maintenance. It's in the request for funding
14 for design and construct. It is the -- your request.
15 I'm missing your request. I don't see it, but it is a
16 dam at Eagle Valley State Park. This dam has been
17 indicated by FEMA to be a high hazard, which is the
18 highest hazard that FEMA has in rating our dams. In
19 fact, the dam is leaking, and it is placed on here. So I
20 think that that is very well done.
21 Now I would like to refer to the next another
22 project that was not included, and that was Department of
23 Wildlife project rank number 7 which was the Kingston
24 Canyon Dam. The Kingston Canyon Dam has been placed on
25 FEMA's high-hazard list. It is also leaking. There's

1 There's probably 40 to 50 people that live there with
2 houses. Below Eagle Valley, below the Ely Dam, there's
3 one resident, but there's State Highway 50, and it's the
4 same size. So there's huge issues that I believe we
5 should be looking at and not doing shade structures. I
6 don't get the priority. So that's the question.
7 Unfortunately, a statement.
8 COUNSEL STEWART: That's fine. Susan
9 Stewart, for the record. Just a couple of things. I
10 think if you look at the criteria and the priorities that
11 have been approved by the Board, the public-facing DMV
12 and the public having challenges accessing services, the
13 attention that the DMV gets is one of the reasons why the
14 shade structure was recommended.
15 The second thing is Hobart and Marlette are
16 part of a water system that provides the sole water
17 source to Storey County, and that water system is owned
18 by the State of Nevada and managed by the Department of
19 Administration, so it's treated differently. Rightly or
20 wrongly, it's treated differently because of those
21 circumstances.
22 The other thing is Public Works primarily
23 builds buildings. And the challenges that we face with
24 the dams that are being presented to us that it is a
25 little bit outside of our wheelhouse and a question of

1 safety issues. High hazard from FEMA means life-safety
2 issues. The valving at the bottom of the dam, the lower
3 level outlet, the slide valving is not working, so you
4 can't effectively lower water elevation in the dam so you
5 can't manage it during storm flows. You're relying on
6 the overflow structure, and the overflow structure needs
7 to be replaced from the part.
8 So what is the difference and significance
9 from one dam to the other dam? I don't understand why
10 one makes it with the same criteria and another one
11 doesn't, and then yet there's a third one, Illipah Creek
12 Dam which again backs up 65 acres of water, and it has
13 the same issues, but these aren't being addressed. I get
14 it that over time, a dam that's leaking only gets bigger,
15 but if we don't start in planning and doing something
16 now, we're increasing the risk of some kind of
17 catastrophe.
18 And I would rather spend shade money at DMV,
19 which I believe DMV, this is their problem creating the
20 lines. We've given buildings. We've given all kinds of
21 stuff: Highway Department a \$50 million-dollar computer
22 system to improve this. I don't want to spend a million
23 dollars there. I want to spend a million dollars fixing
24 life-safety issues with this dam.
25 Below Kingston Dam is the Town of Kingston.

1 whether there, you know, if you look at the statute,
2 whether we are even authorized or required to do those
3 projects.
4 The other thing is the million dollars for a
5 shade structure, once you approach these dams, I think
6 your costs are going to be much more significant than
7 that.
8 And the final point I want to make is yes,
9 there's liability associated with the dams. Yes, there's
10 a need there, and that is weighed against keeping the
11 doors open for DHHS and welfare offices and Caliente
12 Youth Center and the well service and things like that.
13 And so there are always those difficult choices to be
14 made, and they're made using the Board-approved criteria
15 which maybe that's something that the Board wants to
16 suggest we go back and look at again, but I just offer
17 that as perspective and that's all. Thank you.
18 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. The question I
19 proposed was not a comparison to Hobart. It was a
20 comparison to Eagle Valley Dam which did get funding for
21 design and why that one, having the same risk as these
22 other or two other dams that have the same risk
23 classification, that did not make it and two of them from
24 our paperwork are leaking.
25 So then I'd like to go to wheelhouses. This

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

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

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

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

1 all three.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 MEMBER WALKER: Okay.

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

25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the

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

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

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

25 So when I look at the budget of the EVOC

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

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

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

25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: So Brian Wacker, for

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

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

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

21 MEMBER WALKER: Are you remembering?

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

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

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

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

6 COUNSEL STEWART: Yes.

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

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

10 MEMBER WALKER: Okay. Perfect.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 least you've got it in the queue so that there's an
2 investment that's been made, and like I said, an
3 investment to finish what we started. So just piggy-back
4 on what Brian had said. Thank you.
5 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I would like a
6 little discussion on the biggest bang for our State
7 dollars, and where that would refer to is the National
8 Guard. Within the National Guard's ask, there's a
9 project number 25378, and it's a storm system to correct
10 some storm damage. And if the project stays under
11 \$400,000, it's 100 percent federally funded. So my
12 question would be let's keep or I guess my answer would
13 be let's keep the project under \$400,000 and do a portion
14 of it with other funding.
15 I have some other questions along the same
16 lines. Project number 25332 is \$2.61 federal funded to
17 one of our State dollars.
18 Project number 25380 is \$5 federal dollars to
19 our one State dollar.
20 Project 25336 is \$4.7 federal dollars to our
21 \$1, and there's a whole group in between. So why is not
22 the recommendation to do \$400,000 worth of storm drain
23 work that is on the federal dime? We would have to pay
24 for our staff for that.
25 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the

1 record. So that project, particularly 25378, that was --
2 we closed that project at the agency request after the
3 agency presentations, so I think they had a funding
4 issue. So that project was closed, and so they asked
5 that we don't move forward with that particular project.
6 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. Perfect
7 response. Now the five-to-one project.
8 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the
9 record. I just want to jump in here and just frame
10 preliminary kind of a foundational issue. A couple
11 sessions ago, the Board had a discussion about how we
12 decide to select CIP projects, and one of the things that
13 came up was some type of equanimity or equality or
14 something like that.
15 And one of the challenges is is that if we
16 consider again too many projects chasing too few dollars,
17 if we consider the federal dollars that the Guard brings,
18 that means other projects for State agencies that can
19 never bring money are not going to be selected. And so
20 the Guard, as I -- and Brian can speak more to this. I
21 think there are six of their projects in there, and so it
22 really is it's not like oh, we don't want that money. It
23 is there is staff time associated with that. There is
24 State expenses associated with that. And it will be done
25 at the expense of another agency's needs that will never

1 be able to bring their own money. And so I just kind of
2 throw that out there as a foundation for, you know, how
3 some of these decisions are made.
4 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I agree with
5 that wholeheartedly that that dollar that the State
6 spends is a dollar taken away from other projects. The
7 specifics was I see the 100 percent funding. We could
8 put that in at minimum cost to us. But if that project
9 is withdrawn by the client, it's withdrawn by the client.
10 I don't believe I have any more questions.
11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly. I've got a
12 couple of questions, if I may. So I saw a couple I guess
13 one question looks like a subsection of project 505 for
14 paving at the DMV in Reno \$800,000, and I know \$800,000
15 in the scheme of \$1.2 billion is not a lot, but my
16 question is that South Reno DMV is almost brand new. I'm
17 wondering why there's already \$800 grand in paving
18 required. That's kind of specific, but that jumped out
19 at me.
20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the
21 record. I'll attempt to answer that. So the DMV South
22 Reno DMV is already, I believe, five years old. Is that
23 correct? I got a nod, so that means that is correct.
24 And so in the pavement, in the maintenance world, it's
25 time to do pavement maintenance on that facility. So

1 we'll look to do that on new pavements in the stated
2 inventory when they're about that age. It's not a
3 reconstruction. It's just a maintenance activity, and
4 that's what those are. That's what that project is
5 looking at.
6 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thanks. And then on
7 project 507, while we're back there, again, it looked
8 like it made perhaps a subset, but as I see \$3.2 million
9 dollars from the Highway Fund for maintenance on
10 elevators. So I'm just wondering, you know, why is that
11 -- I guess the question is why is that Highway funding?
12 In my mind, maintenance of elevators doesn't register as
13 Highway funds in my mind.
14 COUNSEL STEWART: It's DMV.
15 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the
16 record. So it's Highway funds because it's at a DMV, so
17 it's at a Highway-funded facility is why Highway funds.
18 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thanks. I'll go
19 through a couple other projects here. It was project
20 three for the Department of Health and Human Services.
21 Elevator hoist way at the Northern Nevada Mental Health
22 facility. And I don't have the description in front of
23 me, but as I recall, folks can't get to the second level
24 and sometimes people have to -- I think they said
25 manually be moved to the second floor. In my mind, that

1 seems to fit under kind of ADA and the number-one bullet
2 point. So the question is: That one is on the not
3 recommended list. Wondering how that one got, I guess
4 how it was decided not to do that one. That one seemed
5 pretty critical to me.

6 COUNSEL STEWART: Do you have a project
7 number? Susan Stewart, for the record.

8 MEMBER MANNELLY: It was number three on
9 DHHS. Let me see. 7360. Is that a project number?

10 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah.

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Does not have an elevator
12 to provide ADA accessibility to the second floor. An
13 employee with disabilities cannot be stationed on the
14 second floor due to lack of accessibility, and at times,
15 a patient needs to occupy a room on the second floor and
16 that patient needs to be transported manually.

17 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the
18 record. Would that have been captured in the ADA
19 statewide?

20 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the
21 record. It could have been. We also put together a
22 statewide elevator program, and so it didn't fall into
23 either of those.

24 I think the honest answer to that question,
25 Member Mannelly, is it was not something in our due

1 it's going to be a recurring one.

2 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the
3 record. Phil, could you give me that number again?

4 MEMBER MANNELLY: 7360.

5 COUNSEL STEWART: Page 41.

6 MEMBER MANNELLY: Page 41 so 882 on our prior
7 packet.

8 CHAIRPERSON HAND: 41.

9 COUNSEL STEWART: 41.

10 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Oh, okay.

11 MEMBER MANNELLY: And I'll just add, you
12 know, DHHS, you know, identified it as number three.
13 Other projects from DHHS that are listed lower, at least
14 in their mind, were approved as far as I can tell. And,
15 you know, to Susan Stewart's point before, I can take a
16 note down to add that to a motion, but I guess it's just
17 that one seemed to stand out.

18 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: I walked down here
19 with a different book.

20 MEMBER MANNELLY: Sorry.

21 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the
22 record. The book I walked down here with was my early
23 July book. So what was the question again?

24 MEMBER MANNELLY: I guess --

25 COUNSEL STEWART: Why wasn't it recommended?

1 diligence looking at that project that we thought it rose
2 to the level that it needed to get to be funded. It's a
3 \$6.2 million-dollar project that talks about ADA
4 accessibility to the second floor, which is a great way
5 to phrase that as a justification. But, you know, ADA,
6 you know, accessibility does not mean you have to have
7 accessibility onto a second floor. We can accommodate
8 them in another location or the same thing with a
9 patient. We could accommodate them without the elevator.
10 And so I think that was part of the thinking behind that
11 is \$6.2 million dollars needed for that project, we can
12 accommodate them in another fashion.

13 MEMBER MANNELLY: Phil Mannelly, for the
14 record. I want to make sure we're looking at the same
15 one because the one I'm looking at is \$2.7 million.

16 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Oh. I might be in the
17 wrong one.

18 MEMBER MANNELLY: And honestly, I don't know
19 what this description means: At times, a patient needs
20 to occupy a room. Needs to occupy a room on the second
21 floor, and that patient needs to be transported manually.
22 I don't know what that means. I don't know if that means
23 someone picks them up and carries them up the stairs.
24 I'm not sure, but that's what the description says. And
25 it says it was requested last CIP too, so it seems like

1 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah. Brian Wacker,
2 for the record. I still stand by why I was saying why it
3 wasn't recommended just based on our due diligence, but
4 it's a \$2.7 million-dollar project. It's not a \$6
5 million-dollar project. We could look at including that
6 in the recommendation to the Board if you'd like.

7 MEMBER MANNELLY: Yeah, I would like that.
8 That one seems important to me and to fit, you know, the
9 number one criteria.

10 So I've got a separate question if we're done
11 on that topic. On a couple of the NSHE projects, I think
12 it was Great Basin College and College of Southern
13 Nevada, during their presentations, both generally said
14 okay. If we don't start construction, we're going to
15 lose the one patent or we're going to lose our land. And
16 during the past meeting, I believe I asked both of the
17 representatives, you know, is there a backup plan or a
18 contingency plan? And I'm not sure that there was.

19 So then I guess the question in my mind is
20 what role does the State Public Works Board play in
21 trying to ensure that these institutions don't lose their
22 land, I guess, or stated another way, is it incumbent
23 upon us to ensure that they don't lose the land or, you
24 know, none of those projects are recommended on this
25 cycle, so are they going to lose their land and what's

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 the impact? And I guess is that our concern or is that 2 something, you know, they need to deal with? 3 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the 4 record. That is four criteria that's approved by the 5 Board as far as what we consider when we evaluate a 6 project. So I have as a future agenda item to take a 7 look at that. 8 I do know UNLV had some limitations on 9 property ownership around their campus and they do manage 10 that internally to protect those rights, but that is not 11 something that we would take into consideration. The 12 other question I have is was that NSHE's number one 13 recommended project? 14 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah. Brian Wacker, 15 for the record. It was not. And that's actually a 16 really good point too. When we look at the NSHE and 17 actually just kind of overall, you know, those are often 18 new construction projects. And how do we weigh those? 19 Historically, we look at the NSHE rankings on 20 those projects. We follow those fairly closely from top 21 to bottom. So those projects where they're worried about 22 losing land was not at the top of their list. It wasn't 23 a great concern for them either at least as presented in 24 that list. I'm not saying it's not a concern. 25 I do want to say too, some of those projects</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 like most of those NSHE projects are advanced planning 2 requests only. Those could be reduced even further if we 3 chose to where oftentimes -- well, what we did was we 4 followed what the agency asked for. They asked for 5 design of the whole facility. And that fits that 6 statutory let's do planning first. You could fund a 7 programming or a schematic design. You could fund 8 something smaller just to kind of lump something along if 9 you chose. So there are some avenues out there that we 10 could take. 11 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the 12 record. I would take my lead from NSHE and how they 13 prioritize that project which was why they didn't. 14 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. 15 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Yeah. 16 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the 17 record. Again, when I sat on the NSHE side of the table, 18 for an example, Phil, we had the northwest campus. The 19 agreement we had with the BLM is as long as we show some 20 kind of development within a time period that was agreed 21 by both parties, everybody was satisfied. 22 And for that particular project, as long as 23 we showed that we were doing master planning, we had put 24 a sign up on the property to secure fencing, that would 25 suffice.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 is BLM leasehold for many of those. There are avenues 2 that they can take to extend the timing on those. And 3 oftentimes -- I don't want to speak in absolutes because 4 I don't know what the leasehold agreement says, but 5 oftentimes, there are avenues to modify or change that as 6 long as substantive action has been taken to develop the 7 property. So it's not always a doom and gloom, although 8 when you're looking for justification, it's advantageous 9 to say yes, you've got to do it. But it's not always so. 10 MEMBER MANNELLY: Yeah. And Phil Mannelly 11 again, for the record. I guess it leads to a follow-up. 12 Is there anything that we can do such as at this point, 13 approving a smaller project or building a road or some 14 infrastructure or something less than a whole new 15 building to satisfy the leasehold interest or whatever 16 may be there to ensure that they keep the land or are we 17 kind of stuck with what they present us and that's all 18 that we can do and we can't say well, you know what? We 19 have, you know, a couple million not the whole hundred 20 million dollars or whatever the project may be, but we 21 have a couple of million dollars that we can provide you 22 to do some construction or again, are we constrained to 23 kind of what's presented to us? 24 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the 25 record. I mean, we could always change what a project is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 I want to agree with Brian Wacker when he 2 said that the majority of the projects that we get from 3 NSHE, they are pretty big projects, but we certainly 4 would entertain doing some advanced planning for them or 5 even a lesser project if that would help them. But to my 6 knowledge, they have not approached us. And when I sat 7 on that side of the table, we did not go to the State 8 Public Works Board for us to secure that land. We knew 9 that was our responsibility and that was our agreement 10 with the BLM. 11 MEMBER MANNELLY: Okay. Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the 13 record. Do we have any more questions from I guess for 14 Brian before we ask for a motion? 15 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the 16 record. Before we take a motion, that would end my 17 presentation. I appreciate Brian doing all of the heavy 18 lifting. Thank you. Thank you, Board, for letting me 19 present my recommendations. 20 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the 21 record. Before we ask for a motion, I would ask for a 22 couple of housekeeping items. 23 Member Walker, do you have a project name or 24 Brian, do you have a project name of the dam projects so 25 that I can suggest a motion?</p>

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

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

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

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

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 COUNSEL STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the 2 record. I'm just going to set the table here and then 3 I'll let Brian and Wil take over. 4 Several years ago, the Board was very 5 concerned that the shiny stuff was getting attention and 6 the maintenance needs of the State's building inventory 7 was not being addressed. And so in 2016, at the Board's 8 request, staff put together a letter and sent it to the 9 Governor, Governor Sandoval at the time, asking that the 10 Governor recommend that deferred maintenance projects be 11 approved at a certain dollar value. 12 So what you have here today is a request to 13 do that again, and you have attached as Exhibit A is a 14 draft of the letter that staff has put together to send 15 to Governor Lombardo. And then as Exhibit B is the prior 16 correspondence that has been sent from the Board to the 17 Governor regarding prior CIPs. And you can see prior 18 actions. The Board's been taking this action since 2016. 19 And with that, I will turn it over to Brian and Wil. 20 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the 21 record. Do we have any questions about the letter that 22 we drafted thus far? 23 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. When I read the 24 letter, I came away with the impression that this was all 25 our deferred maintenance within the State. And from my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 was going on, it was absolutely right for doing that. 2 And so thank you, Tito, for doing that. 3 And I don't have any additional comments 4 other than I'd like to have this in the subsequent agenda 5 item. And I have one comment on the letter. The 6 signature block has a bunch of letters by my name. I'd 7 ask that that all be removed. 8 COUNSEL STEWART: They're your letters. 9 Okay. All right. We do need a motion. 10 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Just looking around to 11 make sure everybody is -- Phil Mannelly, for the record. 12 I'd make a motion to approve the letter with the change 13 on Chairperson Hand's signature block as requested. 14 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I will second 15 the motion. 16 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the 17 record. Do we have any discussion? Any further 18 discussion? If not, then all in favor, if you'd please 19 raise your hand or say aye. 20 THE BOARD: Aye. 21 CHAIR HAND: Seeing none that weren't up, 22 none opposed, with that, the motion carries. Thank you. 23 The next item on our agenda for discussion is 24 Board comment and discussion. So we've had a lot of 25 discussion along the way getting here. I think we have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 prior conversation, we don't have deferred maintenance on 2 all of the other divisions defined. 3 ADMINISTRATOR WACKER: Brian Wacker, for the 4 record. This is for the entire state of the products 5 that would be inside the CIP, so it does not include NDOT 6 or NSHE would be the two exclusions on that. So these 7 numbers are inclusive of the entire state. 8 What we don't have is we don't have 9 management of all state agencies inside of Public Works. 10 Buildings and Grounds does only Buildings and Grounds 11 inside of Public Works so, you know, Corrections, DHHS 12 are responsible for their own maintenance programs. 13 MEMBER WALKER: Okay. 14 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the 15 record. Are there any other questions? And I think I 16 asked the question that was sort of important to me 17 earlier, and I apologize for getting that out of sequence 18 making Susan's life difficult. 19 COUNSEL STEWART: No, that's okay. 20 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Make me behave. But I 21 think this is really an important issue. Every CIP, we 22 see these huge maintenance dollars, and Tito, Member 23 Tiberti has been awfully quiet today, but he really 24 championed this in 2016 and he really pushed for it. And 25 he was absolutely right. I mean, when you look at what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 sort of a list of items that maybe we could just review 2 to make sure that we captured everything and there may be 3 some other things that we want to add. And so there's 4 agenda, you know, future agenda items and then we've got 5 Board comments on any agenda item, items to be included 6 in any future agendas and then review and action items on 7 State Public Works. 8 COUNSEL STEWART: If I may. Susan Stewart, 9 for the record. I have a list. Well, I have hen 10 scratching, but I'm going to make a list. And then if 11 you can tell me what I'm missing and certainly, you all 12 know how to get ahold of me and so we can add things. 13 I have stats on advanced planning, I have 14 cost estimates, how Public Works Division puts together 15 their cost estimates on their projects, I have -- and 16 this is my own list -- is when we talk about advanced 17 planning, there may be delays, additional costs 18 associated with that, we have a statute. Does that mean 19 we should look at a bill draft request to address that? 20 I have maintenance inventory on my list. I have looked 21 to NDOT asset management as a possible resource. I have 22 further discussion on deferred maintenance and how we're 23 tracking that success versus we can do better. That's my 24 list. 25 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Anybody have anything they</p>

Page 65

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

Page 66

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

Page 67

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

Page 68

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

Do Not Copy

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

REGULATIONS
September 17, 2024

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

Page 1

1 STATE OF NEVADA
2
3 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION VIDEO CONFERENCE BOARD MEETING
4
5 TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024
6
7 10:58 A.M.
8
9 STATE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION
10
11 680 WEST NYE LANE, SUITE 103
12
13 CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89703
14
15
16
17 THE BOARD: ADAM HAND, Chairperson
18 JOY GRIMMER, Director,
19 Department of Administration
20 PHILIP MANNELLY, Member
21 Roy Walker, Member
22 TITO TIBERTI, Member
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Page 3

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA; TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024,
2 10:58 A.M.
3 -o0o-
4
5 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Member Hand, for the
6 record. Good morning. This is the time and place of
7 Public Works Board meeting on regulation adoption hearing
8 LCB File R072-24. It's Tuesday the 17th, and it is 10:58
9 a.m. We've got just a couple of agenda items today.
10 We'll start with a roll call.
11 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the
12 record. Chairman Adam Hand?
13 CHAIR HAND: Present.
14 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Vice-Chairman Clint
15 Bentley?
16 Member Tito Tiberti?
17 MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.
18 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member Kevin Lewis?
19 Member Philip Mannelly?
20 MEMBER MANNELLY: Present.
21 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member Roy Walker?
22 MEMBER WALKER: Present.
23 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Member and Director of
24 Administration Joy Grimmer?
25 DIRECTOR GRIMMER: Present.
ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, we have a

Page 2

1 AGENDA/INDEX
2
3 AGENDA ITEM PAGE
4
5 1. Roll Call 3
6
7 2. Public Comment 4
8
9 3. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible 4
10 action on the adoption of revisions to the Nevada
11 Administrative Code 341. (Pursuant to NRS 341.110
12 the Administrator recommends and the Board approves
13 and adopts regulations for the Professional Services
14 and Code Compliance Sections of the State Public
15 Works Division.)
16 LCB File No. R072-24 Amends NAC 341 as follows:
17 Updates the building codes adopted by the board and
18 the cost to purchase code books.
19 Revises the monetary thresholds from \$250,000 to
20 \$1,000,000 for when a selection committee must be
21 established to select an architect of engineer.
22 Revises the fee for a project with a total valuation
23 between \$25,001 and \$50,000.
24 Changes the term 'Green building design measure' to
25 'High performance building design measure.'
Repeals the definition of 'Simple payback period.'
Repeals the recycling requirement.
4. Public Comment 7
8. Adjournment 7

Page 4

1 quorum.
2 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you, Wil. The next
3 item on our agenda today is public comment. Do we have
4 anybody down south for public comment?
5 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Wil Lewis, for the
6 record. We have no comments down south.
7 CHAIRPERSON HAND: And Member Hand, for the
8 record again. Doesn't look like we have any here. Do we
9 have any on the phone?
10 COUNSEL STEWART: I have not been advised of
11 anyone calling in to provide public comment. Thank you.
12 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you. Then we'll go
13 to Item 3 on the agenda for possible action. Item 3 for
14 possible action, discussion and possible action on the
15 adoption of the revisions to the Nevada Administrative
16 Code 341 pursuant to NRS 341.110. The Administrator
17 recommends that the Board approves and adopts
18 regulations for the Professional Services and Code
19 Compliance Sections of the State Public Works Division.
20 COUNSEL STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 Susan Stewart, for the record. The board will remember
22 all the way back in March, we had a workshop on changing
23 the State Public Works Division's building codes. We're
24 adopting the 2024 code. And you'll recall we had quite a
25 bit of public in attendance at that workshop, all in

Page 5

1 favor of the proposed amendments.
2 The next step in the process is these were
3 sent to the Legislative Council Bureau for their vetting
4 and review, and they put together what is attached to
5 your agenda item proposed regulation of State Public
6 Works Board, and that's LCB File Number R072-24 dated
7 July 8, 2024.
8 The attached amends the Nevada Administrative
9 Code Section 341 as follows. As I mentioned, it updates
10 the building codes adopted by the Board and also
11 references the new updated cost to purchase those books.
12 It revises the monetary thresholds from
13 250,000 to a million dollars for when the Public Works
14 Division must use a formal selection committee when
15 they're retaining the services of an architect or
16 engineer. It makes a minor typographical correction
17 revising the fee for a project with a total valuation
18 between \$25,000 and \$50,000, and then it changes the term
19 "Green building design measure" to "High performance
20 building design measure."
21 As Brian mentioned earlier, changing the term
22 green building which doesn't really have a connection to
23 industry standards to something that is reflected more in
24 the industry high-performance building design measure.
25 It repeals the definition of "simple pay back period" and

Page 6

1 then repeals the recycling requirement.
2 Since we met last time, the energy code that
3 is referenced in here and adopted did come -- has been
4 published and the concerns were addressed. Any technical
5 questions regarding that, I have people in the room that
6 I can phone a friend.
7 And with that, I would -- unless Brian and
8 Wil had anything to add, I would ask if there's any
9 questions.
10 CHAIR HAND: Are there any questions?
11 COUNSEL STEWART: And if there are no
12 questions, I would ask for a motion to approve and adopt,
13 and then the next step is that we would go to the
14 Legislative Commission for their approval.
15 DIRECTOR GRIMMER: Joy Grimmer, for the
16 record. I'll make a motion to adopt and approve.
17 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Do we have a second?
18 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. I will second
19 the motion.
20 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Any discussion? Are there
21 any questions? There's probably no discussion. With
22 that, all in favor, please raise your hand or say aye.
23 THE BOARD: Aye.
24 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Doesn't look like we have
25 any opposed. So hearing none, the motion carries.

Page 7

1 Couldn't have been any simpler.
2 The next item on our agenda is public
3 comment. And do we have any public comment in the south?
4 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: Administrator Wil
5 Lewis. We did have had a lady that was in the lobby, but
6 I think she left. She was waiting for the 10:00 o'clock.
7 MEMBER TIBERTI: We wore her out.
8 ADMINISTRATOR LEWIS: No comments at this
9 time.
10 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Thank you. Member Hand,
11 for the record. And we don't have any here. Are we
12 aware of any on the phone?
13 COUNSEL STEWART: No. And I just want to
14 point out to the Board that the open meeting law in
15 Nevada requires public comment at the beginning and
16 public comment at the end of every meeting, so I don't
17 include that to torture you. I just it's a requirement
18 of the statute. And so I just wanted to point that out.
19 And there's no public comment, and I haven't been made
20 aware of anyone calling in on the phone to make public
21 comment either.
22 CHAIR HAND: Member Hand, for the record.
23 Thank you for the information. And the last item on our
24 agenda today is to adjourn. Do we have a motion to
25 adjourn?

Page 8

1 DIRECTOR GRIMMER: Joy Grimmer. Motion to
2 adjourn.
3 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Do we have a second?
4 MEMBER WALKER: Roy Walker. Tito Tiberti.
5 I'll second.
6 CHAIRPERSON HAND: Tito. All in favor, say
7 aye.
8 THE BOARD: Aye.
9 CHAIR HAND: Looks like we don't have any
10 opposed with that the motion carries. The meeting is
11 adjourned. And again, thank you all for your time today
12 and the time that you spent preparing for today. I think
13 it was a great meeting.
14 COUNSEL STEWART: Very good.
15 (The meeting concluded at 11:06 a.m.)
16 -o0o-
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

4

5

6

7 I, NICOLE J. HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the
8 State of Nevada, State Public Works Division, do hereby
9 Certify:

10 That on the 17th day of September, 2024, I was
11 present at said workshop for the purpose of reporting, in
12 verbatim stenotype notes within-entitled public
13 workshop;

14 That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1
15 through 8, inclusive, includes a full, true and correct
16 transcription of my stenotype notes of said public
17 workshop.
18

19 Dated at Reno, Nevada, this 23rd day of September,
20 2024.

21

22

23 NICOLE J. HANSEN, NV CCR #446

24

25